OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 GEORGE V, 1919

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1028 Volume II: Pages 1029-2096
" III: " 2097-3192 " IV: " 3193-3996
Volume V: 3997-4702

VOLUME CXXXV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF APRIL TO THE FIFTH DAY OF MAY, 1919, INCLUSIVE



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

DOMINION OF CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Tuesday, April 1, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PAPER PRESENTED.

Paper showing the average number of men employed in the Dominion Police Force for the year 1918.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of John Edwin Scott.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 44, for the relief of Claudius Henry Sherk.—Mr. Ross.

SOLDIERS SENTENCED TO PENAL SERVITUDE.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): For the purpose of asking a question, may I direct the attention of the Acting Prime Minister to the following cable despatch which appeared in yesterday's Montreal Star:

> London, March 31. (Canadian Press Dispatch from Reuter's Ltd.) The new Army Bill provides that members of the Imperial Forces enlisted in the Dominion and sentenced to penal servitude need not serve their sentence in the United Kingdom as hitherto provided in all soldiers' cases, but in the Dominions in which they were enlisted.

Above that despatch the Montreal Star places the sarcastic heading, "Thanks for the honour." May I inquire if the Government is in a position to explain to the House if this despatch means that a number of criminals are to be dumped into this country to be maintained during the rest of their lives at the cost of the taxpayers of Canada, or if this is to be taken as a significant hint of Canada's new status in the Imperial War Cabinet and the Cabinet of Governments.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I have not seen the article, and I have no official information on the subject referred to.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 10, to amend the Dominion Lands Surveys Act.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 29, to amend the Railway Act (Aid for Railway Crossings).—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Bill No. 30, to amend an Act to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

ADVANCES FOR THE PURCHASE OF SEED GRAIN.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 24, respecting advances for the purchase of seed grain, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—minister may guarantee repayment of advances.

Mr. MURPHY: Are these agreements uniform or may they vary in certain cases, and, if so, in what respect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far just one agreement has been made by me with the Bankers' Association on behalf of all the banks. It would never in my opinion be justifiable to make an agreement with one bank more favourable than with another.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the section mean that there will be a discrepancy of 2 per cent between the interest paid by the Government and the interest paid by the entrant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The bank in making a loan to a farmer cannot charge over 7 per cent. If the bank fails to collect and calls upon the Government to pay, the Government is only bound to pay 5 per cent.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—commission on collections.

Mr. BUREAU: A commission of 1 per cent on the amount lent and 7 per cent interest would make 8 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it would mean on all moneys that the bank collects it would get 8 per cent, but the farmer would pay only 7 per cent. The Government pays one per cent for the trouble of collection. That is by way of inducement to the bank to collect the money and keep the Government out of the matter as far as possible.

Mr. BUREAU: The one per cent is paid by the Government at all events. Supposing a farmer borrows money from a bank and gives his note, when the farmer pays back the money, the bank gets one per cent over and above the interest charged to the farmer, and that one per cent is paid by the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. CAHILL: The last time this Bill was before the House, I understood the minister to state that he would take into consideration the advisability of limiting the amount to be appropriated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When the Bill was previously before the House, I stated, in response to a suggestion by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding), that a limit should be placed on the amount which the Government could in any way advance or guarantee for seed grain purchases, which suggestion I said at the time I did not think was practicable, that I would look into the matter further and see if it were practicable. The Controller of the Finance Department, whom I consulted, said that no practicable limit could be fixed because the amount varies from almost nothing in some years to half a million dollars in others. In 1916, following the big crop of 1915, no money whatever was advanced to unpatented homesteaders. In 1917 the amount advanced was $72,757. In 1918 the amount advanced was $370,000. Then back in the year 1915, I do not know what the amount advanced on unpatented homesteads was, but at all events it was up in the millions, so that one would necessarily have to fix the maximum amount, and that would be of no value at all. I do not see that any purpose could be served in fixing the amount, for the reason that there is no guiding principle to follow, and if for any reason the demand for the year exceeded the maximum fixed by Parliament, there could be no justification for not meeting the demand even by Governor General's warrant.

Mr. CAHILL: Under this measure the department has the privilege of spending all of the moneys of the Dominion of Canada, and as Parliament sits usually between the crop seasons, it is surely not too much to expect the department to make an approximate estimate of what they expect to require during the coming season. This provision is for next season's crop, and conditions in the districts that are liable to be benefited under this measure are pretty well known. The department can surely say to-day that it will require $1,000,000 or $10,000,000. If there had been a crop failure last year, the department would require more money. There could be inserted in the Bill a section stating that as Parliament sits between the crop seasons, the estimated amount required should be fixed each year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would have very little difficulty in fixing a maximum amount for this year. I do not think the maximum amount required this year will reach $500,000. But the hon. member asks for a maximum applicable for every year.

Mr. CAHILL: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what anything inserted in the Bill would mean, because the Bill is a continuing authority to the Government. No doubt if the hon. member brings up the question at some time in each session an estimate can then be given of what will be required for that year, but you could not fix that in the Bill, because the Bill would have to be amended every year.

Mr. CAHILL: The amount expended on the Government Railways must be estimated every year, and I do not see any objection to inserting in this Bill a section making it necessary to fix the amount each year, as is done in other appropriations.

Mr. TOBIN: I am surprised that the Government should pay one per cent for collections. I never knew the banks to charge over one-quarter of one per cent. Has the minister made this agreement as to one per cent with the Bankers' Association?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I should be very much surprised to be criticised on the ground of generosity in this respect. I had the greatest difficulty in making the arrangement at the one per cent maximum, and if the Government of Canada, by this change in its policy in relation to seed grain, gets out with one per cent of the amount in outlay, it will be one of the most radical savings ever effected in any branch of the Administration.

Mr. TOBIN: If the minister would consult with the Minister of Finance, I am sure the Minister of Finance would tell him the banks would not charge more than one-

quarter of one per cent, and, perhaps, not even one-tenth of one per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member does not realize that this is not an ordinary collection. My idea was to give the banks an inducement to collect this money, instead of establishing an organization in every part of the country to collect it ourselves. The banks just get 5 per cent on the money they lend which they do not collect, and in respect of that money I think it is safe to say that they lose. They could not afford to do business on that basis, and we give them this inducement in order to ensure that the largest possible proportion of the whole outlay is collected by the banks themselves and a saving to the Government effected accordingly. I earnestly hope that it will never be necessary to increase it beyond 1 per cent, and if we succeed in this I shall be very happy.

Mr. TOBIN: I am surprised at my hon. friend's explanation. He says that the banks have a right to charge 5 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. TOBIN: What does the minister say?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say 5 per cent.

Mr. TOBIN: Interest?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. Where they get 5 per cent on the money they get nothing at all for collecting, because they do not collect. They get 5 per cent when they appeal to the Government to pay on its guarantee. We pay 5 per cent and we have to go and collect it from the farmer. We want that proportion to be as small as possible, and consequently say to the bank, "Wherever you collect we will pay you 1 per cent extra."

Mr. TOBIN: I do not think the hon. minister has made his case any better, for the banks are not responsible to the Government except as regards the collections they make on which they have the right to retain 1 per cent. I think 1 per cent is more than any ordinary business man in the country pays for any collection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. TOBIN: Hon. members dispute this, but I may tell them that in our part of the country and in nearly every small town where there are branches of the different banks all that business men are ever charged on any collection on drafts or notes is ¼ of 1 per cent, and I think that any business man in this House will bear me out in this statement.

Mr. BUREAU: Who will decide whether the loan is to be granted—the bank or the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The system is this. The applicant for a loan applies to the agent of Dominion lands of the district under whose purview is the land on which he wishes the loan, and the agent certifies the application which contains all details as to acreage and the quantities of seed grain to be supplied. When the application is certified he is entitled to go to the bank and get the loan and give the bank security.

Mr. CRONYN: Has the minister considered limiting the amount of seed grain to be given to each applicant or each quarter-section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do that by regulation which we make under the terms of the Bill. The agent will know if a man is applying for more seed than he can use, and it will be an offence if he applies any of the seed to any purpose other than that for which it is obtained.

Mr. TOBIN: In selling grain to the farmer does the Government set the price? What prices are being paid for different kinds of seed grain?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under this Bill the farmer can get his seed where he likes, but through the Department of Agriculture provision is made for supplying seed to municipalities, which in turn supply to the farmers. The Department of Agriculture collects the seed through an organization which it has, inspects it as regards its germinating qualities, freedom from weeds, etc. and then sells it to the municipality at cost, plus any expenditure we may have etc., and then sells it to the municipality sume, sells to the farmer at cost to itself.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister state what objection there is to fixing a limit?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can only repeat the objection I have several times stated. I know of no object to be served, for the reason that where the Government own land on which no one else can lend, not being able to take security, it must lend the money and provide seed, rather than see that land go unseeded. As nobody else can lend upon it, we must do so. If we fix a limit and find it too low we must necessarily exceed the limit; therefore what is the use of fixing any limit?

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I understand the minister to say that the application for a loan is submitted to the agent who decides whether it should be granted or refused. The Government is responsible for the whole thing through its agent but there is no control over the agent. Does it not seem that the matter is absolutely in the hands of the agent? I should think there ought to be some control over the agents, some of whom are over-zealous while others are not sufficiently so, in dealing with applications, their interest probably depending entirely on the political complexion of the man who makes the application. I think something ought to be added to the clause to provide for some control over the agent, and to provide on broad lines the qualifications that should entitle any one to get his loan from the bank. As it stands too much power is left in the hands of the agent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The agent of course is necessarily the main intermediary between the department and the farmer, because he is locally informed. He is on the ground as the trusted officer of the department. Within his responsibility every day are delegated duties just as far-reaching and wide as this, carrying with them just as much risk to the department. Any farmer who feels he has not been properly treated can appeal to the inspector or to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands. These appeals are submitted to the deputy and finally to myself.

Mr. TOBIN: Where is his right of appeal in law?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the right of any free subject of this country. If he is not properly treated by an officer of the department he can appeal to the head of the department. He does not need to have that right specified here because he has it already. Furthermore, there is this restraint: The bank is not going to be over anxious to lend money unless the man needs it and is likely to have a crop which can represent security. The bank will make nothing out of it. If it does not collect it, it will lose money on it. There is that further protection to the Government. As a matter of fact, in all the years that have gone by, the very same system has been adopted of getting the grain to the farmer. It was our officers every time that decided it. That has been the case for twenty years—yes, for fifty years. There is no change in that respect. This is simply another method of financing it.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Has the Government lost money under this system before? I understand it has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I think there has been no loss on loans on unpatented land. There would be some loans outstanding from the year 1915. But we hold the land for it and I am told that there has been no loss at all in respect of unpatented lands because we hold the title. I promised to give the House further details as to the 1915 outlay. I estimated, on the occasion of the last discussion of the resolution, that of the $12,000,000 which we advanced that year for the relief of seed grain we had collected between $8,000,000 and $8,500,000. The actual figures are these. The total amount actually loaned by way of relief in seed grain was $12,309,607.36, of which $7,560,760 was for seed grain and $4,748,846 was for relief. The committee will remember that that was both in respect of unpatented and patented lands, because that year, owing to the tremendous and widespread hardships, we were compelled to extend our operations and we went into patented lands and we loaned all the money that year that we had to loan to take care of the seed situation. Of the $12,309,000 there has been collected to date, including interest, $9,095,753.13. That is up to the 28th February last, a month ago. Exclusive of interest, we have collected $8,415,226.83. The balance to be collected is $3,894,380, and of that balance $2,007,998 is for relief and not for seed grain at all. Of the whole $7,500,000 that was advanced for seed grain all has been repaid except $1,386,382. We expect the great body of that to be paid this fall.

On section 5—orders and regulations:

Mr. BUREAU: I must confess that I have not had time to study this Bill very much but I read here that:

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders and regulations as are considered necessary to give the provisions of this Act full effect.

What are the provisions of the Act? The Act, aside from the interpretation clause, provides that the minister may make an agreement with the bank whereby the bank may advance money to the farmer or entrant, provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid by the entrant to the bank shall not exceed seven per cent. Then, the minister will have power to guarantee the loan provided the Government do not pay over five per cent. The second clause says that the bank will be allowed

one per cent for collection. There are the provisions of the Bill. We give the minister the right to make an agreement with the bank to advance money and then we give the minister the right to pay one per cent. Clause 5 comes along and gives the minister the right to do what the Government have been doing and what we have been protesting against for the last few years. This means that you shall again rule by Order in Council; that you shall determine how the application shall be made by Order in Council, that you shall determine what the form of the note and security shall be by Order in Council; that you shall determine what guarantee you shall give to the bank by Order in Council. In fact everything is to be determined by Order in Council. Furthermore, we are asked to swallow Order in Council P.C. 2472. I do not know what Order in Council P.C. 2472 is and I do not believe there is a man in this House, even the minister himself, who is able to follow the Orders in Council that have been passed. I think that in deference to this House this Order in Council should have been distributed amongst the members so that they would have an opportunity of looking it over. When an Order in Council is mentioned in a Bill notice ought to be given to the clerk so that he could go through the mass of Orders in Council that have been passed and pick out the one that is referred to so that we should have an opportunity of seeing what we were approving. I shall not detain the House any longer than to repeat the protest which I made last session against government by Order in Council. It is the worst kind of camouflage to say that the Governor in Council shall have power to make regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act. What are the provisions of the Act? Outside of the interpretation clause they authorize the payment of one per cent to the bank and they give the minister the right to make an agreement with the bank to borrow money provided the rate of interest does not exceed seven per cent. I would like to know whether or not these regulations and orders are going to be general and whether or not, when the entrant makes application and when he conforms to the general regulations and orders, he shall be entitled to get his money from the bank. The way the Bill reads now not only are regulations and orders to be adopted by the Governor in Council to carry out the provisions of the Act, but special cases which are not provided for by the Act may also be determined, settled and regulated by Order in Council. We find that section 5 says that the Governor in Council may make such orders and regulations as are necessary "to meet any cases which may arise and for which no provision has been made in this Act." For my part, I think you might as well adopt the old and more convenient method of leaving it to the Minister of Interior. It is more agreeable to his temperament and more in conformity with his way of acting with the House. Take an Order in Council, go on and use it and do not come to the House with a Bill, which as a matter of fact is no Bill at all, and say: Gentlemen, we are going to ask your permission to pass a law. There is nothing in the provision of the law that has any reference whatever to the main matter which is the obtaining of the money by the entrant from the bank or which guarantees that every man who is going to apply to the bank for money will be treated fairly and equally. That is what I want put into the law. I have reasons, as other people have, to suspect that all entrants will not be treated in the same way.

Mr. McCREA: The Bill provides that the party who gets the seed grain shall pay interest not to exceed seven per cent. Banks are also to be allowed one per cent commission on collections, making a total of eight per cent, which the banks are to receive for the charitable assistance that is to be afforded to the farmer. Now a great many people in this country are of the opinion that banks are the most favoured class of institution in Canada to-day. We hear a lot about the Government stretching out a helping hand to the labouring classes, and the advocacy of shorter hours and more pay for those classes is very popular. When it comes to dealing with the farmers, it is desired to do everything for the agricultural community, but the Government is not very generous to the farmer when it asks him through the medium of this Bill, to pay eight per cent for the seed grain which he has got to have. Let me take up a little of the time of the House by explaining what I have in mind. I think it is about time that this Parliament should give some attention to an interest that does not seem to have received much consideration, presumably under the belief that it is making big profits. For the purpose of my argument I will provide the industries of the country into four groups: First, transportation by land and and water; second, the farming industry; third, the manufacturers; and fourth, the

banking interests. I do not wish to be understood as considering the situation of these groups merely at the present time. Take, if you will, the ten years preceding the war, and the same period after the war. With respect to transportation by land and water, you will find that the people who have invested their money in that industry have not received five per cent on their invested capital, and lots of them have passed their dividends for years—they have not been able to meet those dividends.

The CHAIRMAN: I regret that I shall have to interrupt the hon. member, and to remind the Committee of paragraph 5, of Rule 13, which declares that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion. I must rule that the hon. member is not observing that rule.

Mr. McCREA: I think I am adhering to the question under discussion.

Mr. BUREAU: We are discussing regulations having reference to the banks.

Mr. McCREA: We are discussing a provision relating to the making of regulations with respect to seed grain, and I want to point out where I think this Government proposes to be over-indulgent to the bankers of the country.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to my hon. friend that the speech which he is now making might possibly be in order upon the motion for the second reading of the Bill, but the clauses to which he has referred were adopted by the committee before the hon. gentleman entered the House.

Mr. MURPHY: May I direct your attention, Sir, to subsection 5 relating to orders and regulations. This deals with payments to any bank.

The CHAIRMAN: I must adhere to my ruling.

Mr. FIELDING: There are some words to which the hon. member for Three Rivers has called attention, as to which I think we might well have an explanation. I quite understand it is not uncommon that the Governor in Council shall be empowered to make regulations for the carrying out of an Act, and no doubt this is a case of the kind, but I think the minister has introduced some words into the Bill which are certainly very unusual. It is proposed, not only that the Governor in Council shall have power to make regulations for the carrying out of what is in the Act, but also for the carrying out of matters that are not specified therein. The words in question are that—

the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders and regulations as are considered necessary to give the provisions of this Act full effect—

I think that is reasonable. The section goes on to say, however—

—or to meet any cases which may arise and for which no provision has been made in this Act.

I think that is a very unusual provision. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has some object in view, and I am not objecting if he will give us an explanation. I do not think the words in question are usually found in any Act of the kind, and if my hon. friend will explain the reason it may prove to be quite satisfactory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree that the only words that are not in every Act of this character are those words to which the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens called attention. I did not draft the Bill myself (the drafting was done by officers of the branch who have to do this work), but I had fully in my mind what was before the draughtsmen when they inserted this particular clause:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such orders and regulations, as are considered necessary to give the provisions of this Act full effect.

I need only say that the fewer provisions there are, as my hon. friend from Three Rivers says, the more limited the effect. All this provision could do would be to give effect to the terms of the Bill.

The next phrase is:

—or to meet any cases which may arise, and for which no provision has been made in this Act.

The cases, of course, would have to be ejusdem generis, would have to be of the character provided in the Act. I presume what the draughtsmen had in mind was this: The Bill provides only for advances to entrants. That is to say, no man becomes entitled to any benefit under the Bill, or can receive any benefit under it, unless he is an entrant, unless he has a homestead, and his rights in the homestead have not matured into his rights to the land. Now in the working out of our Dominion Lands Act, and in the working out of the Order in Council which preceded the introduction of this Bill, we found a number of difficulties like this, and the variety of them is constantly increasing: Where the man gets a certificate of recom-

mendation for his patent, the rule we adopted first was that that man was not an entrant and could not come to us for any assistance; he had to go to the local authorities, the same as if he had a patent. But we found the local authorities would not deal with them—in many cases they absolutely stood out and would not,—and we were confronted with the situation of leaving that man without seed, or else coming to his rescue.

Mr. MURPHY: To whom does the hon. gentleman refer when he speaks of "local authorities"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean the provincial authorities who operate through their municipalities. So that we had to modify our policy, and take in certain of those classes, and we have provided, wherever that has been done, that they should send back their certificate of recommendation and leave it in our hands until they had completed payment on their lands. Now it would be just such cases, coming within ejusdem generis, that would be provided for in the provision referred to. I do not consider the clause of vital importance. However, I think the Bill is better with it than without it, and I prefer to have that phrase remain. I know it will do more useful work, and I fear that if it is left out we will likely be confronted next year by individual cases, or classes of cases, that we cannot meet under the strict reading of the Bill. As to the general criticism that this is providing for legislation by Order in Council, any one who reads paragraphs a, b, c, d and e will see that these are far better left to regulations. We always make the subject of regulations the forms to be used, the formalities to be gone through, the nature of the security to be taken, and all such other matters. Such things are left to be dealt with by regulation in every Bill that has been passed for the last two decades. Talk about legislation by Order in Council! I have taken the trouble to look up the figures, and it may be news to my hon. friend to know that before the War Measures Act was passed at all, before the war even broke out, there were years in which there were more Orders in Council than there have been since.

Mr. BUREAU: That must have been a long time ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only way the Government can act is by Order in Council, unless it acts illegally. Of course, the hon. members knows that just as well as I do, but he is endeavouring to give some circulation to a popular misapprehension which he thinks may bring him some advantage.

Now, as to the only clause around which any legitimate discussion could circulate, that is, the clause to meet any case which may arise, and for which no provision has been made in this Act, I submit to the better judgment of this House that the Bill will likely do its work better with that clause than without it. I do not consider the clause vital to the Bill; it is not so important as that; the words providing that a man shall be entitled to the money if certain rules apply. I do not think that would be good legislation. It is not the law to-day, it is not the law under which hon. gentlemen operated for years. They were never compelled to lend money to anybody for seed grain. Nobody could fix a set of rules with which a man must comply and then say, "That man shall be entitled to the money whether or no." You could never carry on business in that way, and hon. gentlemen must know it. Ordinarily every homesteader is entitled to seed grain if he has land upon which it can be sown, land capable of growing a crop, unless some particular circumstances arise which would prevent it. I do not know any circumstances arising this year or since I was there, but I know circumstances have arisen when it was not in the public interest to lend.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I understand from the reading of the section that this Order in Council authorized certain advances for seed grain made in October last. Will the minister explain what advances were authorized by that Order in Council, No. 2,472, and under what circumstances was it necessary to take action on that matter in October?

Mr. McCREA: Did I get your final ruling, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of the clause under discussion? I think I was right in making the remarks I made. However, you are Chairman and I abide by your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 5 provides for orders and regulations to give effect to the provisions of the entire Bill but does not refer to the general policy of the Government. The hon. member was proceeding to discuss the treatment by the Government of certain interests in this country which he had divided into four classes, when I called the attention of the committee to Rule 13, par. 5. The chairman has no de-

sire to impose his wishes upon the committee and a violation of the rule having been noted, the hon. member may, if he has the unanimous consent of the committee, continue his remarks.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member is either in order or out of order. If he is out of order we want a ruling; then if we choose to appeal we will appeal.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. member were not in order.

4 p.m. Mr. BUREAU: Then we appeal against that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By consent?

Mr. BUREAU: No. I think if this committee is going to be run by the rules of Parliament, when a member is out of order he ought to be out of order. We do not want any unanimous consent to break the rules.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Answering the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), the Order in Council did not, strictly speaking, authorize advances the way it is referred to. —"Authorize the making of advances for the purchase of seed grain."— If by these words is to be understood the making of advances by the Crown direct, it only authorized the making of advances by the banks, and the way the Order in Council of October 7, 1918, read was as follows:

That for this year—the year 1919—the minister might adopt the method outlined in this Bill,—

briefly put—

—instead of the old method of advancing money on unpatented land for seed grain.

The Order in Council is somewhat lengthy, but when I have stated it in those words I have stated all the Order. I can read it to the House if it is so desired. The reason it was necessary at that time was that we had to make our arrangements with the banks, and the banks had to get ready to take care of this business. The farmer in the winter gets his seed grain ready for the coming spring. It would have been better for him if we could have done this earlier; he would have known then how much land he should get ready for the coming year and he would have been sure he would be able to get his seed. It would never have done to have waited for the meeting of Parliament, because we would have been too late altogether to overtake our work.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand the minister to say that this Order in Council, No. 2472, is based upon any Act of Parliament? The rule is, of course, that every Order in Council must be based upon some Act, otherwise it has no foundation at all. Was there an Act last year upon which this Order in Council was based? Or was it made without any authority, subject to be ratified by this Act? I would like to know from the hon. minister which position that Order in Council is in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not certain whether under any other authority we could have taken action even without passing an Order in Council at all; it is possible we could have, but at the time I recited the whole of the facts in a recommendation to Council in this way:—

The minister further recommends that as there is need for prompt action he be authorized under the provisions of The War Measures Act, 1914, to put into effect the plan above described and make arrangements with the chartered banks accordingly, including the giving of the guarantee above set out.—

—which was authorized under the authority of that Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister tell the committee that this Order in Council, which now requires ratification, was based upon some former enactment of this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not in respect of doing it in this way. There was no special previous enactment that would have authorized our doing it by means of guarantee to the banks instead of by cash outlay ourselves. No previous Act contemplated that. We could, however, have advanced money direct, just as we had done in previous years, but we chose this method instead mainly for the purpose of economy, economy that I have not the slightest doubt will be abundantly vindicated by the result.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not saying whether it was necessary or not, but I think it is advisable that we should keep within the well defined bounds: that the Governor in Council has no authority to pass an Order in Council except it is based upon some statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the War Measures Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend did not tell me it was under the War Measures Act. Of course, if that is so then it has a proper basis.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not catch it. In talking of the Order in Council the Minister of the Interior gave us one of those

clever flashes by which he wants to make the House believe that we were always passing Orders in Council, that we were always just as bad in passing Orders in Council as we are now, and he got some of his friends to laugh and say, "What are those Opposition fellows talking about? This was always the way; there is nothing new." That is the opinion the hon. minister flashed on the screen and which his friends were pleased to see, but such is not the case at all.

It is quite true that Orders in Council have been passed every year which had their basis in the statutes, but they were entirely different in their significance from the kind of Order in Council this Government has been passing for the last few years. It is quite true that every contract made by the Government is ratified by Order in Council—even a contract for carrying the mails, say, for a distance of only four miles. All these contracts, it is true, are made by Order in Council, but they have their basis in the estimates and in the statutes which govern the various departments. But the Orders in Council with which we find fault are the substantive enactments, having practically the same force as statutes, and which go very much further than the every-day Order in Council which is necessary to the carrying on of departmental business. I want to make it clear to my hon. friend that I quite understand this flash he has just given us, when he suggested that we were always just as bad and that the Government are but carrying out a well established practice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should be very sorry, indeed, to put out the light of my honourable friend with a flash or with anything else. I want to assure him again that the Orders in Council that have been passed and that will be passed by the Government in office are, so far as I have any knowledge of them, just as firmly rooted in the authority of Parliament and in the statutes as any Orders in Council passed by any other Government since Confederation. Does my hon. friend mean to say that any Order in Council passed by this Government did not have its authority primarily in the statutes? If it did not, the Order in Council would have no effect, and the proper method of attacking it would be in the courts of this country. Some have resorted to that, but not with conspicuous success, and I venture to advise the leader of the Opposition, when hereafter he attacks Orders in Council passed by this Government as having no basis in the statutes, to confine himself to the free-and-easy forum of Parliament instead of going to the courts of the land.

Mr. BUREAU: With his usual ability, the minister has slid out of it. Just now he read me a lecture on Orders in Council, and said that more Orders in Council were passed under the old regime than by this Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said before the war.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend's multiplication table cannot be the one I learned at school, in the figures that this Government has not passed more Orders in Council under the War Measures Act than were passed by any other Government. The minister challenges my leader for doubting the legality of some Orders in Council, and he advises him to attack them in the courts. What a farce! We saw in Calgary what they thought of the courts; they trained their guns on the courts there. It is surely the climax for this Government to talk of respecting the orders of the courts, because experience has shown that the Government only goes to court when it expects to get a favourable interpretation, and that when an unfavourable interpretation is given, the guns are trained on the courts. Coming to the Bill, section 5, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens has pointed out, does not limit the power of the Governor in Council to making regulations only with respect to things mentioned in the Bill; and the minister has not answered that objection. It would surely be better to define more clearly who shall be entitled to make application, and who shall be entitled to receive a loan. Section 2 defines "Entrant" as follows:

"Entrant" shall mean any person occupying Dominion Lands as an entrant under the Dominion Lands Act.

If it is desired to advance money to a man who has not got a patent but whose application for a patent has been recommended, we should include in the definition the words "having a recommendation for a patent." The Bill provides that the men are to deal with the bank, but I see the department is to make regulations by Order in Council with respect to the manner in which applications shall be filed and dealt with. Does my hon. friend mean that he is going to pass regulations directing the agents in certain cases to deal with applications in only one particular way? To whom are the instructions to be issued as to the manner of dealing with these applications? To the agent? As I understand the Bill, the man desiring an advance ap-

plies to the agent, and the agent deals with the application; but the agent's powers are to be restricted by regulations made by Order in Council. Is that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then section 5 provides that "the form and the terms of the note and security to be taken by the bank from any entrant" are to be determined by regulations made by the Governor in Council. Similarly, with respect to "the terms of the guarantee which may be made to any bank hereunder." First, then, the entrant has to go to the agent and, in some cases, win him over before he can win his case. It would be a very easy thing for the agent to fall back on the regulations and say, "I can only deal with your application in a certain way. Although in my opinion your application should be granted, there is an Order in Council providing that in such and such a part of the country and by such and such agents the matter shall be dealt with only in such and such a way." If the man conforms with all the requirements, there is still another way in which he can be put off. He may go to the bank, but the term and form of his note may be such that the bank will say, "We do not care about accepting this note, because it is not in our usual line of business." Would it not be better for the Bill to provide that the man who has his patent, has so many acres under cultivation and so much security put up, shall be advanced ten, fifteen, twenty or thirty per cent of the value of the improvements on his land, or shall be advanced an amount depending on the security he offers. Every man would know then where he stood; every one would know his rights, and the security would be better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman misapprehends the Act altogether. The security the man puts up is the security of the crop to be grown with the seed; he does not put up any other security. We take that as a lien against the loan, but it bears no relation to the value of the land; the only security that does bear relation is the crop itself, which necessarily bears a relation to the seed advanced. Now, if this power on the part of the Crown to grant or refuse loans was an inherent evil, the evil has been in existence for over twenty years past.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not make it any better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the way it has always been done, and in my humble judg-

[Mr. Bureau.]

ment it is the best way. I do not know any rules that could be laid down entitling a man absolutely to a loan, which would be an improvement on the present system; because there might be cases outside those rules just as there might be cases outside the strict wording of the Act. We want to provide for all cases. If there be complaint that the Government have not advanced money to homesteaders this year or last year or any year back to 1915, I have never heard of it. We always do unless there is some special reason for not doing so, and since I have been Minister of the Interior I do not know of any such special reason ever cropping up.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says that the advance is made on the crop. A certain value must be put on the crop, in order to make the advance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the advance made on? Is it a haphazard matter? If a farmer has twenty acres of ground which he is going to put under cultivation, will he get as much as a farmer who is going to put one hundred acres under cultivation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. BUREAU: Then there must be some basis on which to estimate the value of the expected crop. Why not say: If there is a certain acreage—if that is the basis the department decides to go on—the farmer shall be entitled to get so much per cent? The matter should not be left in the hands of agents of the department or to action by Order in Council.

Mr. MAHARG: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not a farmer.

Mr. BUREAU: I am sorry I am not.

Mr. MAHARG: If you were to lay down the rule that you would give a certain percentage for a certain number of acres, then by reason of climatic conditions and so on one man might have to sow two bushels to the acre whereas another man might have to sow only a bushel and a half or a bushel. How would the hon. member regulate that?

Mr. BUREAU: I would regulate that on the crop of the year before. If climatic conditions exist, they must have existed the year before. If a man got thirty bushels an acre last year, the chances are that he will get thirty bushels this year.

Mr. MAHARG: Thousands of farmers may not have a bushel an acre this year.

Mr. McMASTER: The last line of clause (d) reads:

Notes and security to the Crown.

Should this not read "notes and securities."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—penalty for misrepresentation, fraud, etc.

Mr. MAHARG: Has the minister fully considered the drastic nature of this section? I have no objection to the first two lines which read:

Any person who is guilty of misrepresentation or fraud in securing an advance under this Act, ... shall be liable to—

—whatever the minister may wish to insert there. But the rest of the section is entirely too drastic, as the conditions are such that it is absolutely impossible for a farmer to live up to it. He may find himself, through a number of circumstances, violating this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite conceivable that a man who had really committed no offence might be liable to prosecution under this section. That is to say, although he had committed an offence against this measure, he might have done only what circumstances compelled him to do. That could be taken care of by a proviso that no prosecutions should be entered except with the consent of the minister. I do not know of any other way of taking care of it. Under the distribution of 1915 we encountered a large number of cases in the absolute, but a relatively small number where men, having got the grain which cost the Government several hundreds of dollars, and having given liens for it, immediately sold it to somebody else, never sowing it at all. Their own land remained unseeded and all the Government had were liens on land which the farmers claimed was not fit to sow. Some proportion of our loss will be by reason of frauds, or what should have been considered as frauds, committed by borrowers in that way. We want to hold before these people the necessity of carrying out to the utmost of their power the intent of Parliament in advancing this money, and not to enable them to defeat that intent by negligence in sowing the grain or by fraud in selling the grain or in any other way. I do not think the fine is too high because it says "not exceeding $1,000," and twelve calendar months is not too long. I do not think in practice a prosecution is ever entered except at the instance of the Department of the Interior which advances the money, so that no man is in any real peril. But of course, the way the section reads now, prosecution might be entered by an individual. Where, however, it was shown, even on such a prosecution, that the man had done the best within his power, we ought to presume that no magistrate would enforce a penalty upon him.

Mr. MAHARG: I think there is no alternative. If a man is guilty, the magistrate must impose a penalty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. He may find the man guilty and let him off on suspended sentence, or he may fine him a dollar.

Mr. MAHARG: In either case people who do not understand the circumstances may conclude that the man is guilty of fraud, and that would be doing an injustice to him. The section says:

Having secured such advance fail to apply it to the purchase of seed grain.

A man might be figuring on buying his seed grain at $2.50 a bushel and might get it for 10, 15 or 25 cents less. What is he going to do with the rest of the money?

An hon. MEMBER: Return it.

Mr. MAHARG: There is no provision for that.

Or who disposes of the seed grain purchased with any such advance or who makes use of any portion of the same other than for seeding purposes on the land in respect of which his application is made.

He may intend sowing one and one-half bushels to the acre, and he may have fifteen, twenty or twenty-five bushels left over with which he cannot do anything except let it go to waste. I have been a farmer myself for a number of years and I have never been able to figure up just how many bushels of seed grain I might require. Some provision should be inserted, or else the section should be confined to the first two lines and the penalty. Surely "guilty of misrepresentation or fraud" should be sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would mean misrepresentation or fraud in obtaining the advance. The great difficulty is not in fraud in obtaining the advance but in fraud after the advance has been made. In practice the farmer does not get the money; he gets the grain. Forms are supplied to the banks giving orders on whoever the farmer wants to buy the grain

from, and then we take receipts from those parties so that he actually gets the grain, therefore the case to which the hon. gentleman refers, where a farmer might, after getting the money, decide not to buy, would not arise.

The hon. member's point is well taken, I think, and it might be met by inserting, after the word "advance," the words "through his own default."

Mr. McMASTER: I am also of opinion that the point is well taken, but I would suggest that the clause might read as follows:

> Any person who is guilty of misrepresentation or fraud in securing an advance, or in the use of the grain secured under this Act, shall be subject . . . . .

Then, to constitute an offence there would need to be some tortuous condition existing in connection with the use of the grain. I am not a farmer but I have often lived in the country, and would very much regret to see a man fined a thousand dollars because, having some of this grain left over, he fed it to his chickens. But that would be the position in which he would find himself.

Mr. ROBB: I remember there were frauds in connection with the sale of seed grain in previous years, and it is probably as well that the minister should in this matter provide against a repetition of them. I see no serious objection to the amount of the fine imposed, but it seems to me that in recent months the Department of Justice has been unnecessarily imposing long terms of imprisonment on citizens. A man should not be liable to twelve months' imprisonment for an offence of this kind, and I think it would be advisable to amend this clause so far as this feature is concerned. Fifteen or thirty days would amply meet the ends of justice in this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Referring first to the point raised by the hon. member for Brome, I think it is necessary to define what will constitute fraud after the grain is received, for if his wording were accepted it might not cover fraud at all. If a man slept in his bed all day and never tried to put the seed in it would not be fraud, but I purpose to make it that man's duty to use the seed for the purpose intended and for none other. As to the point which the hon. member for Huntingdon raised, I think he is under a misapprehension in stating that the Department of Justice has got into the habit of imposing long terms of imprisonment.

Mr. ROBB: I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The department has no power to impose sentences. It has never had that power and does not intend to arrogate it. The Department of Justice is not a court, and the imposition of sentences is a prerogative of the legal courts of the country. As to whether or not twelve months is too long a term, I may say that it has always been the rule to make the term of imprisonment commensurate with the fine, and if I have judged correctly from the examples, the rule has been that the maximum term of imprisonment should be such as the ordinary man would be able to pay if he desired to escape the alternative length of imprisonment. That rule seems to have been observed in this and every Parliament in fixing the relationship between the maximum imprisonment and the maximum fine.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. minister takes exception that the Department of Justice has been imposing heavy penalties. The department fixed these fines in many cases by Order in Council and the minister is now attempting to create a law that will enable a magistrate to imprison men for twelve months.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not an Order in Council; it is a statute, and if it passes, the Department of Justice will not be concerned in the imposition of fines and imprisonment, but the courts before whom cases may be tried.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The minister is drawing a distinction between the Department of Justice and the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council has made numerous regulations, non-observance of which is punishable with fine or imprisonment. Under the War Measures Act such regulations have been made by the score, and the particular one I am thinking of just now is that by which it was made a crime to strike at a certain period. The minister may say that the Department of Justice is not altogether responsible for what the Government has done, but I do not think he will say that regulations have not been made by the Government imposing fine and imprisonment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was drawing a distinction between the Department of Justice and the courts. It is they who impose fines and never the Department of Justice. It is true that whenever Parliament authorizes them to do so, the Gover-

nor in Council may define offences and create penalties which the courts may act upon. That is one thing, and it is quite another to say that the Government imposes certain penalties on offenders.

Mr. WHITE (Alberta): I would point out certain difficulties that might arise in connection with this matter. Suppose a man buys a certain quantity of wheat, which is usually sown not later than the first week in May, and owing to some unforeseen climatic condition he had this wheat unused. Perhaps he owns a piece of land that is covered with water and is unable to use the wheat, and the only way in which he could obviate a loss would be to sell it. If he did so under this section he might be punished for an improper use of the seed, and I think there ought to be some provision by which he should escape prosecution by establishing his inability to use the grain. I have no doubt that if a case such as this came before a magistrate the defendant would not be severely penalied, but the difficulty might well arise

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would offer an amendment to meet the point raised by my hon. friend, that after the word "fails" in the third line of clause 6, there be inserted the words "through his own default."

Mr. ARGUE: I may say that last year in seeding I purchased the necessary amount of wheat, and after I had completed seeding I had an excess of 20 bushels that I could not dispose of. In a similar case a man could not return the wheat to the Government and if he were not allowed to sell it, what could he do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under this amendment he would not be liable.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: In such a case as that mentioned by the hon. member a man might easily over estimate the amount of seed he would require and the question might possibly arise whether his non-use of the twenty bushels was due to his own fault, or not. It might be advisable, therefore, to have a definition of the exact significance of the words "through his own default."

Mr. MEIGHEN: In applying it, he exercises his best judgment. Having done that, he is not liable, if you insert the words "through his own default."

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Under the law, good judgment or good faith do not count.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It must be his fault if he fails to apply it. It is in not applying it that the fault lies. The amendment meets the case. I think we are discussing an academic question. I cannot conceive of any person being prosecuted unless there has been some turpitude, because the prosecution must proceed from the department defrauded, namely, the Department of the Interior. There is going to be no prosecution unless there is evidence of fraud.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no great dread of a man being tried before a trained judge, and especially in a case where the discretion of the court can be used, because then you have a trained jurist who understands what the discretion is and how it must be exercised. But I have the greatest possible dread of putting a law of this kind into the hands of a magistrate who is not a trained jurist, who has no knowledge of the law and who does not understand how to exercise this discretion. The ordinary magistrate will readily understand that the law means that he must send this man to jail for a year and that he must fine him $1,000. He will not understand that he has a discretion of from $1 to $1,000. I would like the minister to be very careful. We had a case from the West that was spoken of in the House a short time ago, where the magistrate imposed five years' imprisonment on a man and a fine of $5,000. One of the judges fortunately was able to quash the conviction. That was a case where magistrates undertook to try a case without any proper knowledge and passed an absurd judgment. In this case the minister is giving jurisdiction in a part of the country where there are evidently not very well trained magistrates. They have no opportunity of being trained, and he is asking one of them to try any of those poor farmers, with jurisdiction to send him to jail for a year and to impose a fine of $1,000. In the first place, I would think it rather absurd to expect that a man who has to approach this Government for the purpose of getting money to buy seed grain would be able to pay a fine of $1,000. He has not got the $1,000. He is obliged to come to us for the money to buy seed. It looks rather unkind to pass a law saying that if he uses a plateful of that seed he may be fined $1,000. I think that is the most absurd proposition. If the minister is going to leave this provision here he should name his court. Nobody less than a County Court judge should try these cases, and I would further say, as this is such an extraordinary sort of a thing, that no proceeding should be commenced except upon leave of the attorney general

of the province. Safeguards should be thrown around the prosecution of some poor man who might innocently use a handful of this seed for something else. There is no limit; a handful is just as bad as twenty bushels. If you are going to send him to court, we should have the assurance in the first place that it would be a competent court and in the second place that no person for spite could bring a prosecution against his neighbour except upon leave of the attorney general of the province so that there will be certain safeguards thrown around these cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is afraid that if a case of this kind come before magistrates they will not understand that the words "not exceeding $1,000" permit them to fine less than $1,000 or that the words "not exceeding twelve calendar months," permit them to impose a penalty of less than twelve months. I do not think we have any magistrates of that kind in our western provinces and this only applies where there are unpatented lands. They all understand that the maximum penalty means the maximum penalty. It is true that they sometimes go wrong but they would not be likely to violate the A B C of the Act in that way. The very case which the hon. gentleman refers to, in Saskatoon, instead of showing that they did not understand the law, showed that they did in that respect at least because the punishment although high, was not the maximum at all. However, as to whether these cases should go before judges or not, I really think it is better to have them disposed of summarily. If they are disposed of summarily before a magistrate, there is the same right of appeal if there is any doubt about the conviction as in other cases of summary trial. They can go before a county judge by the simplest possible procedure, so that that safeguard rests in the Act as it stands now. It would mean very considerable expense if a man were required to go before a court higher than that of a magistrate's court; whereas if he goes before a magistrate and then applies for a right of appeal, the same law applies as in almost innumerable other cases of a like kind. It might be well, in view of the fact that this might be open to abuse on the part of perhaps a spiteful neighbour to guard against that. Under any wording of the law that you can conceive of a man might possibly find a fictitious offence on the part of somebody against whom he had a spite. In order to enable any person to begin a prosecution, it might be well to make a proviso that no prosecution should be entered except on the authoriy of either the Minister of the Interior or the Attorney General of Canada. It would not be a good principle to place it in the hands of the Attorney General of the province because the facts are known here.

Mr. McKENZIE: All criminal prosecutions are under the control of the province.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not prosecutions for offences created by Acts other than the Criminal Code. In case of the violation of the Lord's Day Act prosecution has to be authorized by the Attorney General of the province but it is the only case that I know of. Prosecutions for violation of the Military Service Act require the consent of the Attorney General of Canada. Why—because it is Canada that is interested. It is Canadian money that is being advanced.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is immaterial to me. The Minister of Justice is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would really work better with the consent of the Minister of the Interior because he is the minister, if anybody, who will prosecute. Nobody else should prosecute

Mr. McKENZIE: My objection to that would be that a man is in his own household, so to speak. It is the Department of the Interior that is interested. I want to get to an independent source. The Department of the Interior is concerned. I would like to see an appeal to the Department of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection at all to an amendment and I would suggest this: Provided that no prosecution under this section shall be entered except upon the written consent of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. ROBB: Does the minister still insist upon imprisonment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: I suppose the minister is making provision largely for new settlers coming in. They would not have more than 160 acres, or a quarter-section each. Under ordinary conditions the settler will not pay more than $500 for all the seed he will buy. It may be said there is a probability that the man will sell at half price, but there is no incentive for him to do so. Why give authority to impose such a heavy fine, and to imprison the man for a year? It is the Minister of the Interior who is

asking for this authority, and the hon. gentleman cannot get away from that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite correct. The man might only get $500 in respect of his homestead, but there are many thousands of cases now of men who have pre-emptions as well, so that without any difficulty he could get a thousand dollars worth of value from the Crown and then immediately sell it and attempt to escape from the country. The hon. gentleman suggests that a maximum fine of $1,000 is too much. In such a case as referred to the man would be taking no chances at all; even at the maximum he would be ahead the whole amount of the fine. The twelve months' imprisonment bears the proper relationship, I think, to that maximum fine. Really I am rather surprised that it should be objected to, because if the maximum is made too small the dread of it is that much less.

Mr. MAHARG: Ordinarily I would not object to the imprisonment penalty because it is applied where usually there is fraud being perpetrated. As to the fine, offenders are usually in a position to pay it. In this case, however, the circumstances are exactly reversed. No man who applies for seed grain is going to expose himself to the imposition of a $1,000 fine. If the minister will undertake that no prosecution shall be entered except at the instance of his own department, or the Department of Justice, and eliminate the fine, I shall cease my objection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the man could not pay the fine, and you eliminate the imprisonment, that does away with the punishment altogether. Really I do not know what hon. gentlemen are after. It may be that in the great majority of cases where fines are liable to be imposed, the man presumably could not pay. But if he could not presumably pay he very often does pay if there is the alternative of a considerable term of imprisonment. He gets the money somehow, he gets it from his friends, or in some way or other, so that fines are always there as an alternative. The same rules apply as to any other prosecution by statute; this is not in any class by itself at all. The man who steals presumably has not the money himself; although in many cases he has. In many cases men will borrow money on seed grain loans when they have means of their own. They have had in many cases, and they will again, so that we have no right to suppose they will not have the money. And even if we have the right to suppose they would not have the money, that would not be an argument for eliminating imprisonment, it would be an argument for retaining it.

Mr. MAHARG: My complaint is that you have not altered the clause at all. It still reads that a man may be liable to fine and imprisonment without having intentionally committed any wrong whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have inserted the words "through his own default," and I have also added to the provision that there shall not be a prosecution except with the consent of the Minister of Justice, who, of course, would never give that consent except on the application of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the minister will see that the cause of justice will be just as well subserved if he cuts the term of imprisonment and the fine in half. These violently savage provisions do not tend to the good administration of justice. Let the punishment fit the crime. If a man makes away with some of this seed grain he will only do it nine times out of ten because he was driven to do so by hardship or necessity. If he does it he should be punished, but it does not redound to the credit of this country to have these savage enactments on the statutes. I must ask the minister to cut his fine and his imprisonment in half. He will find his law just as well applied, just as well carried out, everybody will be happier about it, and it will tend to bring more people into the Northwest, and I am sure the hon. gentleman himself thoroughly desires an increase in the population and prosperity of that country.

Mr. BUREAU: That's a great appeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This provision will not affect immigration at all, because homesteads and pre-emptions are pretty well out of the way for some time to come.

Mr. McMASTER: It is the atmosphere which is created.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman refers to this as savage. Surely the adjective is ill-chosen.

Mr. McMASTER: No, very well chosen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the hon. gentleman point me to an enactment on the statutes of Canada where the penalty is less than the amount the offender could gain by the offence? He cannot do it. The hon. gentleman says that in nine cases out of ten it will be because the fellow is hard-up and driven to it by necessity. Very

well, assume that the hon. gentleman is right, although I do not think the facts are with him, what about the other one-tenth, is there to be no punishment for them? The maximum invariably applies to the other one-tenth, or less. What about the fellow who takes this means of getting out of the country with a small fortune?

Mr. McMASTER: It would be a very small fortune.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that man to escape, because some other fellow is less guilty?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

BRONZE COINS—CURRENCY ACT. 1910, AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White Bill No. 25 to amend The Currency Act, 1910, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—New bronze cent:

Mr. BUREAU: In what respect does this Bill differ from the old Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend was absent when the resolution, on which this Bill is founded, was under consideration. I then gave a full explanation with respect to its provisions, but I am quite ready to repeat that information now.

Mr. BUREAU: Never mind, I will look up the record.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I may say that eighty of the present one cent pieces make an avoirdupois pound. Of the new pieces one hundred and forty will make an avoirdupois pound.

The weight of the present piece, the large bronze cent, is 87½ grains, and it is proposed to make the weight of the new piece 50 grains. It will be slightly larger than the American one-cent piece and thicker than our ten cent piece so as to be readily distinguishable by touch.

Mr. BUREAU: It is smaller than the cent we have?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

[Mr. Meighen.]

SUPPLY.

IMPERIAL WAR CABINET AND IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE—STATEMENT BY HON. MR. ROWELL.

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

Civil Government—Department of External Affairs—Salaries, including Deputy Minister at $6,000, $50,075.00. Contingencies, $15,500.00.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Chairman, this item of the Estimates would appear to afford a suitable opportunity for a brief statement to the House in reference to the work last year of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference. Some members of the House have made inquiries as to what took place at the meetings of these bodies last year, and it is only fitting that the House should be placed in possession of the information which the Government has and which it is at libetry to communicate to the House.

Shortly after the House opened I placed on the Table the report of the Imperial War Conference as published for distribution. The meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet and the Imperial War Conference in 1918 were summoned by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in order that matters relating to the prosecution of the war and problems of reconstruction that affected all the Dominions of the Empire as well as Great Britain should be taken into consideration in common council in London. The two bodies exercised different functions. The Imperial War Cabinet dealt with all matters relating to the war and the terms of peace. The Imperial War Conference dealt with problems that might be described as those of reconstruction, and matters of common Imperial concern that were not related to the war or to the terms of peace. That was the broad, general division of work between the two bodies. They met on alternate days and there were committees of both bodies in session more or less constantly all the time during the whole period that both bodies were meeting. The Imperial War Conference of 1918 was unique in this respect, that it was the first occasion on which India was represented as of right. The hon. members of the House will remember that by the Constitution of the Imperial War Conference, as laid down at the Conference in 1907, it was composed of the representatives of the Mother Country and of the self-governing dominions; India was not entitled under the Constitution then laid down to be represented at the

5 p.m.

Conference. As the change is a very important one, may I draw the attention of the House to the Constitution of the Conference as laid down in 1907 and point out the change which has been made.

The resolution adopted at the Conference in 1907 reads:

> That it will be to the advantage of the Empire if a conference, to be called the Imperial Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and His Governments of the Self-Governing Dominions beyond the seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will be ex-officio President, and the Prime Ministers of the Self-Governing Dominions ex-officio members of the Conference. The Secretary of State for the Colonies will be an ex-officio member of the Conference and will take the chair in the absence of the President. He will arrange for such Imperial Conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective Dominions.

Then provision is made for a permanent secretariat, and also for the calling of the Conference from time to time.

Mr. McMASTER: May I interject a question? Was what the hon. minister calls "the constitution" prepared by the Conference itself or by the British Government?

Mr. ROWELL: It was prepared by the Conference itself and adopted by the Conference after protracted discussion. If my hon. friend will turn to the minutes of the Imperial Conference of 1911 he will see a most interesting discussion which preceded the unanimous adoption of this resolution. As originally submitted it differed in some material respects from the form which it finally took when it was unanimously accepted by the Conference.

This resolution provided that the Conference was to meet every four years. Normally the meeting of the Conference would have been in the year 1915, but owing to war conditions the Conference was not then called. In the year 1915 the Government of India, acting through the Imperial Legislative Council, passed this resolution:

> This council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a representation be sent through the Right Honourable the Secretary of State to His Majesty's Government urging that India should, in future, be officially represented in the Imperial Conference.

That resolution was accepted on behalf of the Government by Lord Hardinge, and was approved by the Council without a division. It was subsequently approved by the Government of the United Kingdom, and at the meeting of the Imperial War Conference which was summoned to meet in 1917 representatives from India were present by courtesy, and this resolution was unanimously adopted:

> That the Imperial War Conference desires to place on record its view that the resolution of the Imperial Conference of the 20th of April, 1907—

That is the resolution, the important part of which I have just read.

> —should be modified to permit of India being fully represented at all future Imperial Conferences, and that the necessary steps should be taken to secure the assent of the various governments in order that the next Imperial Conference may be summoned and constituted accordingly.

That resolution was unanimously adopted by the Imperial War Conference of 1917, and its substance was communicated to the Governments of all the self-governing dominions. They approved of the resolution, and the amendment to the constitution thereupon went into effect. When the Imperial Conference of 1918 was called India was summoned as one of the constituent members of the conference, and her representative appeared there for the first time, speaking for India's three hundred millions of people.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are represented by our Prime Minister; is there anybody who by virtue of his office is the representative of India?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: India was represented at this conference by the Secretary of State for India, Hon. Mr. Montagu, who was there in his official capacity, and by two other representatives named by the Government of India. One was the Maharaja of Patiala and the other was a distinguished member of the Legislative Council of India, Sir S. P. Sinha, who has since, as Lord Sinha, with a seat in the House of Lords, become Under-Secretary for India—the first native Indian to be a member of the British Government.

I was about to remark that Australia was not represented at the conference of 1917, but she was represented at the conference of 1918. So the conference of 1918 was unique and historic in this respect: That for the first time in the history of the Empire all its self-governing dominions were represented by the Prime Ministers of those dominions with some of their colleagues, India, which is gradually becoming self-governing, was represented by her own representatives as well as by the Under-Secretary for India, and the other outlying portions of the Empire were represented by the

Secretary of State for the Colonies. So there were assembled in that conference the representatives of over four hundred millions people—practically one-fourth of the whole human race.

The conference was unique in this further respect, namely, the time at which it was held. It was held at the darkest period of the history of the war since the first battle of the Marne. The months of April, May and June of the past year were among the most critical and difficult months in the whole war, and it was interesting and significant that at that very time, when the outlook was dark and in many respects discouraging, representatives of all portions of the Empire, including India, should gather together as indicating the firm resolve of the British Empire in all its component parts to stand together to see the war through to a victorious conclusion, no matter how difficult the course might be, nor how dark the present horizon.

The Conference was also unique in this respect: that notwithstanding all Germany's efforts to drive the British ships from the high seas by submarine warfare, His Majesty's navy had so successfully controlled that menace that representatives from every continent of the world—Asia, Africa, Europe, America and Australasia—were able to travel in safety to London, there to meet in common counsel to formulate plans to defeat and overthrow the power that was committing this inhuman piracy upon the high seas. The whole situation—the composition of the Conference, the conditions under which it met, and the mastery of the seas which was indicated by the fact that the representatives of the whole British Empire were able to meet, led Mr. Balfour, who was speaking at the opening of the Conference to suggest that it was one of the most significant gatherings in all recorded history. He pointed out, as has so frequently been pointed out in this House and elsewhere, how completely the Germans misunderstood the spirit of the people who composed the British Empire when they thought that Empire would fall to pieces when the pressure came in the stress of a great war.

Mr. CAHILL: What colonies are represented at this Conference?

Mr. ROWELL: There are no colonies represented directly at the Conference. The self-governing dominions, India, and the Mother Country, are represented. The other colonial possessions are not represented, except so far as they are represented by the Colonial secretary. He is a member of the Conference under the Constitution of the Conference, which expressly provides that the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary of Great Britain shall be members of the Conference. The Conference was therefore primarily a gathering of the self-governing Dominions of the Empire.

Now, the House will be interested in knowing what subjects were taken up and discussed at this Imperial Conference. I shall draw the attention of the House to some of the more important questions, and those members of the House who are interested in pursuing the matter further will find the questions discussed in the report of the Conference which has been laid on the Table.

One of the most important questions related to the naturalization law. The members of the House will recall that at the Imperial Conference of 1911 the Conference unanimously agreed that thereafter there should be created what was described, as an Imperial citizenship; that is, a citizenship which would be valid throughout the whole Empire. Prior to the conference of 1911 and, indeed, at the very time that conference was meeting, our naturalization was limited to our own territory.

In other words, a man naturalized in Canada became a British subject as long as he was within the Dominion of Canada. If he returned to his own country and had not previously been de-naturalized there by some act of his own, he became a citizen of his own country again. Nor was he a British citizen if he went to Great Britain or any other portion of the British Empire. As I pointed out, the conference of 1911 decided in favour of Imperial nationality and recommended that an Act be brought in, which might be adopted by all of the self-governing dominions, and which would confer what was described as Imperial nationality. That Act was adopted by the Imperial House of Commons in 1914.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We adopted it, too.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: It was adopted by the Canadian House of Commons in 1914. It was also adopted by Newfoundland. It was not adopted by South Africa, Australia or New Zealand, the principal reason being that before they had taken action the war broke out and the matter stood over, as they intimated, pending the end of the war. Owing to war conditions, however, the British Government came to the conclusion that some important changes should be made in this law, and in 1917 they sent to the Governments of the dominions a communication suggesting certain amend-

ments. These were considered, and an Act based upon them was passed by the Imperial House of Commons last year, making some important changes in the law, perhaps the most important change being the enlarged provisions for cancelling certificates of naturalization upon the conditions outlined in the Act. It is not necessary for me to trouble the House with those details, because they will come up for consideration when the Government Bill dealing with naturalization is brought in, as no doubt a Bill will be brought in embodying at least some of the provisions of the new Imperial Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What will the principal features of that Act be?

Mr. ROWELL: The principal features of the British Act are greatly enlarged powers for cause to cancel certificates of naturalization. I could give my hon. friend the provisions, but I presume he does not desire me to stop to do that now. Then there is a provision in that portion of the British Act that applies to the British Isles only, (not the general portion that may be adopted by the whole Empire), that no alien enemy can be naturalized for a period of ten years.

At the Imperial Conference, 1918, this resolution No. 20, was passed:

> The Conference refers to resolution 10 passed by the Imperial War Conference, 1917, recognizing the desirability and importance of securing uniformity of policy and action throughout the Empire with regard to naturalization, and recommends that a special Conference, representative of all parts of the Empire, should be held at the earliest practicable date to examine and report in the light of that resolution upon any question connected with nationality or naturalization which any government represented at the special Conference may desire to raise, and upon any suggestions which may be made for the amendment of the existing law.

This contemplates a future conference dealing with matters that are not dealt with in the present British law. I can suggest two or three of the subjects that are under consideration but upon which no final conclusions have been reached. One is the question of the status of the married woman who is married to an alien—shall she, if she marries an alien, be entitled to retain her British nationality? Another is the question of dual nationality. As hon. members are no doubt aware, in some countries a man does not lose his citizenship in the country of his birth by becoming a citizen of another. In Germany they have, in the Delbruck law of 1913, a provision whereby a German citizen desiring naturalization in the country in which he was living could get the consent of the Imperial German Government to retain his citizenship in his own country, and also become a citizen of another country. This question of dual nationality relates not only to Germans but to all Russian citizens. Under the Russian law a man did not lose his Russian citizenship by becoming a citizen of another country unless he had a special ukase from the Czar, and the dual nationality applied. He might become a British citizen under the law and he might be a British subject here, and still be a Russian citizen at home. There is a third question which I cannot at the moment recall, which this special conference was to be called upon to consider. Resolution 19 on naturalization is to this effect:

> This Conference is of opinion that legislation should be passed throughout the Empire restricting, for a period after the war, so far as in the circumstances of each country may be possible, the naturalization of citizens of present enemy countries, and also the acquisition by them of any form of political rights or of land or mining privileges.

The position of the Government of Canada and of the Government of South Africa was that that was a detail in the administration of the naturalization law with which the Parliament of each Dominion could deal, and that it was not a proper subject for consideration at the Imperial Conference. And, Canada and South Africa pressed that that resolution should be withdrawn. Australia and New Zealand, however, who were sponsors of the resolution, were not prepared to withdraw. Canada refrained from voting on it, taking the ground that it was not a proper subject for consideration, and South Africa voted against it.

Two other important resolutions came up, one particularly important one, relating to immigration. Resolution No. 13 of the Conference is to this effect:

> The Imperial War Conference reaffirms the principle laid down by Resolution 21 of the 1917 Conference, in favour of arrangements being made by which intending emigrants from the United Kingdom may be induced to settle in countries under the British flag. It is of opinion that the representatives of the Oversea Dominions in the United Kingdom should keep in the closest touch with any new body established by His Majesty's Government to supervise emigration from the United Kingdom. The Conference is of opinion that the appointment of a consultative committee, not to exceed ten members, on which representatives of the Oversea Dominions should sit, to advise any such body, would afford the best means of co-operation.

The proposal that came before the Conference was for a central immigration au-

thority on which the Dominions should be represented which would control immigration. I think the views of all the Dominions were against it. They felt that any British authority should be set up by the British Government itself, and that while the Dominions would consult with them in respect to the policy adopted, the British Government must alone be responsible in connection with that authority. The principle, however, of direct immigration to the self-governing Dominions was one in which the conference heartily concurred. And, although I take it for the time being that the first task is to absorb our own returned soldiers and to secure employment for any who may, through the dislocation of industry caused by the cessation of the war, be thrown out of employment, as soon as we are in a position to receive immigration I have no doubt we may expect a substantial influx from the Old Country, particularly of soldiers who fought in the war.

Mr. VIEN: Do I understand that this or any other organization under the control of the British Government will direct and shape our immigration policy?

Mr. ROWELL: They have absolutely nothing to do with our immigration policy but are merely concerned with directing British immigrants to the self-governing dominions, and with that policy we are in hearty accord.

Perhaps the most important question concerning immigration was that relating to India, which aspect of the situation I shall explain to the House. Hon. members will recognize the fact that the question of Indian immigration to the different dominions of the Empire has created considerable feeling and controversy for many years. It is a subject on which the people of India have felt very deeply, and upon which the peoples of the self-governing dominions have had no less strong and decided convictions. The position of the representatives of India was that that country being a portion of the Empire, her citizens should not be placed in a less advantageous position than other Asiatic peoples. They took the view that as they were citizens of the Empire fighting in the war for the British cause they should not be discriminated against or placed in a less advantageous position than the people of China or Japan. That contention, one must frankly concede, was strong and meritorious from their standpoint. The conference of 1917 agreed upon a principle of reciprocity, agreeing that the citizens of any dominion should not ask greater privileges as regards visiting or settling in India than they were prepared to concede to the people of India, settling or visiting in the dominions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It meant exclusion.

Mr. ROWELL: It meant something to them as a matter of sentiment. It meant that they were not disposed to grant to any of the dominions the privileges which would not be accorded them in return. As might be expected, at the conference of 1918, at which the Indian representatives attended for the first time as a matter of right, the great question in their minds, and the one which they strongly urged upon the attention of the conference, was the position of East Indians in the self-governing dominions and the matter of Indian immigration in the future. The whole subject received the most careful consideration of the conference, the discussions extending over a considerable period; and the following resolution which was unanimously agreed upon was accepted by India and the dominions as being a practicable policy, giving effect to the principle of reciprocity which had been adopted at the conference of 1917. This resolution, No. 21, is:

> The Imperial War Conference is of opinion that effect should now be given to the principle of reciprocity approved by Resolution XXII., of the Imperial War Conference, 1917. In pursuance of that resolution it is agreed that:—

I would ask my hon. friends to note particularly clause No. 1 as it has a very important bearing upon our relations with India.

> 1. It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities:
>
> 2. British citizens domiciled in any British country, including India, should be admitted into any other British country for visits, for the purpose of pleasure or commerce, including temporary residence for the purpose of education. The conditions of such visits should be regulated on the principle of reciprocity as follows:—
>
> (a) The right of the Government of India is recognized to enact laws which shall have the effect of subjecting British citizens domiciled in any other British country to the same conditions in visiting India as those imposed on Indians desiring to visit such country.
>
> (b) Such right of visit or temporary residence shall, in each individual case, be embodied in a passport or written permit issued by the country of domicile and subject to vié there by an officer appointed by, and acting on behalf of, the country to be visited, if such country so desires.

(c) Such right shall not extend to a visit or temporary residence for labour purposes or to permanent settlement.

There is a frank recognition that so far as labour is concerned the right of entry to Canada does not apply to Indians desiring to come here for either work or settlement.

3. Indians already permanently domiciled in the other British countries should be allowed to bring in their wives and minor children on condition (a) that not more than one wife and her children shall be admitted for each such Indian and (b) that each individual so admitted shall be certified by the Government of India as being the lawful wife or child of such Indian.

Mr. McMASTER: A terrible responsibility!

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Will Canadians receive reciprocal treatment in this respect?

Mr. ROWELL: I am quite sure the Government of India will facilitate any hon. member by following the same procedure there. This clause was of course regarded by the Indian representatives as of great importance to them, while other clauses were of as equal importance from the standpoint of the self-governing dominions.

The most acute troubles that have arisen in connection with Indian immigration have occurred in Canada and South Africa, perhaps more largely in the latter country which has had a larger immigration, but I am glad to say that this resolution was unanimously accepted by the representatives of all the peoples of the Empire, including India, as embodying for the future a fair and honourable understanding on this subject.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Was that agreed to by Australia?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, it was agreed to by all portions of the Empire; and I think that when one considers the subject from every point of view one must recognize that it is a fair and reasonable solution of the difficulty. I appreciate the objections there may be on the part of some to permitting the wives of Indians at present residing in Canada to come here. I can quite conceive that there may be objections to this, but I think we must concede that much at least to our fellow citizens of the Indian Empire who have fought so valiantly in this war.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Has the minister any idea which particular wife of an Indian will be given preferment in coming to this country?

Mr. ROWELL: The only rule is that embodied in the resolution. The Government of India must decide who should be the wife to come to Canada.

In dealing with this question, I think it is only right to say that the Indian representatives pointed out that the removal of the grounds of misunderstanding which had so long existed between India and the Dominions, and which had been used by the German propagandist to stir up trouble there and cause widespread unrest, was a real contribution to the peace and security of the Empire.

Mr. McQUARRIE: May I ask the minister if this arrangement is similar to the arrangement which has existed between India and South Africa for some years? I believe that in South Africa one wife is admitted with her children, but there a very difficult situation has arisen because a woman would bring a large number of boy children, perhaps nine or ten, and there has been absolutely no way of meeting that situation. Perhaps an amended arrangement has been agreed to by South Africa as well as other colonies. I would like to know whether any change has been made in regard to the arrangement which was adopted in South Africa.

Mr. ROWELL: I am not familiar with the arrangements existing in South Africa. All I know is that the representatives of South Africa cordially approved of this as being a satisfactory arrangement.

I was going on to say that India contributed over a million soldiers in this war. They fought magnificently in the three eastern theatres, Mesopotamia, Palestine, and East Africa. The Indian troops were probably not suited to conditions of warfare in Western Europe, but in the other theatres they have won imperishable glory for that race, as have the soldiers of the self-governing dominions.

If the representatives of the dominions are to meet around a common council board with representatives of India to plan together about the affairs of the Empire, we must give some recognition to the common citizenship that exists to the extent at least indicated by this resolution.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the minister was in attendance upon this conference. Did he gather that this proposal was heartily accepted by the representatives of India?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the best answer of that would be to read the statement of

Sir S. P. Sinha, who spoke on the resolution which he moved. The sentiments which he uttered, he said were those of the Maharaja of Patiala, who could not be present on the day that the resolution was moved. There is nothing in the remarks of the representatives of India other than cordial approval of the arrangement that was made. Perhaps it is of interest, in view of the importance of the subject, to turn to what was said:

> Mr. Long. I am desired by my colleague the Maharaja of Patiala, who is unfortunately prevented from being present to-day, to express his entire concurrence in what I am going to say to the Conference. I also regret exceedingly the absence of Sir Robert Borden, because I wanted to express in his presence my deep feeling of gratitude for the generous and sympathetic spirit in which he has treated the whole question, both last year and this year. I desire to express my gratitude to him for the very great assistance he has rendered, to which I think the satisfactory solution which has been reached is very largely due—that is, if the Conference accepts the resolution which I have the honour to propose.

I should think that one could not get a franker statement of appreciation and approval than that. It is only right to say that Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, as the discussion was closing, and after all had spoken, said that he hoped that the time would come when Indian citizens would be received in all portions of the Empire in the same way as those of any other section. But that was not the statement made by the representatives of India. Of course, it is the natural feeling and ambition which they must have. For the satisfactory solution which was worked out, my hon. friend the Minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder) should receive a substantial share of the credit because he devoted a great deal of time to this important matter.

Mr. COOPER: I was not in the House when the minister spoke about naturalization but it has been brought to my attention that there are a large number of men who served in the Canadian forces but who have not lived in Canada for the prescribed number of years to entitle them to take out naturalization papers. Is it the intention of the Government to help them in any way by reason of their services to the country overseas?

Mr. ROWELL: In the statement I made to the House I spoke simply as to the character of the legislation which Great Britain had passed and I said that an amendment to the naturalization law was under the consideration of the Government and that a Bill would be brought down this session. The matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Cooper) refers is now under consideration by the Government.

There is another group of matters relating to improved communication between the different portions of the Empire and in regard to which I do not think I need detain the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Ocean and telegraphic communication?

Mr. ROWELL: Telegraphic, cable, news, shipping, all branches. In fact, these questions have been amongst the most important which have come up at the various conferences from time to time and they have called for a good deal of consideration at each conference. I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the resolutions to be found in the report of the conference and then pass on to other matters. The first relates to improved news service throughout the Empire. Resolution No. 9 reads as follows:

> The Imperial War Conference is impressed with the importance of securing (a) that an adequate news service should be available in all parts of the British Empire, and (b) that this service should be supplied through British sources. The Conference requests His Majesty's Government to formulate a scheme with these objects in view, on the lines indicated in the memorandum prepared by the Minister of Information, and to submit this scheme for the consideration of the Governments represented at the Conference.

That resolution was passed but no proposals have so far been submitted by the Imperial Government. Then, on shipping, there was were two resolutions, No. 11 and No. 24.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was not that resolution debated by the British press at the time and opposed?

Mr. ROWELL: The resolution was debated by the British press and I think that in some quarters there was opposition to it. Of course, it depends on what was intended. The British press stood, and I think very properly so, for a news service that would not be dictated by the Government, a news service that would be controlled by the press. The opposition, in so far as it was manifested by the British press, was against a news service which would be dictated and controlled by any government.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Would the minister give us his own views on that point?

Mr. ROWELL: I agree with that. In connection with a general news service

throughout the world, I think the newspapers themselves should have facilities for collecting and disseminating the news.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Was not that idea of an Imperial news service suggested by Lord Beaverbrook?

Mr. ROWELL: Lord Beaverbrook did recommend an Imperial news service, but that question had come up at a preceding conference—I am not sure whether it was in 1911 or 1917. It was suggested then, I think by Australia or New Zealand, and this particular memorandum, which is referred to in this resolution, was prepared and submitted by Lord Beaverbrook.

The resolutions relating to shipping are 11 and 24.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before my hon. friend passes to another subject,—did any question arise with respect to the ocean rates?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was there a decision arrived at? As my hon. friend knows there has been quite an agitation on this side of the Atlantic having for its object the lowering of ocean rates. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was appealed to on several occasions, and he promised at the time that he would approach Lloyds and the British authorities so as to give our Canadian shipping firms a better chance. Did the Conference decide anything of a concrete nature under the head of shipping?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, to this extent: It was decided that an Imperial Board containing representatives of the Dominions as well as the Mother Country, should investigate the whole question of shipping, including a number of other matters mentioned in the resolution, with a view of seeing if some remedy could not be found which would meet the situation.

Resolution in No. 11 reads:

> The Conference accepts in principle the establishment of an Imperial Investigation Board, and refers it to a committee of the Conference to frame a detailed scheme for such a board.
>
> The Conference agrees that it be also referred to the committee to consider the best machinery for promoting the development of Imperial communications to the best advantage, with special reference to the probable size of vessels and the consequent demands upon harbour accommodation for the purposes of Imperial requirements, and to the resolution handed in by the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

The conference appointed a committee, pursuant to that resolution, to consider and bring in a report upon it. The committee held several sessions, but they reached the conclusion that they could not, in the brief period in which the conference was in session, without consultation with experts, and without giving the whole matter full investigation, reach a conclusion which would warrant action, and they therefore reported this resolution, No. 24:

> That in order to maintain satisfactorily the connections, and at the same time encourage commercial and industrial relations, between the different countries of the British Empire, this Conference is of opinion that shipping on the principal routes, especially between the heart of the Empire and the Oversea Dominions, including India, should be brought under review by an Inter-Imperial Board, on which the United Kingdom and the British Dominions and Dependencies should be represented.
>
> 2. That for this purpose an Imperial Investigation Board, representing the various parts of the Empire, be appointed, with power to enquire into and report on all matters connected with ocean freights and facilities, and on all matters connected with the development and improvement of the sea communications between the different parts of the Empire, with special reference to the size and type of ships, and the capacities of harbours; the board to include, in addition to representatives of the Governments concerned, persons with expert knowledge of the problems involved, including representatives of the shipping and trading interests.

The British Government has asked that Canada should name its representative on that board, and the matter is standing pending the restoration to health of the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne), who was a member of this committee, and who took part in framing this resolution. I anticipate that when Hon. Mr. Ballantyne returns he will take the matter up, and Canada's representative on this board will be named with a view of inquiring into all matters covered by the resolution.

Resolution No. 12 of the Conference relates to inter-Imperial parcels delivery:

> The Conference considers it desirable, for the purpose of encouraging Imperial trade, that the present facilities for inter-Imperial parcels delivery should be enlarged, improved, and coordinated, and recommends that the proposals contained in the Board of Trade memorandum should be examined by the Governments represented at the Conference, with a view to the preparation of a detailed scheme designed to promote this object.

The Government of the United Kingdom brought to the attention of the Conference that in many quarters of the world the Post Office Parcel Delivery was allowed on a scale much larger than in Canada, and certain other portions of the Empire. We limit the size of the parcels much more than they are limited in many places, and the suggestion was that inter-Imperial trade

should be encouraged by promoting a larger use of the parcel post than has hitherto prevailed. A resolution was passed approving the general principle, but the details of the scheme have not yet been worked out.

Mr. McMASTER: We were under the impression that the parcel post had been used very much in Canada during the last few years.

Mr. ROWELL: Possibly my hon. friend is able to speak with authority upon the matter. I was under the impression that it was the express that was used particularly in the line which my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps.

Mr. ROWELL: The resolution No. 14 dealing with cable communications is as follows:

That it is in the highest interests of the Empire that the rates for telegraphic communiactions between the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, South Africa, and India, should be further materially reduced as soon as practicable. That in order to ensure generally the cheapest and most secure telegraphic communication between the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, it is desirable that they should co-operate in the provision of a state-owned cable across the Atlantic.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is an old question.

Mr. ROWELL: It is an old question which has been discussed, I imagine, at every Imperial Conference that has been held certainly in twenty years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have, of course, the Pacific cable.

Mr. ROWELL: We have the Pacific cable which is owned by the British Empire, but when it was first started, the governments concerned had to contribute a substantial amount in order to make up the deficits. It has been paying its way now for some years, and is considerably more than earning its operating cost. We have had available a cable across the Atlantic during the period of the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A French cable?

Mr. ROWELL: A German cable. Whether that will continue to be available will depend I presume somewhat upon the decision of the Peace Conference. It is at present being operated, I believe, by the Pacific Cable Board, the same board that is operating the Pacific cable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where does that cable land?

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: Somewnere on the eastern coast. If that is available of course the resolution is satisfied without further action. Australia and New Zealand pressed very strongly for this matter.

The next group of subjects that called for consideration was the development and utilization of Imperial resources.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Before the minister proceeds, might I ask if the question of passports has been dealt with in the documents presented at this Conference, and what rules, if any, are being observed with regard to passports in the various parts of the Empire?

Mr. ROWELL: The question of passports did not come up for consideration at the Conference.

The next group of subjects, as I have mentioned, was the development and utilization of Imperial resources and there were four or five resolutions dealing with various aspects of this matter. The first related to the exclusion of German alien enemies from participation in the non-ferrous metal industry. The British Government passed an Act, called the Non-Ferrous Metal Act, designed to exclude alien enemies from interest in the non-ferrous metal industry of Great Britain. That action grew out of the dominant position which the German metal interests held throughout the British Empire when the war broke out, and it was an Act to secure relief from that condition of affairs and to guard against its repetition in the future. The Conference passed this resolution, No. 2:

In pursuance of the policy of freeing the Empire from dependence on German controlled organizations in respect of non-ferrous metals and ores, the Conference endorses the principle of the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Act of the United Kingdom and recommends the Governments of the Empire to adopt effective measures, in so far as these may be necessary and have not already been taken, to carry out this policy.

Mr. McMASTER: May I ask a question? I notice sometimes the hon. minister uses the word "commonwealth," which has a good Cromwellian smack about it, and at other times he uses the word "empire." Are these words synonymous or interchangeable?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the word "empire," if used in its old meaning, has no proper application to the situation that now exists—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: —in relation to Great Britain and the Dominions. We must either give that word a new content, a new meaning, or use a word that is more appropriate to the present conditions. Personally, I prefer the phrase " the British Commonwealth."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. N. W. ROWELL (Resuming): Just before the committee rose, I was referring to the resolution passed by the Imperial War Conference relating to the exclusion of Germany from the non-ferrous metal industry. As the House will have observed, all I have attempted to do is to report the proceedings of the Conference rather than to discuss the questions which were raised there and discussed at length. The limits of time make it necessary for me to confine myself to what was actually done. But may I be permitted to observe, in connection with this and the other resolutions relating to Imperial resources the questions involved assumed peculiar importance during the period of the war. Germany had not only succeeded, in the twenty-five years preceding the war, in peacefully penetrating, industrially, all the countries of the world, but had secured a grip upon the metal industries of the world, particularly the non-ferrous metal industries, which gave her a commanding position at the time the war broke out; and the object of this resolution was to prevent so far as possible, a repetition of that situation in the future. Hon. members will observe that so far as Canada is concerned —and this would apply to some of the other dominions also—the matter is one not easy to deal with by legislation, because of the distribution of legislative powers between the Dominion and the provinces. The provinces, controlling their own lands, control the development of the mining properties within the provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend in mind any properties in Canada which were controlled by the Germans and were utilized for war purposes? There were a number of such cases in Australia.

Mr. ROWELL: I was referring to the general principle involved. So far as Canada is concerned, this resolution is receiving consideration at the hands of the Minister of Mines to see what action, if any, Canada should take in order to give effect to it.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask if the Conference had in mind, at the time this resolution was passed, the control of the nickel mines in Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: The nickel mines in Canada constitute, of course, a very important and essential raw material, essential not only to Canada but to the Empire as a whole, and I had intended making some reference to that on a later resolution.

Another question which was dealt with by the conference, in which perhaps our interest is less direct than in the resolution I have just mentioned, was the freeing of the industries of the Empire from dependence on German products, such as dyes. This resolution, No. 10, reads as follows:

> The Conference takes note of the action taken and contemplated by His Majesty's Government with a view to freeing the industry of the United Kingdom from dependence on German dyestuffs, and recommends the Governments of the Empire to consider immediately what steps can be taken to co-operate with the efforts of the Imperial Government to promote the successful development of the dye industry in the British Empire, and so to avoid enemy domination over our essential industries.

The House will recall the unfortunate position in which Great Britain, the Empire and the United States found themselves when war broke out. They had to depend on Germany for dye stuffs and other essential materials and undoubtedly Great Britain has made up her mind that she will not be caught again in the same position, but will endeavour to see that there are developed within the limits of the Empire those industries which are essential to the maintenance of the larger industrial life of the country. I believe steps are being taken by Great Britain to give effect to this resolution.

One of the most important questions considered by the conference was the control of raw material.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Did the non-ferrous resolution contemplate the pooling of all the metals of Canada and the Empire, thereby putting us out of commission as a separate entity?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it did not contemplate interfering in any way with our liberty of action. It was recommended that all portions of the Empire should take action similar to that taken by Great Britain, in order to ensure that those industries should not fall into enemy control, but be preserved under the control of citi-

zens of the British Empire. Hon. members of the House need not be reminded of the importance of raw materials in the conduct of this war. The control of raw materials was one of the great factors which enabled the Allies to succeed in this struggle, and the denial to Germany of access to essential raw materials was one of the important factors which reduced her to the position where she was compelled to conclude peace. The control of raw materials was one of the subjects which engaged much time and thought at the conference, and the action of the conference was embodied in three resolutions, the published portions of which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House, afterwards making one or two observations on them. Resolution No. 3 reads:

(1) The Conference agrees that it is necessary to secure for the British Empire and the belligerent Allies the command of certain essential raw materials in order to enable them to repair the effects of the War as soon as possible and to safeguard their industrial requirements.

(2) The Conference is of opinion that the Governments of the British Empire should make such arrangements amongst themselves as will ensure that essential raw materials produced within the Empire shall be available for the above purposes, and should arrange with the Allied Countries to utilize for the same purposes essential raw materials produced in those countries.

Paragraph 3 of the resolution is not printed. It set out a list of materials which were considered essential for the continued prosecution of the war and for the maintenance of the industrial life of the nation. It is only necessary, perhaps, to mention the two which we practically control in this country, namely, nickel and asbestos, both of which were included in the list. I believe we control seventy or eighty per cent of the world's nickel supply, and a similar percentage of the world's asbestos supply. In those two essential raw materials, Canada holds a dominating and controlling position. Paragraph 4 of the resolution is as follows:

That this Conference has considered the provisions of the Imports and Exports (Temporary Control) Bill now before the Imperial Parliament, and is of opinion that, whilst the circumstances of the different parts of the Empire differ widely as regards the extent to which it may prove desirable to pass similar legislation, the respective Governments should nevertheless take such action as may be deemed expedient to enable the objects of resolution 3 to be fully carried out.

To assist the Governments in determining their action in this respect the Conference recommends:—

(1) that a committee of its members should first consider the possible methods in each part of the Empire of obtaining command of each of the essential Raw Materials specified in resolution 3.

(2) that the Governments represented at the Conference should, in the light of the information collected by their representatives on this Committee, consult with the representatives of the producers and trades concerned as to the method of obtaining command of best suited to each individual commodity.

A committee of the conference was appointed in pursuance of that resolution. It held many meetings. It took into consideration all those raw materials essential for war and for the maintenance of industries, enumerated in resolution 3. It tabulated the information, showing the available sources of supplies throughout the world, how far those sources were controlled within the Empire and how far within Allied countries, and it outlined the best methods of developing and utilizing those raw materials for the benefit of the Empire and the Allies. That particular information gathered in that way was not published; it is kept in the possession of the Government, because to publish the information at that time would have been to give it to the enemies of the Empire.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says that a sub-committee was appointed and suggestions made as to the best methods to meet the views expressed by the resolution. Were those suggestions kept secret, or are they to be distributed amongst the various self-governing dominions, so that common action may be taken on the subject?

Mr. ROWELL: These suggestions are all distributed as confidential documents amongst the different governments. The full report of the sub-committee, which was adopted by the conference was not published in the record, but was published as a confidential document and is in possession of the cabinets of all the dominions, giving them full information as to raw materials, their sources, their present state of development, the Empire's needs, and with suggestions in many cases as to their development and utilization.

Mr. BUREAU: Does that include the provincial governments?

Mr. ROWELL: No, only the Federal Government in each case. The third resolution dealing with this matter is No. 23. It reads:

(1) The Conference having considered the report of the committee on raw materials request His Majesty's Government to communicate this report forthwith to the Governments of the Dominions and India and to ascertain their views on the appropriate action to be taken.

(2) The Conference further agrees that steps should be taken to ascertain the needs and resources of the allies in respect of raw material specified in the report.

Pursuant to the terms of this resolution, that special report has been communicated to all the Dominion Governments.

One other step the conference took was in connection with the development of Imperial mineral resources, and is set forth in resolution No. 16. At the Imperial War Conference in 1917 a resolution was adopted providing for the creation or the appointment of an Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau upon which all the Dominions should be represented. That bureau was subsequently appointed, the Canadian representative on it being Dr. Miller of the Ontario Bureau of Mines, a very distinguished geologist and a man thoroughly posted on the mineral resources of Canada. At the Imperial Conference this year it was suggested that the powers of the bureau should be substantially enlarged and that all portions of the Empire should agree to make a contribution for its maintenance. Canada was not able to perceive that she would derive as large a benefit from this bureau as many of the other parts of the Empire thought they would. We thought that we had as full and ample a knowledge as we could possibly have of the mineral resources of Canada, and, therefore, we were not in as great need of the services of the bureau as were other portions of the Empire. As, however, it had been agreed upon in 1917, and as the other portions of the Empire were exceedingly anxious that the work of the bureau should be continued, we were willing to support it for a period of I think, three years, during which time its work can be fully canvassed, and we can decide whether we desire to continue to support it or not. The resolution No. 16, reads as follows:—

The Imperial War Conference, having considered the memorandum by the Minister of Reconstruction on the Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, as amended, agrees that the number of representatives on the mineral, mining and metal industries on the Governing Body of the Bureau should be increased from four (as originally agreed) to six.

The Conference further approves the proposal for a Charter of Incorporation as set out in paragraph 6 of the memorandum and the proposals in paragraphs 7 and 8 as to the allocation of expenditure.

The allocation limited our liability to a specified amount and for a specified period instead of making it a general liability as was first proposed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the bureau going to do? Is it going to experiment with regard to our mineral resources or is it going to acquire property on behalf of the Imperial Government? The minister said a moment ago that the lands belonged to the Provincial Governments. What relation will that bureau have to the various Provincial Governments?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think it is the intention to acquire property on behalf of the Imperial Government. This is rather a bureau to investigate and report, to collect information as to the mineral resources of the whole Empire, where those resources are located and how they can be developed for the benefit of the whole Empire. The estimates of our share of the expense will come up under the Estimates of the Minister of Mines (Mr. Burrell), who will then have a full report of the work of the bureau and will be glad to give it to the House. I have only a very general knowledge of the matter.

Mr. CAHILL: To whom will the bureau report?

Mr. ROWELL: It is appointed by all the Governments of the Empire and will report to all.

Mr. CAHILL: To whom first?

Mr. ROWELL: As it is located in London, I presume it will report first to the Government in England, and the report will be sent to all the Dominions.

Mr. BUREAU: This bureau is in England. The information, I understand, is to be gathered from the various Dominions, and is then to be spread through this particular bureau to the various Dominions. That is, all information that may be gathered from Canada through this bureau will be sent to Australia, and all information Australia will give the bureau will be sent to Canada. Is that the idea, namely, to spread, by medium of the bureau, information as to the natural resources which exist in each Dominion?

Mr. ROWELL: That is one of the objects, and that will be done.

Mr. BUREAU: What are the others?

Mr. ROWELL: I am speaking now from a recollection of last summer and of a matter which did not come particularly under my jurisdiction. I think the intention is not only to acquire knowledge as to these resources, but to report on the feasibility of their development commercially. That is one of the objects they have in view in enlarging the committee and seeking to en-

large its powers. The Minister of Mines has a report of the work that this Imperial Bureau has done and will give it when his estimates come up.

Mr. BURRELL: As a matter of fact, there has been no expense to us. The Imperial Government is paying the expense for the first three years. Our only contribution will be the expenses of Dr. Miller, the Canadian representative, who is just leaving. He has been over here and has supplied me with more memoranda on the subject.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Has the Bureau any executive functions, or is it merely an advisory body?

Mr. ROWELL: It is purely an advisory body, gathering and disseminating information.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I see it stated in the report that it agreed that this should be a governing body and not merely an advisory body, and in order to give it executive functions it must be incorporated. By the resolution which was virtually passed the Bureau was organized as an incorporated body, so it must have been decided to give it some executive authority.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend has the report by him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it is on pages 8 and 9.

Mr. ROWELL: It will be observed in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Interior (Mr. Meighen), who was looking after this matter at the Conference, that he took the view that from our standpoint this Bureau was not as important as it was considered to be by other parts of the Empire, and in deference to Canada's view the report of the committee was amended in very important respects. The report will be found on pages 237 and 238, on which latter page my hon. friend will find the changes that were made. The original paragraph was as follows:

As to the expenditure, it is suggested that a distinction should be drawn between current administrative expenditure and the cost of special inquiries instituted by the Bureau on its own account, at the wish of any of the Governments.

In lieu of this the following was inserted:

As to expenditure, each Government would, of course pay the expenses of its own representative. The normal expenditure of the Bureau would be met out of funds contributed by the Imperial Government, as suggested in the report of Sir James Stevenson's Committee, together with such contributions from the Overseas Governments as they may, by agreement, be prepared to make.

[Mr. Rowell]

This arrangement shall continue for three years, before the end of which time the question as to the contribution to be made by the Overseas Governments shall be brought up for discussion at an Imperial Conference.

These clauses were inserted to meet the objection of Canada to the report as originally presented, so that it will be seen that apart from the expenses of our own representatives our expenditure is only such as we may choose to contribute, and is limited to three years.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): What was the purpose of granting that Bureau incorporation by Royal Charter, as was actually done?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot answer my hon. friend's question, as I was not following that particular part of the discussion. Unless the question is answered in the report which he has I am afraid I cannot answer it. Another question that called for very earnest consideration—

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that the only expenditure to which we are bound is the expense of our representative in London, in addition to what the Government may choose to contribute voluntarily?

Mr. ROWELL: That is it. The question of petroleum supply was considered, and in resolution number 18—

Mr. LEMIEUX: At this point may I be permitted to make a remark in regard to a question I put the other day to the Minister of Interior about the Shale Oil Company. I thought it was shell, but somebody said "Shale." I asked him if that company had obtained a charter from the Government giving them the right to acquire oil-bearing lands of Western Canada. My hon. friend answered that a request had been made by that company and had been taken into consideration but had not been granted. I have not his exact words before me, but the answer was not very definite; I do not know if they convey the impression that the company was barred from operation in Western Canada, or if for the time being the matter was not decided. I noticed in the press of Saturday or yesterday a despatch from Calgary in which it was stated that that company—called the Shale Company or the Royal Dutch Company—is actually operating in the West and boring at various places, and it is hinted that it is composed chiefly of gentlemen from Great Britain. I have heard of several names in connection with the company, and particularly one prominent Canadian name, that of Sir Clifford Sifton. Does the hon. member know whether that company has

anything to do with the project which was discussed before the Imperial Conference? He will pardon me if I speak on this subject while he is giving such valuable information to the House, but I think he will remember that at the beginning of the war —he was not in the Government then—we passed legislation giving the Imperial Government a sort of prior right to all oil-bearing lands. My hon. friend will, of course, understand the reason for this. The British navy depended considerably on a constant supply of oil during the war, and it was felt that it was necessary as much as possible to corral, so to speak, the oil-bearing lands in the various dominions. Now I would like to know if the company to which I have referred has anything to do with the project of which we have heard.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid I cannot fully answer that question as I am not familiar with some of the matters to which my hon. friend has alluded. With reference to the Shale Oil Company, the hon. Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) in his answer indicated that the application had not received favourable consideration at the hands of the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that final?

Mr. ROWELL: So far as I know, it is. As it is not in my department I cannot undertake to answer the question, but that is the general situation as I understand it. As regards the other company to which my hon. friend has referred, I am not familiar with it and know nothing of its operations.

I can only say that any company that is operating out there must be operating on the same terms as any other oil prospector under the provisions of the law governing the opening up and developing of oil lands. I may say, in answer to my hon. friend's general observation as to petroleum, that the prospecting in England is being done under the direction of Viscount Harcourt who, as chairman of the committee, presented a confidential statement to the conference disclosing how vital this oil question was to the Imperial navy as well as to the general mercantile marine and other services in the Empire. Viscount Harcourt very strongly emphasized the importance of developing all the oil supplies of the Empire and making them available for the purposes of the Empire particularly in times of stress. The resolution passed at the conference was as follows:

The Conference takes note of the Memorandum on the question of Petroleum, and, having regard to the great and growing importance of petroleum and its products for Naval, Military, and industrial purposes, desires to commend the suggestions contained in the memorandum to the serious consideration of the Governments concerned.

That memorandum has been referred to all the Governments of the Dominions for their consideration.

It was decided at the conference to have a gathering, after the war was over, of representatives of the statistical branches of the Governments of the Empire with a view of considering the question of establishing an Imperial Bureau of Statistics. This is dealt with by resolution No. 8:

The Imperial War Conference having considered the correspondence as to the improvement of Imperial Statistics arising out of the recommendations of the Dominion Royal Commission, is in favour of the proposal to hold a Conference of Statisticians after the war, and that such Conference consider the establishment of an Imperial Statistical Bureau under the supervision of an Inter-Imperial Committee.

Another matter that came up for consideration at the conference was the report of the Imperial Graves Commission. The report was accepted by the first resolution of the conference:

The Conference desires to place on record its appreciation of the labours of the Imperial War Graves Commission and is in favour of the cost of the carrying out the decisions of the Commission being borne by the respective Governments in proportion to the numbers of the graves of their dead.

I should think the House would be interested in knowing just what the recommendations of the commission were in reference to the decoration of the graves of the dead. I turn to page 227 of the report which sets out the decorations which are to be placed over the soldiers' graves. The report recommends:

(i) That the principle of equality of treatment laid down by the Commission should be carried out by the erection over the graves of all officers and men in the war cemeteries abroad of headstones of uniform dimensions, though with some variety of pattern.

(ii) That each regiment should have its own pattern of headstone, to be erected over the grave of every man of that regiment wherever he may be buried, and that regimental feeling should be consulted as to the design of the headstones.

(iii) That there should be carved on each headstone the rank, name, regiment, and date of death of the man buried beneath it, and that relatives should be allowed at their own cost to add a short inscription of the nature of a text or prayer, subject to the approval of the Commission.

(iv) That in every cemetery there should be two central monuments: (a) at the eastern end, a great memorial stone upon broad steps and bearing some appropriate phrase or text, and (b) elsewhere in the cemetery, a cross.

(v) That in every cemetery there should be some form of building, either covering the memorial stone or separate from it, as a shelter for visitors from the weather and as a place where religious services might be held.

(vi) That the cemeteries should be laid out and planted with flowers and shrubs under the direction of horticultural experts working in co-operation with the architectural designers. The surfaces of the graves should be levelled, for reasons both of convenience and of economy.

(vii) That each cemetery should be fenced in by some durable boundary, preferably a low wall.

(viii) That each cemetery should have a printed register of the burials in it, which should be easily accessible to visitors.

(ix) That, in consultation with the French authorities, the principle of concentrating in selected cemeteries the bodies at present buried in isolated graves or in small groups should be settled in advance.

(x) That, for the purpose of carrying out the proposals contained in the report, three principal architects in the first instance should be chosen (names recommended—Mr. Reginald Blomfield, Sir Edwin Lutyens, and Mr. Herbert Baker): the cemeteries should be divided into groups, and to each group should be assigned one principal architect and a number of younger men working under his leadership; the majority of the cemeteries should be designed by the younger men. . . . . The final selection of the regimental headstones should be referred to an informal body of artistic advisers.

Those were the general principles embodied in the report of the War Graves Commission

Mr. LEMIEUX: I saw in the papers this morning that Vimy Ridge has been donated by the French Government to Canada. Is that true?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not think there has been any official information received as yet by the Government in reference to it, but I do know the French Government has dedicated the land where our soldiers are buried as cemeteries in perpetuity.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that parents will not be allowed to erect distinct monuments over the graves of their relatives, that the monuments will be uniform and erected under the direction of the War Graves Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: That is the case. Relatives will be permitted to put a distinctive inscription or prayer on the stones, but, outside of that, they are to be uniform.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend does not know the dimensions of each stone?

Mr. ROWELL: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Because they might put any inscription on the monument unless it must be within certain dimensions.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so. I am sure that it will be large enough to permit of a suitable inscription. It is being designed very carefully by the most skilled artists and designers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will our Canadian architects be consulted on the matter? And might I not express the wish that the Canadian graves, at all events, will be of a distinctly Canadian stamp or style.

Mr. ROWELL: I believe there will be a distinctive emblem marking the Canadian graves, but as to whether the stones will be distinct in design from the others I can not say. The only knowledge I have is that gained from hearing the report presented at the conference but from that report I know that everything that can be done by the best skill available is being done to not only erect suitable stones, but to lay out the cemeteries in a way befitting the men who have so gallantly fallen. I am sure that all Canadians will agree that the least we can do is to show our appreciation of these gallant men is to see that their graves are properly cared for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The monument will be the same for the officer and the private?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite. They are all equal in death.

The question of demobilization was also considered at the conference. I shall not go into it. Resolution No. 18 deals with the question of demobilization. That had already been taken up between the Minister of Militia and Defence here and the Overseas Minister of Militia and Defence, and the question discussed by the Imperial War Conference was rather demobilization as it affected the whole Empire. It was as to the working out of plans which would ensure a certain amount of shipping being available for each portion of the Empire in order that the troops of each might be brought home; in other words, in order that some would not get all the shipping and others left without any.

The last matter I will mention that was dealt with by the Imperial Conference related to the question of Imperial organization. In addressing the House the other day I spoke of the resolution which was passed dealing with the channels of communication—that is resolution No. 15—and I shall not repeat what I then said. I only wish to say in reference to that resolution that while hon. gentlemen may think the actual change is a small matter, it is the significance of the change

that is important. It is in the recognition of the changed status of the Dominion, and the consequent changed status of the Governor General as the representative of His Majesty in the Dominion, that the significance of the change lies.

Another important discussion took place on the question of the constitution of an Imperial Court of Appeal, which was pressed very strongly upon the conference by the Prime Minister of Australia. He appeared to think that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was not as dignified a court to appeal to as the highest Court of Appeal, the House of Lords, for the citizens of the United Kingdom. We thought an appeal to His Majesty in Council was as dignified and quite as satisfactory as an appeal would be to the House of Lords, or as an appeal would be to any new Imperial Court that may be constituted, and we therefore did not feel that any resolution was necessary.

Mr. MORPHY: Has it ever been up for discussion in any of these conferences that the Supreme Court of Canada might very well be named as the court of final resort for all Canadian questions?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know that the question came up directly in that way, but speaking myself on this resolution I pointeded out that so far as I knew the only question that was agitating the public mind in Canada with reference to an appeal was for the limitation of appeals rather than the court to which the appeals would go.

Mr. VIEN: Was it suggested that the appeal to the Privy Council might be done away with?

Mr. ROWELL: No. What was suggested by the Prime Minister of Australia in his original resolution—which was not adopted—and was covered by a modified resolution which I will refer to shortly, was that there should be constituted one Imperial Court of Appeal, which would supersede the House of Lords as a final Court of Appeal for the citizens of the United Kingdom, and would supersede the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a final Court of Appeal for the residents of the Overseas Dominions and of India. His argument was that it would tend to maintain the unity of the Empire if we had one final Court of Appeal to which all citizens may go as a last resort to have their cases decided. That view did not appeal with any degree of force to the representatives of Canada. The resolution number 22, as finally adopted, was as follows:

> The Conference is of opinion:
>
> (1) That the question of replacing the present dual system of appeal by the constitution of one Imperial Court of Appeal demands the prompt consideration of His Majesty's Government.
>
> (2) That the Lord Chancellor should be invited to prepare and circulate to the Governments of the Dominions and of India, as soon as possible, a memorandum of such proposals as in the opinion of His Majesty's Government are practicable for that purpose with a view to decision at the next Imperial Conference.
>
> (3) That each such Government, as soon as possible thereafter, shall communicate to the Government of the United Kingdom its views with regard to such proposals.

Hon. gentlemen will see that all that is affirmed there is that the matter is deserving of the prompt consideration of His Majesty's Government, and in view of the strong stand taken by the Prime Minister of Australia, who thought that something disastrous might happen if this new court was not constituted, perhaps that affirmation is not going a very great distance.

I have covered the principal matters that came before the Imperial War Conference for consideration. I may say that the Imperial War Cabinet was sitting at the same time as the Imperial War Conference, and the work was divided between the ministers who were overseas. The principal part of the work of the conference,—at least, the direction of Canada's part of the work of the conference,—came under the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), and the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), who were responsible for its direction so long as they remained in England. They were, however, compelled to leave before the Imperial War Conference closed, and then I took charge with the assistance of the Minister of Militia (Maj.-Gen. Mewburn), and of the Minister of Marine and Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne). I was associated with the Prime Minister in connection with the work of the Imperial War Cabinet, and upon that I shall speak very briefly.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Before my hon. friend leaves the work of the Imperial War Conference I would like to ask him a question. The report does not pretend to publish all the resolutions which were passed at the conference. In a speech delivered by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister in London on 31st July, which speech was published in this country at the time, he divided the work of the conference into three classes. He said:

> A certain class of the resolutions recorded definite conclusions on matters of great moment. Another class commended to the attention of

the various Governments' questions that require fuller consideration, as well as executive and parliamentary action in the several nations of the British Commonwealth. A third class comprises the resolutions that set up standing committees, representing the United Kingdom and the Dominions for the purpose of reporting to the various Governments concerned after necessary study and consideration. In this class are to be included demobilization, the regulation of ocean freight rates and the control of raw materials within the Empire. The subjects falling within the second and third classes were not finally dealt with by the Conference; but matters were put in train for such action as the several Governments may eventually find necessary.

So, according to the Prime Minister, all the subjects included in the first class were finally dealt with at the conference, and definite conclusions were reached. We have always been given to understand that the work of these conferences must be ratified by the Parliament of each Dominion concerned before being given effect to, but I see by this speech of the Prime Minister that certain matters were decided and final conclusions were reached without the Parliaments of the various Dominions being consulted. I would like to know from my hon. friend what these matters are which were finally dealt with, and upon which conclusions were reached, and whether we, the Parliament of Canada, are going to know what has been done and finally dealt with, as stated by the Prime Minister.

Mr. ROWELL: I can illustrate, I am sure, what was in the mind of the Prime Minister by one of the resolutions to which I referred this afternoon. Take a case which was finally dealt with—finally in the sense that the Government of Canada, as a government, gave its assent to the proposition. That Government, of course, must necessarily have the backing of the House, as any other governmental action must have if it is to become the settled policy of the country. The illustration I have in mind is the resolution I read dealing with the relation between India and the Overseas Dominions in reference to immigration. The understanding arrived at and embodied in that resolution was final so far as the different Governments there represented were concerned.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Was not an Order in Council passed by this Government to ratify the conclusion reached in regard to Indian immigration?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so, so far as a decision was concerned, and the action contemplated must be taken by each Government. Action has been taken by this Government to carry out that resolution by passing the Order in Council adopting the principle embodied therein.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): What about the Canadian Parliament?

Mr. ROWELL: If the matter required legislation, why, of course, it must come before the Canadian Parliament, but it stands in exactly the same position as any other executive act which the Government has authority to take under our Constitution.

Mr. VIEN: There is a big difference, to my mind. In the case of a decision of the Imperial Conference which is assented to by the representatives of the Canadian Government, they do assent to such a decision without having the authority from a law enacted by the Canadian Parliament, whereas in the case of an Order in Council passed in the ordinary course of affairs the executive power has not the right to pass such another Order in Council unless that right has been previously given to it by a law of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. ROWELL: I confess I cannot see the force of my hon. friend's observation. For this reason: if the laws passed by the Canadian Parliament give the executive the power to act by Order in Council, the executive acts upon that basis, and the act is valid because they have received the power.

Mr. VIEN: They received the power from whom?

Mr. ROWELL: The Parliament of Canada. Exactly in the same way, if the Prime Minister representing Canada assents to any resolution by the Imperial Conference, he only does so by virtue of the authority vested in him as Prime Minister acting within the scope of his authority under the Constitution.

9 p.m.

Mr. VIEN: But the Prime Minister, as such, has no authority to go overseas and bind Canada to certain decisions of the Imperial Conference unless an Act of Parliament grants such authority to him or the other representatives of the Cabinet. What is the law in our statutes which authorizes the representatives of the Canadian Government to bind this country to certain policies which have not been enacted in our legislation?

Mr. ROWELL: The representatives of Canada cannot bind Canada to any policy that requires legislative sanction without the legislative sanction of the Parliament of

Canada, and no one professes that they can. The Prime Minister, in assenting to this resolution which I cited as an illustration, exercised exactly the same authority as the Prime Minister of Canada has exercised ever since the Imperial Conference was organized. The same authority was exercised by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the Conferences of 1897, 1902, 1907 and 1911. That is, he speaks for Canada as the representative of the Government having a parliamentary majority behind it. If that majority does not endorse his action, then the resolution is not implemented; but he has exactly the same authority to speak there on behalf of the Government as he has to speak here in Canada on behalf of the Government on any matter of public policy affecting the Dominion.

Mr. VIEN: Could the hon. minister cite an instance in the former Conferences where Sir Wilfrid Laurier bound Canada to any policy without having authority from the Canadian Parliament?

Mr. ROWELL: Let me give as an illustration the meeting of the Imperial War Conference which determined the constitution of the conference, and which prescribed who should be members of it and defined its powers: it was all assented to by Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues at the Imperial Conference, and properly assented to—

Mr. VIEN: But I mean measures?

Mr. ROWELL: —without any statutory authority. It was a perfectly proper thing for him to do as representing the Government of the day, if he believed it was a proper policy to pursue, and if when he reported back to the Canadian House of Commons they had disagreed with the conclusions he reached, then his Government would have been replaced by another Government which would not have supported the constitution adopted at that Imperial Conference. I could go further and give a whole list of resolutions adopted at the previous conferences and point to any number of them assented to in exactly the same way.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is this difference. I am not aware that any action that they took at the conference in the days of Sir Wilfrid were ratified here by the formality of an Order in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: I think that Sir Wilfrid, quite properly, took it upon himself to adopt a certain policy and did not pass any Order in Council to ratify it; he simply did it as Prime Minister. It may have been that no Order in Council was necessary in connection with this Hindu immigration or probably could all have been done by regulation of the department, but the minister in charge of the department considered it desirable to have the policy confirmed by Order in Council before he acted upon it in an administrative way.

Mr. McKENZIE: As we are dealing with such an interesting constitutional question, perhaps the hon. minister will tell us whether it was the War Measures Act that ratified the action of the Government in London?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I think it was simply indicating the formal assent of the Government of Canada to the proposals embodied in that resolution. The minister in charge of the department is entitled to determine by regulation who shall be admitted, and who shall not, under the Immigration Act, and he can carry out that resolution without any Order in Council at all, as I understand the situation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend allow me to refer to the War Graves Commission? I am reminded that if any design was suggested by the Government the emblem of Canada should be the maple leaf; and as regards the decoration of the graves of our boys, might I suggest that Canadian flora should be transferred to the other side for this purpose?

Mr. ROWELL: I think that is a very appropriate suggestion. If it has not been already passed upon I shall be glad to draw it to the attention of our representative on the commission.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): While on that point might I ask this question: Will the graves of our Canadian boys who were killed while in the Imperial army be marked with any distinctive Canadian emblem, or will they bear the Imperial emblem?

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I shall be glad, however, to see that it is raised in the proper quarter.

Coming now to the work of the Imperial War Cabinet, as I explained in opening, the work of the Cabinet was to deal with the conduct of the war and the terms of peace, and its proceedings were confidential, they were not published; but there is no reason now why I should not mention some of the subjects which came under discussion, in order to give the House some idea of the character of its proceedings.

Let me first explain that when the Cabinet met the first act of the Prime Minister of

Great Britain was to review the whole military and diplomatic situation as it existed at that time in all the theatres of war, and the situation was not particularly encouraging then. He furnished the overseas representatives with full information as to the character of the March offensive, the losses which the Allies had sustained in that offensive, the strength of the British forces, an approximate estimate of the strength of the other allied forces, together with an estimate of the strength of the German forces against which we were called upon to contend. That review of the general military and political situation was followed by a review by the prime ministers of the different dominions of the war efforts of the dominions and of India. I have not the figures available, I wish I had; but I think it is fitting that we as Canadians should recognize the magnificent efforts put forth by other parts of the Empire. So far as the numerical contribution of men is concerned, Australia and New Zealand contributed a larger percentage of their population in men to the Army serving overseas than did the Dominion of Canada; but if you take into consideration the production of munitions as well, then Canada's contribution was equal, and probably greater, in men than that of either Australia or New Zealand. India also made a magnificent contribution in men, as did South Africa.

Then the Chief of the General Staff, Sir Henry Wilson, reviewed the military situation from his standpoint. The First Lord of the Admiralty, Sir Eric Geddes, reviewed the whole naval situation and gave full information to the overseas ministers as to the results of Germany's submarine policy, and the measure of success which had attended His Majesty's Navy in combatting the submarine menace. Then Lord Weir gave a review of the war in the air, and perhaps no information given to the Imperial War Cabinet was of greater interest than that given in reference to the air service. If the war had continued for another year strategic cities and towns of Germany would have been bombed out of existence. Preparations were being made on a gigantic scale for the air service in 1919, and it is not without interest to note that the preparations for the bombing of Berlin were completed just two or three days before the armistice was signed, and the officer entrusted with making arrangements for the bombing of Berlin and who was to lead the air squadron in the attack upon that city, was one of our gallant Canadian officers, Major Mulock of Winnipeg. Colonel Bishop, another of our Canadian boys, still holds the world's record for the number of machines brought down. Then followed a review of the diplomatic situation by Mr. Balfour and Lord Curzon; then a review of the efforts Great Britain was putting forth in the building of ships and in providing munitions, guns and aeroplanes, not only for the season's operations but for the operations of the following year. After the overseas ministers had been put into possession of full information covering the military and diplomatic situation as it existed in June last, practical and urgent problems were taken up for consideration, and one of the first and most important was the question of Allied assistance in Russia. That question was thoroughly canvassed. The Imperial War Cabinet received the views not only of the Imperial staff, but of General Foch and the leaders of the Allied forces on the front. After giving the matter the fullest consideration, the Imperial War Cabinet came to the conclusion that there should be Allied intervention. That conclusion,—to indicate the procedure by which matters were dealt with,—was communicated to the Supreme War Council at Versailles. The Supreme War Council endorsed that conclusion, passed a resolution declaring in favour of intervention, and that such intervention was essential to the success of the Allied cause. All the allied nations agreed to participate in it.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Was the number of Canadian soldiers to be contributed to that expedition decided by the Imperial War Cabinet?

Mr. ROWELL: No. That was not discussed by the Imperial War Cabinet. The War Cabinet settled the principle in favour of Allied intervention; that is, they made a recommendation to that effect. It was the Supreme War Council at Versailles that finally decided in favour of Allied intervention, and that decision was communicated to all the Allied Governments.

Mr. POWER: Did the suggestion to send Canadian troops to Siberia originate with Canadian or Imperial ministers?

Mr. ROWELL: The suggestion originated with the Imperial Government. The situation was this, and there is no reason now why the House should not be informed of the facts. In June last the situation on the Western front was so critical, the need of men so urgent, that the War Office urged the Canadian ministers to put another

Canadian division in the field, so that Canada would then have five divisions in the field. After canvassing the whole situation thoroughly with General Currie, with the Overseas Minister of Militia, and General Turner, the ministers overseas reached the conclusion that we would not be justified in putting another division in the field, urgently as that division might be needed, and for this principal reason: that if we put five divisions in the field, and our troops were as heavily engaged as the British army had been engaged during the preceding two or three months, we would not have sufficient reinforcements available to make up the wastage. We therefore came to the conclusion that it was wiser policy to retain sufficient reinforcements to make good the wastage, and to keep the four divisions we had in the field up to strength, and therefore the four divisions continued.

Now, when it was decided to send forces to Siberia, the War Office asked the representatives of Canada if we would take part in that expedition. That information was communicated to the Government at Ottawa, and the decision that Canada should take part in that expedition was reached by the Cabinet in session here at Ottawa. That decision was concurred in by the Canadian ministers who were overseas at the time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was Sir Robert Borden overseas then?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. POWER: What were the principal reasons which led the Cabinet to concur in this request of the British Government?

Mr. ROWELL: I shall have to outline the situation, because it was the situation that then existed that made necessary, in the first place, Allied intervention, and, secondly, Canada's taking part in it. The Germans at that time were still advancing on the Western front, and the belief on the Allied side then was that we had not sufficient troops then available to beat Germany on the Western front if Germany had an absolutely free hand in the East and was not required to devote any of her attention there. That was one factor in the situation.

Another factor was the position of the Czecho-Slovaks. As my hon. friend is aware, the Czecho-Slovak troops were composed of Austrian soldiers from Bohemia who had either voluntarily surrendered to Russia, or had been captured as prisoners of war, and by reason of their hostility to Austria because of centuries of oppression of their race in Bohemia, were willing to make war against Austria, their former ruler. They organized into armed forces and they had in Russia, altogether in June or July last approximately 300,000 men. It was originally planned that these Czecho-Slovaks should march through to Vladivostok, there take steamer and form part of the fighting army on the Western front; and Great Britain, I believe, provided at least some steamers to bring this force from Vladivostok to the Western front to take part in the war there. As a matter of fact, they were interrupted in their progress to Vladivostok by the Bolsheviks who broke faith with them, and the principal forces fighting against them were German prisoners and Austrian prisoners of German nationality who had also been captured by Russia, but who were led by German officers nominally of Bolshevik regiments. During three or four months in the late winter and spring of 1918, these Czecho-Slovaks had put up a magnificent fight; they had hurled back these Austrian and German forces, prisoners of war, who were seeking to control the Siberian railway and who were helping to maintain German influence in Russia. When they could not make their way through to Vladivostok, they appealed to the Allies for help to relieve them in their position. They needed re-inforcements, munitions and support. The Allies recognized the Czecho-Slovaks as a nation, as one of the Allies fighting in this war, and here was a magnificent band of men, who had been helping to win the battle for freedom, fighting against great odds in Russia and Siberia, who were appealing for help. All the Allies felt that they could not permit that request to go unanswered; that they could not permit the Czecho-Slovaks to appeal in vain. They were our Allies and were in distress; they needed assistance.

A third reason was this. Under the Brest-Litovsk Treaty the western provinces of Russia had been severed from Russia. Those provinces, with a population of from fifty to sixty million people contained the finest farming land and the great industrial centres of Russia. While they had been severed from Russia by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, they had come under German domination and control. If Germany could have retained the advantages she gained under that treaty she could have given up Alsace-Lorraine; she could have consented to an independent kingdom of Poland; she could have withdrawn her troops from Belgium; she could have restored Serbia; yet, by the dominant position she had in Russia and the area for development and expansion in these pro-

vinces, she would have really gained the war: because in entering the war originally Germany did not expect to make her territorial advance on the western front; she expected to build her empire in the east, to open up a way through the Balkans, and to build her empire on the ruins of the Turkish Empire. Last summer, indeed, it looked as if she were in a fair way to accomplish her purpose. She had a road through the Balkans; Roumania, Serbia, Montenegro were all defeated and overrun; Bulgaria and Turkey were her allies; and with Russia practically at her feet and with her forces in Russia dominating and controlling, it looked as if Germany were going to win the war, no matter what sacrifices might be made in the west.

Mr. POWER: Are we quite sure that Germany is not now in almost the same position with regard to Russia?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not quite sure that she is not. But take the situation as it then existed; if the Allies permitted Germany to retain her position, as it then looked, we would have lost the benefits of the war notwithstanding all the sacrifices we had made, and Germany would have had opened for exploitation not only the provinces on her eastern border containing fifty or sixty million people, but the whole Russian Empire. The state of disorganization which then existed in Russia was just the opportunity for the organizing genius of Germany, and her representatives penetrated the whole country. The Allied Council were unanimous in the view that they could not, if they were to succeed in this war, permit Germany's influence to continue unchecked in the east; that they would have to lend assistance in the way of men to the Czecho-Slovaks in their great fight, and that they would have to endeavour to re-establish the eastern front so as to compel Germany to fight on that front as well as on the West. They felt it incumbent upon them to give assistance to the independent governments which were springing up throughout Russia, in the North, in the South, and in Siberia, and which were combatting German influence and intrigue. All these reasons combined led the Allies to intervene.

Mr. POWER: If I understand the minister aright, the reasons for Allied intervention in Siberia were: first, to relieve the pressure on the western front by building an eastern front; second, to support the Czecho-Slovaks. Does the minister think it would be possible to relieve the pressure on the western front by asking the Czecho-Slovaks to retreat on the eastern front and take boats from Vladivostok around to the western front? Secondly, does he think that we were relieving the pressure on the Czecho-Slovaks by sending a brigade of British troops some six months after the time of the greatest pressure on the western front? This decision to intervene was, I understand, arrived at sometime in June or July.

Mr. ROWELL: In July.

Mr. POWER: The Canadian troops—and I understand they form a large portion of the British troops in Siberia—did not reach Vladivostok until some time in October when all danger was over, and they were not in anything like sufficient numbers to give real support to the Czecho-Slovaks. The Czecho-Slovaks were not attempting to fight on the eastern front, they were, from what I understand, coming east to take boats to bring them back to the western front, so that I cannot see any real reason for this intervention.

Mr. ROWELL: I am sorry, I evidently have not made myself clear, or my hon. friend did not follow me. I said that the original plan of the Czecho-Slovaks was to come through Siberia to Vladivostok, take boats to France, and there fight on the western front.

Mr. POWER: That would not be organizing the eastern front.

Mr. ROWELL: At that time it was assumed that the Government of Russia was friendly to the Czecho-Slovaks and was friendly to the Allies. It proved that the Russian Government was friendly neither to the Czecho-Slovaks nor to the Allies. They intercepted the passage of the Czecho-Slovaks who could not get out and had to fight for their lives there, and that changed the whole situation.

But when my hon. friend asks me whether I think this or that in regard to matters of strategy, I say frankly that they are for the Supreme War Council and Marshal Foch to decide. I have not, and do not pretend to have, any opinions on military strategy. On the question of where the fight must be fought, where the armies must be placed, and where troops must be sent we must accept the advice of the supreme military advisers.

Mr. VIEN: Did I not understand the minister to say that he was consulted as to

the advisability of sending an expedition to Russia?

Mr. ROWELL: I said that the Imperial War Cabinet was consulted as to the advisability of sending an expedition to Russia, having had before them the views of the military and diplomatic advisers.

Mr. VIEN: I understand it was the Cabinet in which the hon. minister sat that agreed to that?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: If I understood the minister correctly he said: that the advisability of sending the troops was a matter that was left to the Supreme War Council.

Mr. ROWELL: I said that the question of where troops should be located and where the fighting should be done was one for the Supreme War Council. The question of whether the Allies should go to the assistance of the Czecho-Slovaks and the people of Russia who were fighting against German aggression—the question whether or not we should accept the views of the Supreme War Council on the importance of establishing an Eastern front, was one upon which we were entitled, and were bound, to express an opinion.

Coming to the question of Canada's sending an expedition, the decision was reached in the latter part of July or early in August that there should be allied intervention, and what Canada should do was considered in the manner I have mentioned. Canada sent men for a valid reason. It was agreed that all the Allies should be represented in this expedition. It was understood that Japan, because she had the men and was nearest to that theatre of war, should supply the principal part of the troops. Everyone recognized that this was a necessity of the situation. The other Allies were to send contingents according to their ability. The question arose as to how the contingent that would represent the British Empire should be composed. Great Britain herself had thrown every man she could spare into the line on the Western front, no fewer it is said than three hundred thousand youths of eighteen years of age had been sent over the early part of the year, in April, May and June. I saw those regiments drilling and they were mere schoolboys. There were no others available, and as the situation was so critical these lads had to be called out. Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Great Britain had each, in proportion to population, put more men into the battle line than Canada; and when it came to a question of how the British Commonwealth contingent should be made up we felt that it was only right that, as we could not comply with the request of the War Office to send another contingent to France, we should at least be prepared to provide a brigade for Siberia. We took the position we did because of the critical situation that existed at the time, and in this I am speaking for myself, I sure the same is true of my colleagues—I have nothing whatever to regret in the action then taken. We should have failed in our duty at that time had we not undertaken to do what little we could to help the situation.

There is one consideration I would add, and in this I am speaking for himself. I believe Canada has a deep and vital interest in the Pacific, and that many of the greatest events of the future will be transacted around the basin of the Pacific. Two-thirds of the world's population live in the countries on the Pacific ocean or immediately adjacent thereto,—China, India, Japan, Northern Russia, the United States, and Canada. We share with the United States the dominating position on the eastern side of the Pacific, and in all events that happen on the Pacific Canada has a deep and abiding interest; and, as the years go by, will have a still greater interest. If a force was to be sent to Siberia representing the British Empire in order to relieve the pressure on the western front and help speed the day when our Canadian boys would return, Canada, because of her position and ability, would have failed in her duty at that time if she had not cheerfully contributed to that contingent. My hon. friend says that the trouble and danger were passed before they went. An understanding was arrived at that the British Empire would send a certain number of troops. Japan sent her troops France and Italy sent their troops, and Great Britain sent the number of men she agreed to send, namely one battalion,—as a matter of fact she sent two. Owing to conditions prevailing in Canada we were longer than we had hoped in sending our troops, and as soon as the Armistice was signed the matter was taken up with the War Office. We asked if it was necessary for the troops to go forward, and the reply came that owing to the critical situation in Russia it was absolutely necessary that troops should go forward. Great Britain said that if we did not send our troops she would have to provide a contingent, and at that time she was not in a position to

change her plans suddenly. We were simply carrying out the arrangement arrived at in July and August, and doing our share in this struggle in order to achieve victory and, finally, peace.

Let me say that the success of the war this past year has in no small measure been due to the fact of the unified command. Will my friends, then, not apply the same thing to the situation in Siberia? Could we as Canadians say that when the other troops had to be maintained in Siberia, and when the Supreme War Council considered it essential that troops should be maintained there, Canada should be the first one to quit and refuse to take her share? That is not the part Canada has played in this war, and it was not the part that the Government was prepared to have her play. We carried out our obligations honourably, and intimated that as soon as our troops could be relieved and permission given for them to return to Canada we should be glad to welcome them back.

Mr. POWER: Were we to consider ourselves at war with the Russians at that time?

Mr. ROWELL: We occupied exactly the same position as the other Allies.

Mr. POWER: Were we at war with Russia or any portion of Russia, and are we at war with them now?

Mr. ROWELL: I shall not undertake to answer that question, because I do not suppose that anybody can state exactly what the situation is with reference to Russia and the various elements in Russia. There are several governments in Russia with which we are not at war.

Mr. POWER: Are we at war with any government in Russia?

Mr. ROWELL: So far as the Canadian brigade is concerned, we are not in contact with the forces of any Government with which we are at war.

Mr. VIEN: Do I understand the minister to say that the Canadian troops would not have been sent to Siberia if other troops had been available at the time either from Great Britain or from other countries?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not say that. What might have happened under other conditions I cannot say. I know what did happen under the conditions that existed.

Mr. VIEN: Was it imperative that Canadian troops be sent to Siberia on occount of the lack of troops from other sources?

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: I believe that troops were not available from other sources at that time, and that was represented to us.

Mr. VIEN: When the armistice was signed the American troops had only been in the field for a few weeks or a month. Were steps taken to ask the United States to send these 3,000, or 4,000, or 5,000 men that were required from the 200,000 or 300,000 men they were bringing back every month?

Mr. ROWELL: No, we have not asked the United States, or any other country, to carry Canada's burden in this war.

Mr. VIEN: Does the minister wish to convey the idea that when a country like Canada has sent, and kept in the field for almost four year, over five per cent of her population, the United States could not have been asked to send 5,000 men to Siberia, instead of our 4,000 or 5,000 men. without bringing upon us the reproach from the United States that we were asking them to do our share?

Mr. ROWELL: The United States sent her quota. The British Empire had to send hers. She agreed to send hers. Canada provided the rest of the men. As far as the Empire is concerned, Great Britain not only sent one in five, but she sent more than ten per cent——

Mr. VIEN: And the United States?

Mr. ROWELL: Let me deal first with the Empire's contribution to the Siberian expedition, which is the question that we are now considering. Great Britain had more than ten per cent of her population in her army, but in addition to the men that were sent from England, New Zealand sent ten per cent, and Australia sent a larger percentage than Canada. Canada was doing nothing more than her fair share in bearing any burdens that fell to her in sending an expedition to Siberia.

Mr. VIEN: I am sorry to say that I find that our relations with the Empire have caused us to neglect the interests of Canada and that we might have looked not only to other Commonwealths of the Empire to share in this Siberian expedition, but to other allied countries. There were not only the various colonies of the British Empire which had interests at stake, but there were other independent countries which had as much at stake but which did not contribute their full share to the expenses and sacrifices of the war.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Might I suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Vien) that

there are people nearer home who have not contributed very much to the war?

Mr. VIEN: When that question comes up we will discuss it.

Mr. ROWELL: Let me answer my hon. friend in this way: I do not know to what country my hon. friend refers.

Mr. VIEN: I want to be very frank; I refer to the United States.

Mr. ROWELL: The United States, Great Britain, France and Japan were interested in the situation in Russia. Does my hon. friend say that France should have done more?

Mr. VIEN: I will speak of the United States. I say that in my opinion the United States had not done her full share to the extent that Canada had done hers, and it would have been in the interest of Canada to be relieved from the responsibility of the Siberian expedition, and the United States to send four or five thousand men to Siberia.

Mr. MORPHY: Will you let me ask you what has your county done in the war?

Mr. VIEN: That is out of the question for the time being.

Mr. MORPHY: I should think it was.

Mr. VIEN: That is out of the question for the time being, but, when the time comes to cover that ground I will answer the hon. gentleman in the proper way.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid we shall not make much headway if there are to be interruptions such as these, although I am very glad to answer all the questions that may be put to me in discussing these estimates. My hon. friend says that Canada has done more than her share—

Mr. VIEN: I do.

Mr. ROWELL: —and that her interests have been sacrificed in this war.

Mr. VIEN: In the Siberian expedition.

Mr. ROWELL: Then I desire to put myself on record as absolutely dissenting from my hon. friend's view. I desire to join issue squarely and fairly on that question with him and with any who share his views. My hon. friend has said that we should have withdrawn and allowed the United States to send the additional men. The United States sent all the men she agreed to send. I believe that, notwithstanding all the sacrifices that the old Mother Country made in this war, if Canada had dropped out, if we had declined to send men to Siberia, rather than ask the United States to bear her share of this burden, she might have called out some more of her schoolboys and sent them over in order to carry her own burden. Neither Canada nor the Mother Country is desirous of putting her share, or any portion of it, on the shoulders of any others, and we are not their keepers. We are here to do our own duty in our own place. Now, I mentioned this matter as one of the questions that came before the Imperial War Cabinet and as illustrating the kind of questions that came up for consideration. It has developed into a discussion much more protracted than I had anticipated.

Mr. POWER: If we are not at war with any particular section or race of Russians, how can any hon. member, or any minister, justify our sending men over to Russia who may be shot or killed in action against one or other of these various races or sections?

Mr. ROWELL: I have given my hon. friend the reasons why there was intervention. I have stated the reasons why Canada was asked to take part in the expedition. My answer is that Canada was simply carrying out her part of the arrangements which, in the judgment of the War Office and of the Supreme War Council, it was necessary should be carried out. As a member of the Government I am prepared to take the full responsibility for everything that follows from that action.

Mr. POWER: Were these men supposed to fight when they got there?

Mr. ROWELL: They went over to fight.

Mr. POWER: With whom?

Mr. ROWELL: Owing to the conditions which developed they have not been called upon to fight. They have been engaged in assisting in preserving order.

Mr. POWER: Did the minister or anybody else have any idea who these Canadian troops were going to fight when they got there?

An hon. MEMBER: The Bolshevists.

Mr. ROWELL: They were going to fight—

An hon. MEMBER: Your friends.

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said in a general way that the Bolshevists were our friends. As he said "your friends" meaning this side of the House, I ask him to withdraw the expression. I want you to rule on my question of order.

An hon. MEMBER: You must be Scotch.

Mr. VIEN: I want a ruling on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I was not aware that the remark was addressed to the other side of the House, and one of the rules——

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman who made the observation used the expression "your friends."

The CHAIRMAN: A rule of the committee declares that an hon. member on rising should always address the Chair. I will not insist upon the hon. member withdrawing the remark.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all want to preserve decorum in this House. But does the Chair think that by a little joke, or turn of that kind, it can be tolerated in this House that any member on one side or the other can stand up, and in an observation ally other hon. gentlemen with Bolshevists?

The CHAIRMAN: If an hon. member, in the course of debate had declared that another member was a friend of the Bolshevists I would certainly ask him to withdraw the expression, but no hon. member was speaking at the time, and I therefore do not know to whom I could address the order of the Chair that the expression be withdrawn.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. member for Algoma has just said that the Bolshevists were our friends. I ask that the hon. gentleman stand up and withdraw the remark.

Mr. POWER: I presume the remark was addressed to me as much as to any hon. member, and I have no very great objection to be told that I am a friend of the Bolshevists since the Prime Minister of this country has invited the Bolshevists to a conference with him. If they are respectable enough to join him I have no objection to be called a friend of theirs.

Mr. VIEN: I want a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling has already been given that no hon. member in the course of debate used the expression referred to, and therefore the Chair cannot order it to be withdrawn.

Mr. ROWELL: I have already given one subject that came up as an illustration of the subjects that were brought before the Imperial War Cabinet for consideration. The general plans for the campaign, so far as they were proper matters for consideration by Government, came before the Imperial War Cabinet, particularly the whole Eastern situation.

Another very important matter that was considered, and considered most carefully, was the possible conditions of peace. I have noticed a rather interesting discussion in the press as to whether the Dominion ministers were consulted on the terms of peace. The whole question of the possible terms upon which peace might be concluded were laid before the Imperial War Cabinet, were considered by a committee of that Cabinet most carefully, and much thought was given to the whole subject. All such matters were dealt with by the War Cabinet while it was in session.

I do not think I need go further in connection with these subjects. I have only one further observation to make in reference to the work of the War Cabinet, and it is this: There could be no more striking tribute to the benefit of British institutions, and to the progress of liberty as we understand it, than the proceedings of the Imperial War Cabinet and the men who composed that Cabinet. When you find General Smuts, that great leader who was associated with General Botha in leading the Boer forces in South Africa scarce twenty years ago, seated at the same council table with Lord Milner—and hon. gentlemen know the relations that existed between them during the Boer war—and with the representatives of all the dominions, planning together for the successful prosecution of the war and the defeat of the German army and forces, you have one of the most striking testimonies in all history to the benefit of free institutions and of responsible government as we understand it in the British Empire. The fact that General Smuts was there, with his colleague Mr. Burton, from South Africa, taking part in these proceedings in the midst of this war, is a striking monument to the genius and statesmanship of Henry Campbell-Bannerman who gave responsible government to South Africa in so short a period after the termination of hostilities in South Africa. The meeting was a striking tribute to the loyalty and devotion begotten of liberty, and to the genius for government which the Anglo-Saxon race possesses.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I would like the hon. gentleman to state what change in our constitutional relations the creation of the Imperial War Cabinet has brought about? The Prime Minister said that it was an important change in the relations between

the various portions of the Empire. What is that change, and can the hon. gentleman furnish any information as to the permanency of the institution to which he refers?

Mr. ROWELL: I thought I had dealt with that phase of the subject the other day, but I shall be very glad to supplement what I then said in answer to my hon. friend's question, and it must be largely by way of a re-statement. Prior to 1917, when the Imperial War Cabinet was constituted, the Dominions did not share, in any real or full sense, in the consideration of questions of foreign policy, or in the consideration of questions relating to peace or war. It is true that during the process of our constitutional development the status of the Dominions has steadily advanced, and that the Dominions have from time to time been consulted, and latterly were in reality largely responsible for the negotiation of their own commercial treaties. At the Imperial Conference of 1911 a resolution was passed that in future the Imperial Government before concluding treaties which, by reason of their general nature, would affect the Dominions, should communicate with the Dominions in reference to them. All this indicates a growing desire on the part of the Dominions to be consulted in these vital matters, and a growing recognition on the part of Great Britain of the necessity of consultation, but as a matter of fact that consultation was uncertain, spasmodic and not really effective in the larger sense. The constitution of the Imperial War Cabinet meant that with respect to matters so vital as the ones I have mentioned to-night the Dominion ministers sat at the same table with the representatives of the Mother Country and talked them over in the frankest manner. The inmost secrets relating to the conduct of the war, were laid before the Dominion ministers, and if there was any additional information they desired and asked for it was provided. At these Imperial War Cabinet meetings the Dominion ministers sat as equals with the British ministers in considering these questions of policy. I think the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) was entirely justified in saying that that was an important development in our constitutional relations. It was the recognition of the equality of the status of the Dominions with that of the Mother Country.

Now, my hon. friend has also referred to the permanence of this Imperial War Cabinet. It was created for the period of the war, and he will recall that at the Imperial War Conference of 1917 the resolution then passed declared that a conference should be held following the war to consider the relations which would exist between the different portions of the Empire. I have the resolution here, No 9; it reads as follows:

> The Imperial War Conference are of opinion that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference, to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities. They deem it their duty, however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based upon a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth, and of India as an important portion of the same; should recognize the right of the Dominions and India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations, and should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action, founded on consultation, as the several Governments may determine.

While that resolution provides that these constitutional relations shall be considered at a special Imperial Conference, it also lays down the principles upon which that consideration shall take place, and that declaration is most important, because it negatives the idea of a central Imperial Parliament controlling all the affairs of the Empire. It declares expressly in favour of the autonomy of the different component portions of the Empire, and that the development is to be along the lines of consultation and co-operation, rather than of concentration of power in the hands of any one portion; and I take it that that resolution is a landmark in the history of the constitutional development of the Empire; and that it settled—because it received the assent of the Mother Country and of all the Dominions and of India—the basis upon which future development shall be made.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): But there is nothing to ensure the continuance of the institution. It rests now merely upon the goodwill of the British Prime Minister.

Mr. ROWELL: There is nothing to ensure its continuance, because it is created only for the period of the war. What is to take place after the war is to be settled at this special Imperial Conference—and

I submit that that is the wise thing to do —when there is time to consider the subject in all its aspects and in all its bearings, based on the principles laid down in that resolution.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the intention of the hon. minister to inform Parliament as to the general lines of the policy to be pursued by the Canadian ministers at that next meeting of the Imperial Conference, so as to enable Parliament to discuss what this constitution of a permanent character should be?

Mr. ROWELL: All I can say is, that I think this resolution lays down the broad lines upon which constitutional development must take place. As far as I am aware, the Government has not considered any further practical proposals in reference to it. Possibly the Imperial War Cabinet, providing for continuous consultation as it does during the period of the war, might be considered afterwards as a suitable development based on the principles of this resolution, but nothing has been decided so far in connection with that matter.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Chairman, I think on the whole the committee is indebted to my hon. friend (Mr. Rowell) for the very clear statement he has made of the relatively recent creation of the War Cabinet and of its work during the period of the war. It is quite apparent, that in the work of the War Cabinet and of the Imperial Conference there are many things which were practicable during the war, but there are also many things which remain in the purely academic stage. The name itself, War Cabinet, suggests violently the idea that it was created for the purpose of carrying on the war. I have followed as much as I 10 p.m. could from afar whatever deliberations of that body were made public. I have read also some criticisms of the activities of the War Cabinet. Only the day before yesterday I read a very severe criticism of the activities of the War Cabinet by General Calwell, of the British War Office. We must expect, as the Prime Minister said the other day, that, now that the war is over, many of the generals and other outstanding officers will give vent to their grievances. As I said a moment ago, many of the matters which were discussed were of a practical nature, and many others, fortunately, were only in the academic stage, and will remain there for a long time.

[Mr. Rowell.]

My hon. friend began his remarks this afternoon by referring to the coming of India into the Conference of the Imperial allies. I am proud to see that India has at last secured a status in the British Empire. But as the question affects Canada in some degree, I doubt whether it is very good policy on our part to be associated in a Conference with the representatives of India. This reunion of Imperial statesmen is one which must not be one-sided in its activities, and it appears to me that a policy of compromise in the long run may triumph in that Conference. If there is one question where, I submit, there must not be any compromise—although I stand strong for compromises generally—it is the question of immigration of East Indians. We know what is the feeling of our friends from the Pacific coast against such immigration. For years past the people of India have felt that as British subjects they are entitled to live under the flag wherever that flag waves.

In the year war was declared a shipload of Indians was anchored off Vancouver, and it is a well know fact that British Columbians positively refused entrance through any of the ports of that province to these Indians who had intended to settle in Canada. It was a scandalous affair in this sense, that here were British subjects of an equal status with ourselves under the British flag, yet who were not allowed to land on British territory. That shows, Mr. Chairman, how wise it is to mind our own business, and to concentrate our activities as much as possible on our own Canadian affairs. I am not opposed to Canada being closely associated with the statesmen of the Mother Country, particularly during the greatest of all wars that humanity has ever seen. Far be it from me to oppose any such close association. But we must be very careful not to engage ourselves for the future as regards association with the people of India, at least. It is quite clear that the representatives of Canada sitting with the representatives of India at the Peace Conference would sooner or later be faced with the problem whether Indians should be allowed to settle in our country. It is true, as my hon. friend very guardedly explained this afternoon, that reciprocal treatment has been agreed upon by the representatives of India and the representatives of the dominions, but my hon. friend is too shrewd a statesman not to understand that such reciprocal treatment in immigration simply means the

complete exclusion of Indians from Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

The question of naturalization was a subject which, of course, had to be discussed by the Imperial Conference. It was discussed in this House during the year 1914. when we passed an Act concurrently with the British Parliament dealing with the actual conditions then existing. I understand that new features have been added to those laws, extending the privileges of British citizenship to people in the United Kingdom and in the Dominions. The conditions arising out of the war will, of course, make necessary some changes. I suppose the same procedure will be repeated; that an Act will be passed by the British Parliament and a similar Act by the Parliament of Canada, both Parliaments exercising their undoubted rights in the matter.

My hon. friend says that one of the questions which came before the Imperial Conference was that of immigration. It is proposed to establish a central bureau in London, or in England at all events, for the purpose of directing the flow of immigration to the Dominions. My hon. friend said that this would be done in conjunction with the Dominion authorities.

Mr. ROWELL: In consultation with the Dominion authorities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no objection to that, provided always that this Dominion at least remains absolute master as to its immigration policy. We have been too ready in the past to receive immigrants even from the United Kingdom. We must select our immigration, and I am pleased to say that the best class of immigration we can get is from the United Kingdom and Scandinavia. We cannot expect immigration to any degree from France or Belgium, but I hope that if good sturdy people from France or Belgium desire to emigrate, the Government will see to it that if acceptable they are directed to Canada. I agree that the bulk of our immigration must come from the British Isles and Scandinavia. We should keep a very careful watch over the tide of immigration. We should not wait until the immigrant has reached our shores, and then return him to Great Britain or Scandinavia, or wherever he came from, but we should have our agents on the other side at the port of embarkation, and the medical examination should be made over there. In years gone by, our medical officers had to meet these immigrants at Montreal and St. John, but more particularly at Quebec and Halifax and they were subjected to a very hurried examination. The result was that unfortunately a poor class of immigrant was sometimes admitted. I was startled the other day to see the figures of the feeble minded in the province of Manitoba, in a report by one of the officers of the department. This officer singles out the province of Manitoba because statistics recently compiled show that a poor class of immigrant has been shoved off on that province.

I hope the Government, in its new scheme of immigration, and the representatives of Canada at the Imperial Conference, will see to it that our rights are asserted and that a very close medical inspection on the other side of the water forms a distinct feature of our immigration policy.

My hon. friend spoke of the hope expressed at the Imperial Conference as regards cheaper communications between the Mother Country and the Dominions, mentioning specially cable communications and shipping generally. As regards cheap cable rates I am entirely in accord with what my hon. friend stated, and I think the resolution which was adopted at the last Imperial Conference is the same as those which, from time to time during the last twenty years have been adopted at the various meetings of that conference. It is a great pity that we should not have a state-owned cable between the various portions of the Empire. During the war, the censors and the various governments have done their best to prevent us from getting the real news. That, however, is an aside. But I regret that even in normal times the press of Canada should be served with American news. I do not object to the Americans; indeed I am a friend of the Americans; but we belong to the British Empire and I would like to read in my morning and evening newspapers news that is not tainted, and the only way to obtain a satisfactory result in that regard is the control by the British Empire of a cable which would distribute news throughout the Empire, and at a cheap rate. I am not speaking of state-owned cables for the newspapers only, but for the public generally. Cable rates in this country are certainly exorbitant, and my opinion is that the cheaper the rates, the larger will be the revenues of the cable companies. The cable companies, of course, form to-day a formidable trust, and unless the British Government and the Dominion Government unite and get control of a cable, as we obtained control of the Pacific cable, we shall not be able to make any headway

against the trust. We have a very good illustration of what cheap rates can bring about. Some years ago, when Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General, it was said that letter rates could not be reduced; that to reduce them would mean a huge deficit for the Post Office Department. Sir William Mulock went before the conference at the time of the Queen's Jubilee and compelled the then Postmaster General in Great Britain to accept the principle of penny postage throughout the British Empire. Canada led the way in that great reform, and since that time the Post Office Department, instead of having a yearly deficit, has had a yearly surplus. The principle worked well: The cheaper the rates, the larger the number of letters and post cards, and the bigger the business. I hope, therefore, that the resolution of the conference will carry; that we shall succeed in choking that cable trust which controls the news of the world, and that a state-owned cable will be established to unite more closely the various portions of the British Empire.

My hon. friend spoke of a very interesting and practical subject, the question of lower oceanic rates. We cannot hope to extend the trade of Canada if we are treated, as we have always been, by the British shipowners. The St. Lawrence route, which is admittedly one of the best routes in the world, which has been so much improved during the last twenty-five years, has been discredited by the abnormally high rates imposed on our shipping. I hope the Government will see to it that those rates are lowered and that Canadian traders are given a proper chance.

My hon. friend spoke of the Imperial Court of Appeals. I may surprise some of my hon. friends by what I am going to say. While I am far from being an Imperialist, speaking for myself and as a member of the minority in Canada, I stand by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and I am against any radical change. I would be against the Supreme Court of Canada as the final tribunal in Canada. Let me explain. I do not object to the Supreme Court of Canada being the last court of resort for our ordinary civil and commercial cases; but as regards constitutional cases, I stand by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. First of all, it is a court which is the honour of the British Empire, and I may say, of the civilized world. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has from time immemorial given ample satisfaction to all those who have had the honour to appear before it. Its members are among the ablest men in the land and they are above suspicion, and, I repeat, I stand for the Judicial Committee in all matters constitutional. As regards our civil and commercial cases, I see no reason why they should go beyond the Supreme Court of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Is the hon. member in favour of the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Alaska award?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was a special commission—an arbitration, and I may say that in that arbitration our Canadian commissioners stood by Canada. Unfortunately—and I may say it was quite openly stated in this House when I was a young member—the news of our defeat before the Alaska Boundary Commission was flashed one sad morning to the House of Commons and on both sides the extraordinary attitude of Lord Alverstone was severly censured. But this is not the question. We are speaking of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and I, as a member of the minority, stand fast by that committee as the court of final appeal on constitutional questions. My hon. friend laid stress on the fact that new channels of communication had been established between the Dominion and the Mother Country in that the Prime Minister would in the future be in a position to correspond directly with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. I have the highest regard for the wisdom of my hon. friend, but if the clear results of our association with the members of the Imperial Conference only amounted to that, I would say that it was indeed a very humble pie that we were eating, because it is really not a great success to achieve when, after more than one hundred and fifty years of association with the Mother Country, we find that we have at last succeeded in having a Prime Minister who in the future will be able to correspond directly with the Prime Minister of England. I do not wish to belittle the deliberations of the Conference; far from it. But there were other questions much more vital and important than that in the discussions which took place at the Conference, and which I suppose will be discussed before this House when the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) returns to Canada. He has himself declared that any constitutional change evolved from that war cabinet would have to be submitted to the Parliament of Canada. I do not know what change can take place. We have just passed through the greatest of all

wars. There was no binding agreement between the Mother Country and Canada as regards our participation in the wars of Great Britain, and yet Canada did magnificently, as was remarked a moment ago by my friend the President of the Privy Council. There was no binding agreement between Australia and the Mother Country, between New Zealand and the Mother Country, and yet the silken tie was stronger than any gilded chain that might have bound the Dominions to the United Kingdom. On this question, much as I have regard for the opinion of my hon. friend, as to the possibilities of new constitutional agreements, I have more confidence in the judgment of a man whose name and fame are enshrined in the heart of every true Canadian. I refer to the late Edward Blake, whose weighty opinion I beg to quote on this question of closer association with the Mother Country. The following words were spoken by him when a member of the British House of Comomns in 1900:

> For many years I for my part, have looked to conference, to delegation, to correspondent, to negotiation, to quasi-diplomatic methods, subject to the action of free parliaments here and elsewhere, as the only feasible way of working the quasi-federal union between the Empire and the sister nations of Canada and Australia. A quarter of a century past I dreamed the dream of Imperial Parliamentary federation, but many years ago I came to the conclusion that we had passed the turning that could lead to that terminus—if ever indeed, there was a practicable road. We have too long and too extensively gone on the lines of separate action here and elsewhere to go back now. Never forget—you have the lesson here to-day—that the good will on which you depend is due to local freedom, and would not survive its limitation.

My hon. friend referred a moment ago to the action taken by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as regards South Africa. Mr. Blake was speaking on the very day when the Liberal Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was proclaiming the free responsible Government of the new South African Union. There was a strong and bitter opposition in the British House of Commons to that Act of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Government, one of the most violent speeches being delivered by such an eminent man as Mr. Balfour. Yet Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Blake, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and all true British Liberals gave Canada as the shining example that should be followed in the relations between the United Kingdom and South Africa; and as Mr. Blake said: "Never forget that the good will on which you depend is due to local freedom and would not survive its limitation." Sir. any scheme by which you would transfer the affairs of Canada from Ottawa to London would eventually fail.

Sir Robert Borden has, time and time again, declared that you cannot bind Canada by the voice or vote of one or two representatives on vital issues unless the Prime Minister and his colleagues, sitting in the Imperial Conference, are backed by the vote of the Canadian Parliament. I have given the opinion of Mr. Blake. Here is the opinion of another giant. Sir John Macdonald, speaking a few years ago about this dream of an Imperial federation scheme, used the following language:

> We are told that we want Imperial Federation. I will not trouble you with a disquisition on that subject now, but I will tell you Imperial Federation is utterly impracticable. We would never agree to send a number of men over to England to sit in Parliament there and vote away our rights and principles. I am, so far as that question goes, up to the handle a home ruler. We will govern our own country. We will put on the taxes ourselves. If we choose to misgovern ourselves, we will do so, and we do not desire England, Ireland or Scotland to tell us we are fools. We will say: If we are fools we will keep our folly to ourselves; you will not be the worse for it and we will not be the worse for any folly of yours.

That is the language of common sense. That is a pithy description of this Imperial federation dream by the great statesman who once said, 'A British subject I was born; a British subject I will die." There we have the opinions of two of the foremost Canadians that I have known in this Parliament—Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Edward Blake.

Mr. Chairman, there is another great Canadian who, on many occasions, spoke with no less authority on this subject, and perhaps it is proper that I should quote his language, as he only passed away a few days ago. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in this House in 1905, used the following language:

> I do not think that it would be possible to find in any of the self-governing colonies any desire or any intention to part with any of the powers that they have at the present time. At present we are proud to say, and to believe, that the relations of the British Empire within all its parts are absolutely satisfactory. It is not in accordance with the traditions of British history; it is not in accordance with the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race, to make any change in their institutions until these institutions have been proved insufficient or defective in some way. The British Empire to-day is composed of nations all bearing allegiance to the same sovereign.

That is my conception of Canada in her relations with the Mother Country; and, though I do not agree with all the resolutions of the Imperial Conference, of which

my hon. friend so eloquently treated, yet I say that as long as this Conference deals with only practical questions, as illustrated by my hon. friend this afternoon, I will find no fault with it. But when constitutional changes, radical, organic changes in the relationship existing between Canada and the Mother Country are broached, I as a Canadian say "Halt!" Canada has her own constitution, her own responsible Government, she is a nation in the British Empire and she is not ready to sell her birthright for a mess of pottage. We are British subjects but above all we are Canadians, we wish to assert our Canadian nationality and our Canadian rights and nothing can be done by the Prime Minister or his colleagues in any Imperial Conference to bind Canada for the future unless such projects have received the full sanction of the Canadian Parliament which should be backed by the Canadian people.

Railways and Canals—Miscellaneous—Canadian Government Railways, $4,000.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals by what time we are going to sit. It is twelve o'clock by present time.

Mr. REID (Grenville): We are working by standard time.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, but we have to live by daylight saving time. Our life and our work will not agree. If we want to do good work we want to make our work agree with our life.

Mr. REID (Grenville): We do not intend to ask you to sit late but just to pass a few items that are not contentious, in order that we might get into another department.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think it is advisable to get into another department.

Mr. REID (Grenville): That is all I am asking for.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not a question of time, but there are certain rights that we wish to reserve, and I think it is advisable to finish with this department first. If the Estimates of the President of the Privy Council are not through we might deal with some more items but I do not think we should go into any other department.

Mr. ROWELL: There is the item:

Canadian War Mission and representation at Washington, $50,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think there are a great many members in this House who know what the Canadian War Mission is.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

We would like to have some explanation of this item.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend wishes to allow the matter to stand I have no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it would be more satisfactory.

Mr. ROWELL: It is an item that involves an important principle and will stand some discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend give me some information when we come back to this item? Has there been any correspondence exchanged between this Government and the Imperial authorities with regard to representation at Washington?

It was a question some years ago whether Canada should not have a commissioner at Washington. I remember that at one time—I violate no confidence in stating this—Sir Wilfrid Laurier had intended to appoint a gentleman of very marked ability and of high standing as commissioner at Washington, having the same status as our Canadian Commissioner at London. The proposal did not eventuate, but later on I heard, and it was reported in the press, that Sir Robert Borden had intended to appoint Sir Douglas Hazen, as Canadian representative at Washington. I, for one, would have been pleased to see Sir Douglas Hazen as our representative at the American capital. Has the proposal fallen through, or does the Government intend at some date in the future to carry it out?

Mr. ROWELL: With reference to the last suggestion of my hon. friend, touching Sir Douglas Hazen, that is a matter upon which I am not in a position to give any information. In regard to the question of having a Canadian representative at Washington, the Government does intend to carry out the proposal, and this item in the Estimates is to make provision for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: For a permanent representative?

Mr. ROWELL: For a permanent representative at Washington. The exact form which that representation will take is a matter of consultation between the Prime Minister and the Imperial Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The item reads, "Canadian War Mission and representation at Washington."

Mr. ROWELL: The intention is to continue the present Canadian War Mission in existence until the arrangements are

made for a permanent representative. The moment those arrangements are concluded the War Mission will go out of existence, but we do not consider it expedient that there should be an interregnum between the end of that mission and the appointment of a permanent representative. That is the object of inserting this item in the Estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am pleased with the answer given by my hon. friend. If we are going to have a representative elsewhere than at London and Paris, certainly it should be at Washington, and if I may be allowed to say so, the Government by selecting two years ago Sir Charles Gordon certainly did something which pleased immensely all Canadians who happen to know that gentleman. No abler man could have been found for the position which he filled with such distinction during the last two years and, I am told, without any cost to the Canadians exchequer. No man is more conversant with trade questions or is better able to judge of our financial conditions than Sir Charles Gordon. It is not because he is a good Liberal, but I would like the Government to try, if it is at all possible, to induce Sir Charles Gordon to become our permanent representative in the future at Washington.

Resolution reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, April 2, 1919.

The House met at Two o'clock.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): With reference to the Easter adjournment I give notice that I shall tomorrow move that this House adjourn on Thursday the 17th instant at 6 p.m., and that when the House so adjourns, it stand adjourned until Tuesday the 22nd instant.

QUESTIONS.

JUDGE F. S. MACLENNAN.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has His Honour Judge F. S. MacLennan, of Montreal, filled any permanent or temporary positions under Federal Government control since the first of January, 1912?
2. If so, on what dates was he appointed to such positions, and what was the remuneration or salary attached thereto?
3. What amounts, if any, have been paid to His Honour Judge F. S. MacLennan by the Government, since January 1, 1912?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Stand.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: When may I expect an answer to this question?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The first two questions which appertain to the Department of Justice have been answered some two weeks or more ago and the answers sent to the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell). Inasmuch as the last question bears on every department of the Government, the Secretary of State must, before he puts his answers in, receive communications from all departments.

IMPERIAL COURT OF APPEAL.

Mr. CRONYN:

1. Has the Lord Chancellor, in pursuance of a resolution passed at the Imperial Conference of 1918, transmitted to the Canadian Government a memorandum of proposals with reference to the constitution of one Imperial Court of Appeal?
2. When such proposal is received, is it the intention of the Government to lay before this House its views with regard thereto, before making reply to the Government of the United Kingdom?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT BOARD.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What has been the total expenditure up to December 31, 1918, in Nova Scotia, in connection with the Soldiers' Settlement Board?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The total expenditure in connection with loans under the Soldiers' Settlement Board to the 31st December last, in the province of Nova Scotia, is: Loans to settlers, $2,500; inspections and general expenses, $309.25; total, $2,809.25.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

What were the amounts allowed by the Government in connection with National Service Registration in the County of Bagot during June, 1918, for (a) the registrar; (b) the assistant registrars; and (c) rental of buildings for registration purposes?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: (a) $506.20; (b) $834.13; (c) $100.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. What were the respective amounts of the account rendered by the Registrar of National Service in the County of Bagot, for the month of June, 1918, for (a) salary to employees in connection therewith; (b) salary to the assistant registrars; (c) payment for rental of buildings used for registration purposes?
2. What amount has been paid therefor?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. (a) $585.20; (b) $2,108.04; (c) $100.
2. (a) $506.20; (b) $834.14; (c) $100.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What was the total cost to Canada to date in connection with National Service registration?
2. What amount was paid to Mr. L. G. A. Cressé, barrister, of Montreal, for salary and disbursements in connection with said registration?
3. What persons did the said L. G. A. Cressé employ, and what is the amount paid to each person?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $631,230.89.

2. $918.95.

3. George Etienne Cartier, Wilfrid J. Proulx, $2,157.07; Hochelaga, Charles Bruchesi, K.C., $2,552.23; Jacques Cartier, Acquila Jasmin, K.C., $3,888.52; Laurier-Outremont Co., Jos. Perrault, $593.46; Maisonneuve Co., J. A. Couture, $3,742.37; St. Anne Co., Lawrence Kavanagh, $7,409.79; St. Antoine Co., Frederick Hague, K.C., $1,584.33; St. Denis, Chas. A. Pariseault, $3,750.81; St. James Co., Alexandre Brouillette, $2,263.10; St. Lawrence and St. George Co., G. A. Forbes, $2,249.72; St. Mary Co., Jos. A. Lamarre, $3,692.92; Westmount-St. Henri Co., Alex. I. Morrison, $3,064.73; Vaudreuil-Soulanges Co., J. A. H. Cherrier, $1,653.87.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. What were the names of the Registrar, the Deputy Registrar, the Assistant Deputy Registrar, under the Military Service Act, for subdistricts of Hull, Wright, Pontiac and Labelle, of Military District No. 3?
2. When was each of them appointed?
3. What amount has been paid to each as salary up to date?
4. What amount has been paid to each for travelling expenses up to date?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Deputy Registrar Sub-District of Hull, Mr. F. A. Labelle; Assistant Deputy Registrar, Sub-District of Hull, Mr. J. E. D. Caron. The District of Hull includes counties of Pontiac, Wright and Labelle.

2. Mr. Labelle was appointed September 28, 1917. Mr. Caron was appointed October 8, 1917.

3. Mr. Labelle, September 28, 1917, to June 11, 1918, at $200 per month, $1,693.34; June 12, 1918, to March 31, 1919, at $250 per month, $2,408.34; total, $4,101.68. Mr. Caron, October 8, 1917, to February 28, 1919, at $200 per month, $3,350.

4. Mr. Labelle, $11. Mr. Caron, no travelling expenses.

[Mr. Marcile.]

SOLDIERS ON PENSION LIST.

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. How many total disabled soldiers are now on the pension list?
2. How many soldiers have lost both eyes?
3. How many soldiers are bed-ridden and are drawing pensions?
4. How many soldiers suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis have received treatment, and how many are now under treatment?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. 854.

2. 39.

3. 16.

4. (a) Since July, 1915, the number of ex-soldiers suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis who have received treatment, and who have been discharged, or who have died, totals 5,730. (b) 1,712.

ST. PETER'S RESERVE.

Mr. MALLOY:

1. Have all the lands surrendered for sale by the Indians of St. Peter's Reserve, Selkirk, Manitoba, been sold?
2. If so, how many acres remain unsold?
3. Have payments for lands ever been made in accordance with the terms of sale?
4. Has the interest on the funded portion of the proceeds of sale been paid regularly to the Indians?
5. Has any portion of the 3,000 acres reserved by the surrender for hay land been leased?
6. If so, to what extent, to whom, for what purpose, for how long, and for what rental?
7. What is the provision for cancellation, if any?
8. Has there been a reduction in area of the said hay land under the terms of the surrender?
9. If so, what is the extent of the reduction?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes, except the hay lands.
2. The hay and marsh lands.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, when funds were available.
5. Yes.

6. The whole 3,000 acres mentioned in the surrender and contiguous marsh lands, about 10,000 acres in all, leased to Charles Bird and Jacob Jonnason of St. Peter's, and Rufus Stephen Benson and Rufus Henrickson, of Selkirk, for a term of five years from the 1st of May, 1918, for hay and grazing purposes at an annual rental of $2,500 in advance.

7. Provision made in lease that if rent is in arrear or unpaid for the space of forty days, or in case of breach or non-performance of any of the covenants contained in the lease, it shall be lawful for His Majesty the King into and upon the said premises to re-enter and the same to have again, re-possess and enjoy.

8. Yes.

9. To the extent of land leased.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE— PRISONERS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. How many men belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, whether in France or Great Britain, are actually in prison?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to demand from the French and the British authorities copies of the complaints, the evidence and the verdicts for each of the said cases?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to demand from the French and the British authorities, the release and delivery to the Canadian authorities, of all such members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Hon. Mr. MEWBURN:

1. This information is not available in Canada, but a cable has been sent Overseas for the same.

2 and 3. This matter is receiving the attention of the Government.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS — DEMONSTRATION STATIONS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many experimental farms or demonstration stations are there in each of the nine provinces of Canada under the direction of the Department of Agriculture?

2. In what year were said farms and stations established, and where are they situated?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1 and 2. Prince Edward Island: one experimental station, located at Charlottetown, established 1909. New Brunswick: one experimental station, located at Fredericton, established 1912. Nova Scotia: One experimental station, located at Kentville, established 1912; one experimental farm, located at Nappan, established 1886. Quebec: Four experimental stations, at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, established 1911; at Cap Rouge, established 1911; at Lennoxville, established 1914; at Spirit Lake, established 1916; one tobacco station at Farnham, established 1909. Thirteen illustration stations: At Aubrey, Châteauguay county, established 1916; at Lachute, Argenteuil county, established 1918; at Paspebiac West, Bonaventure county, established 1916; at New Richmond, Bonaventure county, established 1919; at Stanbridge East, Missiquoi county, established 1916; at Drummondville, Drummond county, established 1916; at Lac à la Tortue, Champlain county, established 1916; at L'Assomption, L'Assomption county, established 1919; at Rimouski, Rimouski county, established 1916; at St. Clet, Vaudreuil county, established 1919; at St. Isidore, Dorchester county, established 1917; at Ste. Julie, Vercheres county, established 1916; at St. Gédéon, Chicoutimi county, established 1916. Ontario: one experimental farm, at Ottawa, established 1886; one experimental station, at Kapuskasing, established 1916; one tobacco station, at Harrow, established 1909. Manitoba: One experimental farm, at Brandon, established 1886; one experimental station, at Morden, established 1915. Saskatchewan: One experimental farm, at Indian Head, established 1886; two experimental stations, at Rosthern, established 1908; at Scott, established 1910; fifteen illustration stations, at Assiniboia, established 1915; at Biggar, established 1916; at Davidson, established 1918; at Herbert, established 1915; at Lloydminster, established 1916; at Maple Creek, established 1915; at Meota, established 1918; at Noremac, established 1915; at Pambrum, established 1915; at Prelate, established 1915; at Radville, established 1916; at Shaunavon, established 1915; at Weyburn, established 1916; at Tugaske, established 1918; at Zealandia, established 1919. Alberta: Two experimental stations, at Lethbridge, established 1906; at Lacombe, established 1907; two experimental substations, at Fort Vermilion, established 1908; at Beaverlodge, established 1916; seventeen illustration stations, at Bassano, established 1919; at Bow Island, established 1915; at Carmangay, established 1918; at Delacour, established 1918; at Foremost, established 1915; at Grassy Lake, established 1915; at High River, established 1916; at Jenner, established 1915; at Macleod, established 1915; at Magrath, established 1915; Milk River, established 1915; at Munson, established 1916; at Pincher Creek, established 1915; at Taber, established 1918; at Whitla, established 1915; at Wainwright, established 1919; at Youngstown, established 1918. British Columbia: One experimental farm at Agassiz, established 1886; three experimental stations, at Summerland, established 1914; at Invermere, established 1912; at Sidney, established 1912. Yukon Territory: One experimental substation at Swede Creek, Dawson, established 1917.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERT HARRISON (Nipissing) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to immediately resume the work of improving the French River waterway connecting Georgian Bay with Lake Nipissing.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Government have already had presented to them a resolution urging them to take into consideration the resumption of this work. This resolution was presented by the Boards of Trade from the north country. A deputa-

tion composed of business interests from all parts of Ontario met the Government a short time ago in connection with this scheme.

The French river is not a small contracted stream, but a great natural waterway, with wide and deep channels, capable of accommodating the largest of lake carriers, with but little improvement. Breaks in navigation occur at but three points; here three locks will be required. At these locks it is proposed to erect dams capable of maintaining the water level at a uniform height for navigation, and to provide for electrical power.

According to the engineer's report, over 35,000 horse-power will he produced. There has been offered by mining plants from the nickel area $26 per horse-power, and they consider that a generous figure. At even $25 per horse-power, it will net $875,000 per annum in revenue, which will meet the interest on the cost of the entire waterway construction. The figures in the booklet are taken direct from the report of the Government engineers, and though 25 per cent was added to allow for increased cost of material and labour, the revenue from power would still meet the total interest and leave a substantial balance. Therefore it is really not an expenditure, but an investment which will net a revenue from the day it is in operation.

The Sudbury nickel area has already developed and has in use 37,500 horse-power. The International Nickel Company is now adding 12,000 horse-power, but this will be utilized by their own plant. Other industries are springing up, such as the British American Nickel Corporation, and it is well to note that 80 per cent of its capital is subscribed by the British Government; it is therefore a purely British corporation. Already it has been forced to locate its refineries elsewhere, as it could find no power available in that locality.

Mr. MURPHY: Where have these refineries been located?

Mr. HARRISON: They wished to locate the plant in Sudbury, but were unable to do so, as they could not get the necessary power. The refinery is now in Hull. We have lost this plant, and we do not wish to go on handicapping our industrial development.

The only large power undeveloped in this section of the country is the French river, and it is entirely in the hands of the Federal Government, as it is bound up with waterway construction. New Ontario has not hesitated to spend money freely in developing power. Already private capital has invested $37,000,000, and wherever power is available it is prepared to invest still further. Since, however, this power is not open to development by either the Hydro-Electric Commission or by private capital, and as present plants are suffering and new plants are prevented from locating, we feel that the Federal Government should take action at once. It is due to the territory to place this power at its disposal, and at the same time open the waterway to navigation, both of which are urgently needed by this section of Ontario.

The savings to this territory by waterway improvement would be enormous. New Ontario has been condemned to suffer the limitations of a single line rail haul of some hundreds of miles from the supply centres of the south. Older Ontario has a network of competing railways, and the advantage, besides, of waterways surrounding her which tend to reduce the cost of carriage. But New Ontario has been forced to struggle on with no such advantage.

The most important item is the import of coal. The freight charges on this commodity range from $2.40 to $3.50 per ton. Freight adds almost half to the original price at the border. This section of Ontario tributary to the waterway uses over 600,000 tons of coal per year, at the most conservative estimate. The average saving would be more than $2 per ton, so that on coal alone the water-borne traffic would save the country a net sum of over $1,200,000 per annum. Thus, in less than 15 years, the entire cost of the waterway would be saved to the country. It can be conceived how much saving there would be to our large pulp and paper plants, some of which use from 40,000 to 60,000 tons of coal per annum.

If our Ontario pulp and paper plants are going to be able to compete in the open markets with the great mills of the United States, which secure their pulpwood in their own vicinity, they must be protected by affording them water-borne traffic for import and export. At present they may find no trouble, but should paper prices fall and competition become keen, they may find it impossible to compete. It is a striking fact that as things stand, the paper plants of the south contract with Anticosti, Norway, and even Sweden, in preference to our Northern Ontario. The reason is obvious. Rail haul is expensive, and New Ontario should be furnished relief at once.

A similar statement might be made concerning the 36,000,000 cords of pulpwood. If even 20,000,000 tons of paper were produced, the total saving, at $2.50 per ton, would be $50,000,000, or if but half were exported by water, at least $25,000,000, would be saved.

A similar handicap is shown in exports. We have 3,500,000,000 feet of timber behind the French River waterway, on a conservative estimate. On this total, if merely 80 per cent is exported, the saving would be about $5,000,000, estimated at $1.75 per M.

The annual saving on these three commodities, lumber, pulp, and paper, would total over $1,300,000, putting the saving at the lowest possible figure.

When we consider what our mines have given to Canada and the world in the short space of time that they have been producing, it seems scarcely credible. In some twelve years Cobalt has given $170,000,000 in silver, and Porcupine over $40,000,000 in gold, or a total in gold and silver of $210,000,000, while the Sudbury nickle area has given $250,000,000. These three areas, then, have aggregated almost $500,000,000.

New Ontario is producing 91 per cent of the silver of Canada, 58 per cent of the gold of Canada, and 90 per cent of the nickle of the world. Surely such a territory is entitled to the small consideration that would be required for the construction of this waterway, which would pay for itself in revenue from power, and over and over again in savings on imports and exports every four to six years.

We also feel that the Federal Government would do well to take measures to encourage the development of our great iron deposits. At present it is impossible for them to compete with the deposits of the great Missaba range, but they are more and more coming into prominence, and a small bounty of 50 cents a ton might make them marketable, and might make New Ontario one of the great steel producing lands of the world. since her resources are practically inexhaustible stretching from the Atikokan North of Port Arthur and to Timagami North of North Bay.

The French River Waterway would provide another great Lakes Eastern Terminal for the grain flow from the west. It would connect the great Lakes with Lake Nipissing where three Transcontinental railways stand ready to carry the grain to seaboard. Here we have the shortest all rail route to the sea of any line American or Canadian, The Canadian National is only 331 miles to seaboard at Montreal. Should elevators be placed at the east end of Lake Nipissing, the wheat might be carried eastward as required by the eastern markets throughout the year and thus relieve congestion in the west. If this is a fact to-day when only 120,000,000 bushels are produced what will be the case when the total rises as the grain exchange expect next year to 160,000,000 bushels and possibly to 200,000,000 bushels within a few years. Evidently additional traffic routes are necessary as well as outlets by water and rail to the seaboard. Some 66 per cent of our grain is finding its way to American ports and going to swell American revenues. The French River waterway can successfully compete against this route as it is almost 400 miles shorter to seaboard and Montreal has equally good ocean rates with New York or any American ports.

The problem of unemployment is fast reaching a crisis and the resumption of this work is at once possible, since surveys have been made, plans, profiles, and specifications prepared and estimates recently revised, thereby affording immediate employment for a large number of men. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a lot to be said in connection with the French River waterway, but without going into the matter in further detail, I would ask to be allowed to quote this extract from an editorial published not long ago by the Toronto Globe in its issue of March 17:

> The extension of the pulp and paper industry proceeds steadily. The paper and pulp exports of the Dominion may soon surpass those of all other manufactured goods.
>
> All this requires power in enormous quantities. During the past decade $32,000,000 have been expended north of North Bay for the development of water powers. The total Hydro energy already in use is estimated at 126,000 horsepower, and projects are under way—chiefly for the equipment of paper mills—which will add 146,000 horsepower to this total.
>
> There is urgent need for more, yet all this time the French River—owned by the Dominion Government, with three fine power sites capable of developing over 35,000 horsepower and the inexhaustible dam of Lake Nipissing to insure a continuous flow—remains undeveloped. The people of North Bay assert that a market can be found for this power at prices which would yield over $800,000 yearly, a sum greater than the interest on the building of a modern canal with locks connecting the Georgian Bay with Lake Nipissing.
>
> Most of Canada's canals have been built at the expense of the taxpayer, without any income offset to lessen the drain on the public treasury. Here is one which can be so constructed that the water power by-product will, in the opinion of competent judges, pay the whole shot.

We, therefore, in view of the large and great gain that will accrue, not only to this section of Ontario, but to the whole Dominion, urge that the French River waterways

be, at the earliest possible time resumed and carried to completion.

Hon. FRANK B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harrison) this afternoon presenting the claims of his portion of Canada. Some two months ago I had the pleasure of listening to a delegation of over 200 members from North Bay and vicinity who presented the claims of that portion of Canada on the Government for the construction of the French River section of the Georgian Bay canal. I do not think it was put forward as a part of the Georgian Bay canal; it practically is a claim by itself. However, I think we might as well make up our minds that if we start upon the construction of the French river end of it we are adopting the policy of constructing the Georgian Bay canal and that this will only be the first link in the chain.

I have listened to the argument put forward by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harrison) this afternoon, as I listened to the argument presented by the delegation that appeared before a committee of the council two months ago. They certainly made out a very strong case from the local standpoint. The case that was presented by them was put forward purely from the local standpoint. About the same arguments were presented then as have been presented to-day. the first being the amount of power that could be developed, the second the great saving which there would be on the importation of coal required by the industries of that portion of Canada and the third, the bearing it would have on the general transportation interests of the country.

I am not in a position to entirely harmonize the figures with the claims put forward by the advocates of the scheme. I have before me a statement furnished to-day by Mr. St. Laurent, the Assistant Deputy Minister, who is perhaps one of the most competent engineers in Canada. From the data which we have available, it would appear that there would not be more than 25,000 electrical horse-power developed and that would require some storage work in order to carry out the scheme. Taking the ordinary flow of the river, it gets down as low as 3,500 cubic feet per second, the average being 5,000 cubic feet per second. The total fall of the French river from lake Nipissing to the Georgian bay is only 64 feet divided into three different falls. It would require three different developments and theoretically you would only get about 20,000 or 22,000 electrical horse-power as the river is to-day. But, with certain storage dams built, it might be brought up to 25,000 horse-power. If you take that at $12 per horse-power at the works you will only have $300,000 revenue. You may say that is too little. I presume it is. Possibly it would not be considered good business to sell power in that north country, developed at tremendous expense, as cheaply as you would sell it at Niagara Falls, but if you put it as $20 a horse-power, which would be maximum figure, you would have only half a million dollars of revenue, assuming that every available horse-power were sold.

When the scheme was under discussion some nine or ten years ago, and when the estimates were made, between fourteen and fifteen million dollars was figured as the cost of the development. To-day that development could not be made for twenty million dollars, and I imagine the cost would probably go above that. But if you put the cost at $20,000,000, at six per cent you would have interest charges amounting to $1,200,000 a year, and if you sold every ounce of horse power developed you would have only $500,000 of revenue and a deficit of $700,000 a year. So that the power scheme does not appeal to me as a good business proposition.

I realize there would be some saving on coal and on transportation charges generally, but we do not want to forget the fact that three railways go through North Bay and the territory that would be served and it is hoped benefited by this water transportation. One of these railways now belongs to the Government of Canada. It is not now a money maker, and I do not see very much prospect of the Government making any money out of it for a good many years to come. I am afraid another railway will also be the property of the Government before very long, and these railways will simply add to our deficits. If we shall have to pay millions of dollars of deficits on the operation of Government railways, I am at a loss to know wherein lies the good business in adding another deficit of $700,000 for the purpose of building this canal. This, Mr. Speaker, is the other side of the case, and in speaking as I do I am only trying to point out to the House, and to my hon. friend, the real situation from the financial standpoint.

I realize that water-borne transportation is a wonderful asset to any country, and that this Government, or any other Government, ought to do all it can in order to provide water-borne transportation if the cost is not prohibitive. I realize that, and I also realize that if the Georgian Bay

canal could be put through to Montreal, and made deep enough to accommodate ocean going vessels, or even large lake boats, it would certainly reduce the cost of transporting wheat to the seaboard. This is a problem which has been discussed a great many times in this House, and I presume will be discussed again before it is decided upon.

After the matter was presented to me by the deputation that waited on me two months ago I gave it the best consideration I could, and Council also considered it. We discussed the question as a whole, and we did not see our way clear to start out on an expenditure of $20,000,000 at the present time when we remembered that there would be a certain annual loss of some hundreds of thousands of dollars in interest charges, and that it would be a long time before the revenues would ever overtake the expenditures. Probably my hon. friends may say that we never expect the expenditures and receipts to balance. My own opinion is it would be a very long period before that time would be reached. As against that, I know that this project would be a great benefit to the country to be served. I give my hon. friend (Mr. Harrison) credit for the very fair manner in which he has presented the case. I realize that it is a very important matter to the people of Northern Ontario, but, as I said before, the Government did not consider that it was justified under the present financial condition in launching into an expenditure of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 without a little more thorough investigation into the financial end of the enterprise. Hon. gentlemen must remember that the figures which I have given only provide for the water-power development at the falls, and there would be three of these instead of one. If you could incorporate all three into one development it would not be so bad, but any man who is conversant with electrical matters knows that even when you have got your power development at the point of production you are not any way near the end of your expenditure—in fact, the cost of transmission and distribution adds very materially to the actual expense of the enterprise. While I have no figures as to what will ultimately be the expenditure involved in distributing this power through Northern Ontario, yet I am sure it would add many millions to the figures of the cost of development which I have already given.

For these reasons I do not feel like asking Parliament to start out on an expenditure of this kind this year. It may be that at some time in the future we will be in a better condition financially than we are at present. I do not want to hark back to a statement I have already made in this House, but I must say that I do view the financial situation of this country with a very great deal of alarm, and I am not going to take the responsibility of rushing into an expenditure of millions of dollars without knowing where the money is coming from. I do not care whether you talk about the development of the Georgian Bay Canal, the French River scheme, or the St. Lawrence River route, even though all of these will be of great value to the people of Canada and of tremendous value to the transportation interests of this country. I do not care what the scheme is, I want to know what the financial results are going to be, and I want to know where the money is coming from before I feel like advocating it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the minister entertain the same opinion about the construction of the Welland canal?

Mr. CARVELL: While I am not responsible for the initiation of the work on the Welland canal, I will give my hon. friend my own personal view if he so desires.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: I have a great deal more faith in the construction of the Welland canal, and the St. Lawrence route generally, than I have in the Georgian Bay canal. That statement may not be pleasing to my hon. friends in the House, but it is my own personal view. I am a great believer in water transportation. I would like to see deep water transportation from the St. Lawrence river to the Great Lakes, and entertaining that view, of course I regard the Welland canal as the first link in this great project. With the Welland canal deepened you may have cheap water transportation down to within a very short distance of Montreal, and, to a great extent, I believe, lessen the cost of hauling grain from the West to the sea ports; on the return journey taking back coal, iron, steel, and other heavy products which must go from the East to the West. However, that is aside from the question under discussion at the present time. I have listened to a great many arguments in my lifetime over the merits of these two routes, and I must say my view always was that nature put the St. Lawrence river and the Great Lakes where they are and it would be better to improve upon what nature has done than try to seek new channels. However, I am only giving my own personal

view, and I am doing so without very close investigation of the facts of the case; I am not even saying that I would not change my mind if sufficiently cogent reasons were given. It may be that I am all wrong in my belief, but that is my own personal view at the present time; and entertaining that view I look upon the deepening of the Welland canal as the first link in the system connecting the Great Lakes with the seaboard.

As I understand the present proposal, it is not to build the Georgian Bay canal, it is only to construct a section of what would ultimately be the canal from the Georgian bay to lake Nipissing. As I said before the probable cost would be twenty or twenty-five million dollars for an electrical development of about twenty thousand horsepower.

Mr. PROULX: What is the distance from the Georgian bay to lake Nipissing?

Mr. CARVELL: The distance between North Bay and the Georgian bay is eighty-one miles. North Bay is on the eastern side of the lake, and I do not know exactly, but it would be probably fifty or sixty miles from the Georgian bay to lake Nipissing.

I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Harrison) will not feel that as a Government we are turning down the scheme at all. I am only saying that as far as I am concerned I do not feel like going to such an expenditure of money this year without knowing a little bit more about what the ultimate financial condition of Canada is going to be. I know that if we attempt to build this work we have got to borrow money. We are obliged to borrow three or four hundred million dollars this year, for finishing the war, that we cannot get away from; and I have very grave doubts whether we would be justified in starting out to borrow twenty or twenty-five million dollars additional for a local work such as this is. At the same time it is part of a great scheme which it may be, that in another year Government or Parliament may decide to be a proper thing to undertake. If so I will only be too happy to be governed by what the majority of Parliament may think about it.

But it does seem to me that we have got to put the brakes on somewhere, and I would like to see them put on a little harder in a good many spots than they are being put on at the present time in connection with the expenditure of borrowed money.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. PROULX: Without wishing to interrupt the hon. minister I want to ask one question. What has become of the commission that was appointed to study the question of the Georgian Bay canal which Mr. Sanford Evans reported on?

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Sanford Evans was appointed and got his salary for four or five years. He made a report, which has been printed and distributed, I presume, and he ceased to be in the employ of the Government something over a year ago.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are the other officials of that commission still in office or have they completed their work?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think there are any other officials of that commission still in office. If there are any the fact has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. DEVLIN: The secretary drew two or three thousand dollars up to last year. I do not know whether he is still drawing a salary.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not aware of it. It may be possible; I will investigate. If there are any officials on that commission who are not earning their salaries I will try and find other work for them to do, or see that they do not draw any more money. I am informed the commission was closed up two years ago, and I think there is no reason to question that there are no persons now drawing pay from the Government in respect of that commission.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, while I am not so bold as to think that anything I can say will alter the intention of the Government as expressed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, at the same time it should be pointed out that this important project has been before the people of this North country and the Boards of Trade of Ontario for a great many years. I am told that they retained some very competent engineers and electricians to report on the project, and that their figures differ from those upon which the hon. minister relies, and which he is no doubt entitled to rely upon being those of his officials. But as long as this difference exists in those figures I am tempted to tell the people up there that they must not despair of this project being undertaken eventually, especially in view of the statement made by the hon. minister that he is not turning it down, but simply presents the formidable financial difficulties that are now in the way. What the engineers say is that not twenty-two or twenty-five thousand, but

thirty-five thousand horse-power can be developed, and that the cost will not be by any means so great as the minister seems to think.

Mr. MURPHY: How much would it be?

Mr. MOWAT: I do not know, because prices have changed very much in the last few months. I am impressed with the fact that those earnest men up there do not seem to have glossed over any of the difficulties, but appear to have presented the facts in a very candid manner. It is not a local project altogether, because in Toronto there is a great deal of interest taken in it, and also in the other cities and towns of Ontario. I know wholesale merchants in Toronto who have built up a very profitable business with the people of New Ontario in the district which will be served by this canal. For years they have made a great deal of money, a great many goods have been purchased from the wholesale merchants of Toronto, and it is natural that the Board of Trade of Toronto should look with approval and sympathy upon this great scheme, but the only comfort we can get to-day apparently is that it is a matter for future consideration.

I have a resolution passed only a few days ago by the Associated Boards of Ontario, representing 53 towns and cities, including Toronto, and they reaffirm the opinion which they gave in 1912 that this is very important to the province. They say:

> That the Ontario Associated Boards of Trade reaffirm the resolution passed unanimously by them at the meeting held in Toronto on the 23rd day of February, 1912, with reference to the improvement of the French River connecting Lake Nipissing with the Great Lakes, and in view of the fact that development in Northern Ontario is being held back because of a scarcity of Hydro Electric power, we request the Dominion Government to proceed at once with the work and to place such a sum in the estimates for 1919 as will permit of completion under their plans of one of the units on that river.

It is very unlikely that those fifty-three Boards of Trade would have come to a unanimous decision if there was any feeling that they were not justified in passing this resolution. So far as Toronto goes, of course I suppose the power scheme is more important, but whatever helps the country generally I have always understood the merchants of Toronto will be willing to endorse, whether or not trade should happen to come to them. Of course, it may be said that if this canal is completed, and big grain ships from Port Arthur and Fort William come through to North Bay, that transhipment will take place there and go by Montreal and other places, and that that will not be to the benefit of Toronto; but that is not a matter that bothers the people of Toronto so long as the general trade of the country is being built up, because whatever benefits the country at large will benefit the large centres. Therefore, I am glad to make these few remarks in support of a project in which I have complete confidence, although I have said less than I intended to say in view of the statement made by the hon. minister.

Mr. FRANCIS H. KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): The hon. Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, invited discussion on the motion and said that he had not definitely closed his ears to the other side of the problem, and as coming from that district and being somewhat familiar with it, may I be allowed to intervene in the debate. It is a problem. He has referred to it as being a Georgian Bay project. I am not going to deal with that phase of it at all. In the first place this and the St. Lawrence river are two power propositions looked at as a whole that should be controlled entirely by the Government because of the aftermath therefrom. They are in the long run both canal routes, but will have to be looked at from a different viewpoint. The St. Lawrence river is primarily a navigation question, and secondarily there is the power that will flow from that development. We must never think of the St. Lawrence river in any other way than as the main artery to the sea from the interior of Canada, and we must develop it first from the standpoint of navigation, and second for the by-product —viz, any power we can get. The Georgian Bay canal problem, however, is quite different in my view. It will be practically a sub-aqueous canal, the beds of large rivers here and there will have to be dredged out, and so forth. It should go on as the power possibilities require it and, then after all the power development along the valley of the Ottawa river is secured, it will naturally turn itself into a canal route.

Now, the hon. member for Nipissing is asking that the French river, a part of the Georgian Bay route should be primarily a power problem for the opening up of that country, and in that view I think he is proceeding along the right lines. When this proposed scheme is completed ships will no longer stop at Georgian Bay, and therefore the question should be looked at not only in

a local manner but in a national manner. We have to-day the Canadian Northern railway and we have to make it pay. The Canadian Northern railway has no outlet on Georgian Bay. If it wants to haul the grain of the West in the summer time it can only do it from Key Harbour down to Toronto, and then east, which is out of the question. It will have to build a line paralleling this canal route just as the Canadian Pacific Railway did.

The member for Nipissing (Mr. Harrison) and his constituents are to be congratulated on the excellent manner in which they have dealt with this question in a booklet issued, which contains many interesting facts. Lord Shaughnessy's letter, written in 1913, quoted in this booklet, shows what will happen if we do not build this canal. At page 39, Lord Shaughnessy is quoted as follows:

> The subject mentioned in yours of yesterday is not a new one to me by any means, as I pressed the project on the Government as forcibly as I could, upwards of ten years ago.
>
> If the French River route had been opened to North Bay, as it should have been, we would not have built our line from Pt. McNichol east, because it would have been better to have double-tracked the line between North Bay and Montreal.

If this branch line has to be built across to the Georgian Bay ports, it will cost some money, and without the French River canal, that is the only way the Canadian Northern railway can haul the wheat that comes down by the lakes in the summer time. Port McNichol is a Canadian Pacific Railway port; Midland and other Georgian Bay ports, the Canadian Northern railway from the West to Montreal, does not touch. But if we build this canal, as we can do at less cost than would be involved in the construction of a branch line of railway, we can at once bring this wheat down within three hundred and some odd miles of Montreal. In fact, it would be the shortest rail haul into Montreal, as is very interestingly set forth in this booklet. If we get the wheat into Lake Nipissing, we are within three hundred and thirty-one miles by rail of Montreal, and this is a shorter haul than by any other railway. The Canadian National railways can therefore haul that wheat at a better profit and a less cost per ton per mile than the other competing railways, though charging the same rate. Aside, therefore, from the local phase of the question, considering it only from the standpoint of a Government proposition, the suggestion that the member for Nipissing has put forth deserves very serious consideration.

In addition, there would be a saving to the Canadian National railway on coal. The Canadian National railways use a large quantity of coal, and if that coal is brought in by water to Lake Nipissing and there fed to the Canadian Northern railway at North Bay, it could be got in from Lake Erie ports at fifty cents a ton,—forty cents to Georgian Bay ports,—whereas the cost of the rail haul is something like two or three dollars a ton. A considerable saving could be effected, therefore, by the Government of Canada in the matter of coal if this proposal be carried into effect.

I think that Canada ought to awaken to the immediate necessity of developing her white coal. Last year and the year before we found ourselves in a rather serious predicament owing to our absolute dependence —at least, so far as Ontario is concerned— upon our cousins to the south in the matter of coal supply. But their supply of coal is limited to the supply that is in sight, and soon they will begin to conserve their coal, and in order to do that they will have to stop exportation. The production of white coal would be the result of this
3 p.m. canal development. One horse-power is equal to ten tons of coal on an efficient engine, and by using white coal we save that quantity of ordinary coal for every horse-power; we avoid sending that much money out of the country and we help to prevent the rate of exchange from being against Canada. Last year and the year before we imported fifteen million tons of soft coal and three million tons of anthracite, in addition to some slack. The more we can reduce the amount of coal imported the better, and the 25 or 35 thousand estimated horse-power involved in the canal scheme would save 250 or 350 thousand tons of coal consumption.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is an authority on water-power development; would he, if he were putting up his own money, develop a water-power at $800 per horse-power?

Mr. KEEFER: Water-power is often developed at $100 per horse-power. The development of water-power at $800, of course, is an impossible proposition.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what this proposition is.

Mr. KEEFER: I cannot say as to the figures. I am talking of this not as a water-power proposition, but as a national canal system into Lake Nipissing, even if it never went on to Montreal.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does this $800 horse-power include the cost to Montreal?

Mr. CARVELL: No, that is the cost of the development of the French River.

Mr. KEEFER: I have not studied the question, but I would be surprised to find the cost of development on a drop of seventy feet—

Mr. CARVELL: Sixty-four feet. I can give you the figures.

Mr. KEEFER: That includes the canal system also?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: Certainly.

Mr. KEEFER: Then we must consider what will be the benefits of a canal system. Look at the immense national resources of that country: the timber, the pulpwood, the minerals, the Sudbury mines, pronounced by Professor Coleman as inexhaustible so far as present actual demands upon it are concerned.

The output of gold and silver or precious metals is represented by over two hundred million dollars of which ninety millions have been paid out in dividends. Of the vulgar metals the supply of nickel is inexhaustible and there are large quantities of iron ore.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend explain why the nickel refinery has been transferred from that district to Hull?

Mr. KEEFER: I do not know why it was transferred. As I understand it there are two nickel refineries, one built and operated at Port Colborne by an American company —I do not know the name of it—and the other operated by the British American Nickel Company.

Mr. DEVLIN: The nickel plant in Hull is of new construction. There was no transfer.

Mr. KEEFER: I am not familiar with what is being done here. I did hear of the projected construction down here and I did my utmost on behalf of my town to get the company to locate there, but we could not induce them to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have they not come to Hull because they found cheap power there?

Mr. KEEFER: I imagine that the question of cheap power would be an important factor in the matter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And labour.

Mr. KEEFER: The labour question would also be a consideration. The point I want to make is that irrespective of the question of water-power, and as a navigation scheme only into lake Nipissing, the matter is worthy of most serious consideration.

The transportation of other natural products out of that district by water would cheapen the rates of carriage. Lumber would be cheapened, paper would be cheapened. The newspapers are always asking for cheaper paper; the best way to get it is to reduce the freight. The freight rate by rail out of that district is two or three times what it would be by water. This applies also to agricultural products. There is a large and very valuable clay belt in that district to be opened up where splendid crops could be grown. To my mind, all these points are worthy of consideration. To-day the settlers in that country cannot send their pulpwood out because of the high freight rates; they cannot ship their wood to the Niagara Peninsula, right beside the Welland canal—to St. Catharines, Thorold or Niagara—because of the prohibitive freight rates. They cannot even ship to the American ports. I do not want to see our wood going out of the country, but the opening up of water transportation would enable these settlers to engage in competition with other Canadian pulp and paper mills and put them in a position where they would not be at the mercy of the mills situated only in their own local district, as they now are. They now have to sell to the local mills in that country, whereas they should be enabled to get out into the open market.

I look forward to the day when our national railways will stop using coal bought from the United States, thereby increasing the difficulties of exchange, and will commence to use our own white coal.

There is no country in the world so richly endowed with water-power as is Canada and those water-powers seem to be scattered all along the national railways, because the railways follow the river valleys. The day is practically at hand when these railways should be operated by electricity, thus saving the importation of coal. This power phase is, therefore, also a national question apart altogether from the local phase thereof. I have brought these points up for the consideration of the House simply for the purpose of helping out my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Harrison), and also my other friends in that North country. We in the North country are fighting against the difficulties of nature, and I feel that in this matter we should receive the most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright): I desire to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harrison) for having brought this question before the House. What I have to say to-day upon the question of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal I have said upon other occasions, and I would not wish to amplify the remarks I then made because I might weary the House. I listened with great pleasure to the speech of the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer), who placed before the House succinctly and in a manner that was extremely clear, the main advantages of the Georgian Bay canal scheme, not as a local scheme, but as a general scheme for transportation and for the general advantage of Canada. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) seems to look upon this matter principally as one in which we have to consider simply electrical purposes, although he did incidentally mention the matter of transportation and the exportation of lumber. It has been the habit of the House in years gone by to consider the electrical part of the question as an incidental and the transportation as the main feature of the proposition.

One point which I would like to bring to the attention of the House, and which I do not think the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora mentioned, is that the Georgian Bay canal is already built; it is only a matter of putting in a few locks here and there.

Mr. CARVELL: What would it cost to put them in?

Mr. DEVLIN: Costs are running so high nowadays that it is practically impossible to make an estimate, but it certainly will not cost any more money to this country than is being spent on the Welland canal scheme and the other proposition of bringing all the western traffic through the Welland canal via the St. Lawrence to Montreal, and in my opinion it will cost a great deal less. The Minister of Public Works said that three railways go through North Bay. One railway belongs to the Government and one is on the point of belonging to the Government. These are the arguments that we heard in this House some twelve or thirteen years ago and that have been brought forward ever since. The railways have been against this project, and the members whose constituencies were not immediately concerned were perhaps indifferent or violently opposed to it. I am glad to see now that we have one hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Mowat) in favour of this project, and I must attribute to the hon. member for Nipissing the achievement of having made from amongst the members for Toronto, a convert to the Georgian Bay canal scheme.

The hon. minister spoke of the electrical power, but I have no doubt that he understands that electrical power is simply an incidental; that nobody would advocate the building of this canal at the present time solely for the purpose of developing electrical power. The idea we have always had in mind is that you get from water-power cheaper transportation. You have no competing lines from the great lakes to the ocean; you save transhipment and elevator charges, and you lessen the charges all along of haulage. On the other hand your ships do not go back empty; they go back loaded with coal from the lower provinces. The Maritime Provinces would, therefore, benefit by the scheme, and if the ships go back loaded with coal, the western country that needs coal would get it at a cheaper rate than by bringing it in from the United States, and a much cheaper rate than by bringing it in by rail. I have not the figures for the last year or two, but up to last year or the year before I know that practically no soft coal was hauled west of Montreal by the railways. By water transportation Ontario would be supplied right along with soft coal, and it would be a great advantage to Ontario, not only to the constituencies that would help to feed the road, but to other constituencies, to receive coal at cheaper rates.

I am glad to see that the Georgian Bay canal scheme is still alive; that it has not been turned down by the Government. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Public Works wants to receive value for every dollar spent by the Government, and in many ways savings could be made which could be put into a scheme that would be for the general advantage of Canada. If it were stated to those who advocate the Georgian Bay canal scheme that millions more are not going to be spent on the Welland canal scheme, we might say: Well, we can wait. But the more millions you put into the Welland canal scheme, the more millions you put into the coffin of the Georgian Bay Canal scheme, and then the argument will be adduced in the future: What do we need the Georgian Bay canal for? We have spent so much money on the Welland canal scheme that it would be useless now to have two great water transportation schemes in Canada.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parrry Sound): I think the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harrison) is in the unfortunate position of being damned by some of his friends and misunderstood by others. The proposition which the hon. member brings before the House to-day is not the Georgian Bay canal scheme, nor is it a power scheme pure and simple. It is quite true that when the delegation came down here some months ago, they brought forward the argument that the power which would be developed in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal could be sold immediately at a price of, I think, $26 per horse-power, and that they could get contracts for it as soon as the power was ready to be delivered. These arguments were put before the Minister of Public Works and apparently he has let slip, at least partially from his mind, the fact that this waterway was not being constructed simply for the purpose of developing electrical power, but that this power would be created incidentally.

As a matter of fact, the name "French river" is a misnomer, because there is really no river there, but a succession of very long, wide and deep lakes. Occasionally, the channel is blocked by groups of islands, which cause what is known as a fall or rapids, but at only one place are there any real rapids, and that is at the end of Lake Nipissing. This scheme is being brought forward not as part of the Georgian Bay canal system at all. As a matter of fact, its construction has been delayed by the very fact of its association with the Georgian Bay canal. The first complete survey of the French river was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway many years ago, and their estimate of the cost of the water-way, if my memory serves me right, was from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000. Of course, at that time they intended to construct only a fifteen instead of a twenty-two-foot channel; so the cost would be considerable higher now. But if this work is considered as part of the Georgian Bay canal, it is a part as to the desirability and feasibility of which there can be no question. There is no question whatever as to the sufficiency for navigation purposes of the water going down the French river, nor is there any question as to the desirability of building up that portion of Ontario, which at the present time is the most important to us.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has stated that grave liabilities face us at the present time. That is only a reason why we should open up a section of the country like the one under discussion, because it will furnish the means by which we can pay the interest on our debt. We must produce wealth and enlarge our foreign trade through some one or more of these four means—the mine, the farm, the forest, the fisheries. This important work would benefit the country in every one of these ways. For instance, there are pulp mills up there using annually from 60,000 to 80,000 tons of coal. The estimated saving upon that coal is between $2 and $2.25 per ton—I will not detain the House by quoting the exact figures. There is thus an unnecessary overhead charge upon the operations of that mill of $100,000. It would be much better for the country if that overhead charge was wiped out by allowing the mill to get its coal at a reasonable price. Not only that, but the amount of available pulp in that country is absolutely unlimited. We have four pulp mills there now, when we should have forty. The raw material is there, the power is there, and we have the world's market. And it is only by encouraging industries of this kind that we shall be able to meet our interest charges.

Take the case of the mines, for instance. A poor prospector with experience in that part of the country, discovers a mine; at least it is a mine to him, although just a prospect in the meantime. He is most anxious to develop it, but is up against the proposition of paying a very high price for coal. He not only has to pay for the rail haul from Cobalt or North Bay, as the case may be, but he has also to draw the coal many miles on sleighs or wagons back to his mine. He cannot finance that proposition. Now if we can help that man to develop his mine—and we have not seen one-quarter of the mines that will ultimately be developed in Northern Ontario—we should do it in our own interest.

As to railways, the minister has stated that we own one system touching North Bay at the present time. As a matter of fact, there are two which we own at present effected by the coal rates, the Canadian Northern railway and the National Transcontinental. Whatever effect the construction of this work might have on the Canadian Pacific railway, it could have only a beneficial effect on the Canadian National Railway system. The Government system of railways, as the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) has said, has no lake port, but by the opening up of this water-way at a reasonably small expense, the system would have a first-class port, or more than

one, on Lake Nipissing. We already own the foreshore, and have made all preparations, and construction should be started. The Canadian National Railway system would then have a haul of 331 miles to Montreal, practically all down-grade. The Government railway can under present circumstances draw a larger load from North Bay to Montreal than any other railway. In addition to that, the Canadian National railways have to get coal from some place, and at present they are getting it from Fort Erie or Buffalo by an all-rail haul; at least the great bulk of it comes that way. Would it not be a good business proposition for these roads to have their coal at a cost of $2.25 to $2.50 less per ton. I am quite satisfied this waterway would benefit the railways as much as anybody else.

The hon. member for Port Arthur touched very lightly upon the matter of iron ore. We have in that North country millions of tons of iron ore. These deposits have been diamond drilled for many hundreds of feet, but at the present time it is almost impossible to put the ore on the market on account of the transportation cost. If by a system of waterways we could get that ore to the smelters along the Great Lakes we would develop in Canada an industry which at the present time deserves encouragement probably more than any other industry in this country.

I shall not take up the time of the House further. I just put this proposition: We should not make any useless expenditure, of course, but I think any manufacturer who could see a way of cutting down his overhead charges and of greatly increasing the production of cheaper goods, would be very foolish if he did not make the initial expenditure necessary for that purpose.

Motion declared negatived.

BANK MERGERS IN CANADA.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

For a return giving a detailed statement of the number of bank mergers in Canada since October 1, 1911, up to date, together with a copy of all petitions and correspondence opposing same. Also, the names of banks affected thereby.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I gave notice of this motion at the opening of the session I was under the excitement created by the merger of the Bank of Ottawa with the Bank of Nova Scotia. As you will remember, the announcement of this merger caused considerable emotion in and around Ottawa.

The Bank of Ottawa was a well known institution, on a sound basis, and doing an excellent business.

The very name of the bank carried considerable weight with it. The men associated with the bank also carried great weight. The people protested vehemently against that merger here in the city of Ottawa. I remember more especially a remark of one of the leading merchants on Sparks street on the morrow of the announcement that the merger would take place. On being interviewed by one of the reporters of the Daily Citizen, this merchant said: "You have no idea of the feeling I had this morning when I read that the old Bank of Ottawa would pass away. It is as if I had lost an old friend." Of course, that is only sentimental, and banks and ministers of finance do not concern themselves too much with sentiment alone.

But, there is another side to this question. There has been throughout the country, especially in the West, and pretty generally in the rural sections of Canada, a strong opposition to the mergers which have taken place of late. During the fifteen years when the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was Prime Minister, I do not remember that more than one or two bank mergers took place. I know that there was at that time a strong public opinion against such mergers. But of late my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) seems to have been over-generous, over-chivalrous, with the big financial institutions.

I am not well enough versed in the financial and banking affairs of the country to offer any severe criticism. I am simply re-echoing on the floor of the House the protests which have been made throughout the country against that policy. My only reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the House is to learn from my hon. friend if the policy of the Government is to favour more bank mergers. We are now reduced to a small number of banks, nineteen in all. In this country, with a sparse population scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is it the policy of the Government to further reduce the number of our banking institutions? On the contrary should not the Government favour a large number of banking institutions which would distribute to the farmers and workingmen the credit required for the business of the country?

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance will understand that I do not unduly criticise him. I am simply repeating what I read in the press and what I heard as re-

gards this policy. I do not wish to say anything against our banking institutions but there is a fear that the banking business of Canada, will, in a short time, be concentrated in the hands of a few magnates. It is believed that this is not a very democratic way of treating the people. The argument is advanced that the banks vested with a privilege are institutions for lending the money accumulated in their vaults by the thrift and economy of the people at large and that they should be more available to the public. The purpose of my motion is to get from the Minister of Finance a statement as to his policy for the future. I know that good reasons have been adduced in favour of this last merger. I myself discussed the question with the president of the Bank of Ottawa, the Hon. Mr. Bryson, and he told me that, in order to compete out west with the other banks, his bank would have to increase its capital stock to a very large figure and to establish branches all over the country, a thing which would entail a vast expenditure of money and that it would be better for the shareholders and clients of the bank that the Bank of Nova Scotia should take up the business of the Bank of Ottawa. There may be something in that argument but I would like to know from the Minister of Finance, who looks after the banking institutions of this country and who must also have regard to the public needs, what the policy of the Government is. That is the only object I had in view when I brought up this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had understood that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) was not to proceed with his motion this afternoon. If I had known that it was his intention to do so I should have done him the courtesy of having some information which I had compiled and which might be interesting to him. However, the matter is one which I have no objection to discussing because the discussion proceeds along general lines.

Under the Bank Act Parliament has expressly authorized the amalgamation of banks subject to certain safeguards which were deemed advisable in the public interest. The first safeguard is that no agreement shall be entered into between the boards of directors of two banks desiring to amalgamate without the consent in writing of the Minister of Finance. That provision was inserted in the last revision of the Bank Act which took place, I think, in 1913. There is the further safeguard that before an amalgamation of banks is completed the Governor in Council must consent. So that, so far as the legislation is concerned, the interests of the public would appear to be reasonably safeguarded.

I remember when the matter was before the Banking and Commerce Committee in 1913 it was then recognized, as it had been before, that it would be inadvisable to prohibit the banks from amalgamating. The principle of the amalgamation of banks in proper cases was recognized, but in order to ensure that the public interest would be fully considered, as I have stated, a provision was inserted that the consent of the Minister of Finance was necessary. I carried the matter a little further, in order to prevent any premature disclosure of agreements about to be entered into between boards of directors, by making a regulation, by which I notified all the banks that before proceeding to negotiate they should consult with the Minister of Finance. I did that because it is very inadvisable that there should be public discussion about proposed agreements. Once such publicity is given there is danger of a misunderstanding of the situation respecting the banks, and altogether it is very desirable that the statute should be strictly observed, that the consent of the Minister of Finance should be given, and that it should not be announced to the public that two banks are about to amalgamate, because the minister might decide not to give his consent.

I may say that on account of what I might call the general misunderstanding in the country with regard to the matter of bank amalgamations, the duty which is imposed upon the Minister of Finance under the Bank Act is by no means a pleasant one. It is brought to his attention that the boards of two banks desire to amalgamate, with the reasons why, in the opinion of the directors, it is advisable that that should be done. The minister then has to take the responsibility of either consenting to the amalgamation or declining to consent. If he consents to the amalgamation—the situation not being generally understood through the country, the facts before the minister not being disclosed to the public, the public not being aware of the expediency of the amalgamation and not knowing that it is, as I believe it has been in all cases, in the public interest—there is a great deal of criticism which I submit to the House is unwarranted. On the other hand, if the minister declines to give his consent in a proper case he is clearly shirking the duty imposed upon him by Parliament.

There is no general rule, I think, that one can lay down with regard to the class of bank amalgamations which should be allowed, and those which should be denied. I think that it is a matter for careful consideration, on the part of the minister and the Government, of all the facts presented. There are four parties who are interested in cases of bank amalgamation. In the first place there are the depositors of the banks in question; in the second place there are the shareholders of the banks; in the third place the customers of the banks, and in the fourth place the general public. My hon. friend has referred to a recent case of bank amalgamation. It is true that there was a good deal of sentiment attaching to the Bank of Ottawa. Not only did the people of Ottawa have a certain sentimental feeling about a financial institution of the standing and strength of the Bank of Ottawa, but for myself I also disliked to see the Bank of Ottawa disappear as a separate entity. The feeling, however, was, I admit, entirely sentimental, and so far as I can gather now there is practically a consensus of opinion that what was done was wisely done, and that none of the interests that I have mentioned, viz: the depositors, the shareholders, the customers or the general public, have been in any way disadvantaged, but on the other hand the whole situation has been benefited. Now the Bank of Ottawa, as I have said, was a bank of high standing and good credit, a strong institution. Its difficulty was that it was receiving money from depositors to a very large amount from month to month, and it had not the facilities, by reason of not having extended its branches throughout the various parts of the country like others of the banks, to keep that money successfully employed. Therefore, as my hon. friend has stated, a question that arose was as to substantially increasing the capital, and also—and this he did not mention—going to a very heavy expense in the establishment of branches through which the rapidly increasing funds of the bank could be loaned. During the last few years the discounts of the Bank of Ottawa declined, while its deposits had increased. Its investments, therefore—because it had to invest its surplus money in securities of various kinds—increased. Now, while every bank should have a substantial amount of its funds invested in high class securities, the primary purpose of a bank is to loan to the commercial and agricultural community. The Bank of Ottawa, therefore, was handicapped in that important respect. The Bank of Nova Scotia, as is well known to this House, is one of the most carefully managed and most powerful institutions in Canada. I had before me the information at the time the amalgamation was under consideration, and speaking from memory, I recall that at only seven points, and those in the larger places where there was ample banking accommodation and consequently keen competition among the banks represented there, was there any over-lapping of branches. In other words, if ever there was a natural amalgamation for the purpose of serving the public throughout the Dominion of Canada, it was the amalgamation of the Bank of Ottawa with the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Bank of Ottawa has its branches largely in the Ottawa valley. It gathers up large sums there in deposits, and, as I have stated, it is desirable that those funds mobilized in that way should be made available to be loaned in other parts of the country where there is a greater demand for money.

The amalgamation of the Bank of Ottawa and the Bank of Nova Scotia was, I submit, a benefit to all the four interests that I have mentioned. In the first place, no one can say that the depositors of either bank are in a less advantageous position than they were before; a powerful bank has been formed with the combined resources of the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Bank of Ottawa as security for their obligations. There is no question in my mind that the customers of the bank will be as well served, because it will be to the interest of the Bank of Nova Scotia to continue the business with the customers of the Bank of Ottawa through the offices which it takes over; that is a valuable business. The impression seems to prevail that it would be of some interest to a bank to withhold funds from commercial or other customers; on the contrary, no bank can possibly succeed unless by lending its money to those customers. Therefore it is an object to any bank not only to maintain, but to increase the number of customers, and a bank would be justified in paying a substantial sum for the business which it had taken over at any branch of another bank, if it could obtain it. So far as the shareholders are concerned they are capable of having proper regard for their own interest, and if the shareholders of the Bank of Nova Scotia and the shareholders of the Bank of Ottawa both agree that this is a proper course to pursue, he would be a bold man who would say that any objection could be raised on that score. There re-

mains the question of public interest. I have shown that there was practically no overlapping, that the two banks formed the natural complement, so to speak, the one to the other, and that there will now be made available through the branches of the Bank of Nova Scotia in the West, and other branches which they will establish, the fund which the Bank of Ottawa was unable to loan to mercantile and agricultural customers.

The one point in connection with the amalgamation which I think was regrettable is that which my hon. friend has called attention to—the sentiment attaching to the name: Bank of Ottawa. We will all agree, I think, that we do not like to see an old and worthy institution bearing the name of the capital city pass off the scene, but that is a matter of sentiment; from the business standpoint and that of public interest it is perfectly clear that the banking situation as a whole has been strengthened and that facilities have been afforded which did not exist before for serving the agricultural and commercial needs of the community.

Now, there is another aspect of the matter. Conditions of world trade have been greatly changed by the war. During the war Canada developed great manufacturing capacity and output; to-day she is faced with heavy obligations due to the war; and it is, I think, the duty of the Government and of the people to increase so far as is possible our export trade both in manufactured goods and agricultural products. In connection with the carrying on of export trade it is very necessary that banking facilities should be afforded. Those banking facilities can only be afforded by the establishment of branches in the principal world centres or in the countries with which that export trade is to be developed. Now, the smaller banks are not in a position to establish those branches. The larger banks can establish branches in London, Paris, New York and Chicago, and I think one or more have established branches now in Asia.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Vladivostok.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, Vladivostok. Now, an amalgamation which instead of two banks produces a bank very much stronger than either, makes it possible for that new bank to establish branches for export business which could not be so well established by either of those banks separately. I think that one of the reasons for the tendency to amalgamation of banks, which is manifest not only in this country but in a very much greater degree in Great Britain, has arisen from the necessity of providing for national purposes strong financial institutions, capable not only of serving domestic needs but also of promoting and facilitating export trade. Since 1913 I have had before me as Minister of Finance a number of applications for amalgamations of banks. In some cases I have thought it in the public interest and have not hesitated to give my consent; that, I submit, is my duty under the Bank Act; in other cases I felt it my duty, having regard to all circumstances, to withhold my consent. And that, I submit, is the policy that must be followed by myself or by my successor as Minister of Finance when a question relating to bank amalgamation is before me or before him. He must estimate the situation as it exists, taking into account the position of the banks, and the advantages to the directors and the shareholders and also of the public interest. It is peculiarly the province of the Minister of Finance to consider the public interest. If he reaches the conclusion that an amalgamation is not in the public interest—and cases like that arise—he should refuse his consent. If, on the other hand, it appears to him clear that not only is it not against the public interest, but in the public interest, I think he should not hesitate to give his consent.

Now, take the bank amalgamations of recent years. It is true that until 1911 there were not so many as there have been since, but the tendency which I have mentioned was not so much in evidence at that time. Nevertheless, there was a number of bank amalgamations—I have forgotten how many—sanctioned during that period, and I think properly sanctioned. I do not recall any bank amalgamations in the past to which serious objection can be taken. I do not recollect all that have occurred since 1911, but among those which have taken place within the last two or three years was the absorption of the Traders Bank, in Toronto, by the Royal Bank. Some objection was made at the time, but I think the consensus of opinion is that the banking situation was strengthened by that amalgamation and that the public interest is better served by the Royal Bank than was the case before, because the Royal Bank was a much stronger financial institution than the Traders Bank. So far as I am aware, they have carried on with entire satisfaction to customers and to the public generally the business which was formerly carried on by the Traders Bank.

Last year the Bank of Montreal took over the old established Bank of British North America. As long ago as 1912 that matter was brought to my attention by the directors of the Bank of British North America. The shareholders of that bank were English shareholders; the directors desired to amalgamate with the Bank of Montreal. At that time it did not appear to me to be opportune that the amalgamation should take place. After the war broke out and financial conditions were rather radically changed in Great Britain, the request was again made that we should permit the absorption of the Bank of British

4 p.m. North America by the Bank of Montreal. Having regard to the fact that the shareholders were English shareholders, that the board of directors were in London, that there was a practically unanimous opinion over there in favour of the amalgamation, that the Bank of Montreal was a very powerful financial institution, that it was clear that no detriment—indeed, that only advantage—would result to the public from the carrying out of the proposed change, the Government, after giving the matter full consideration, had no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that consent should not be withheld.

Similarly, the Northern Crown Bank, a Winnipeg bank, was taken over by the Royal Bank. I know that that strengthened the financial situation. The Northern Crown Bank was a good little bank, reasonably strong financially; but it had not the facilities for expansion, and its absorption by the Royal Bank was a good thing for the shareholders of the Northern Crown Bank and of the Royal Bank and for the public generally. I have heard no complaint that the clients of the Northern Crown Bank are not as well served by the Royal Bank as they were by the Northern Crown Bank.

I have spoken about the recent amalgamation of the Bank of Ottawa with the Bank of Nova Scotia. I submit again that what was done was clearly in the public interest. The Government would have been shirking its duty if it had refused its assent to that amalgamation, because in the judgment of the minister and of the Government it was a proper case for such action.

For the information of the House I may say that although the statute imposes upon the minister the duty of consenting or refusing consent to amalgamation, I always bring the matter before Council in order that it may have full consideration, because I realize that there is a good deal of public interest in these matters.

[Sir Thomas White.]

I chance to have in my pocket a little memorandum which I made the other day after reading an article in the Monetary Times regarding the tendency to bank amalgamations in Great Britain. A number of amalgamations of banks of the first magnitude have taken place in England within the last couple of years and the same objection was publicly voiced there as has been voiced in this country. The matter was carefully considered there by a committee. My recollection is that the committee found that there was absolutely no danger of what is called a money trust, because it is the object of these banks not to hold their money, but to lend it out; in other words, to extend their business. Only by lending money to the public can these banks make money. An amalgamated bank does not gather up all its resources and hold them unproductive; its object is to get them out, to get them earning. It is on the difference between what they pay for their money and what they receive from their discount business that they make the profits which go to their shareholders after the expenses of their business are paid.

The committee further recommended precisely the safeguard that we have in this country, namely, that there should be assent on the part of the Treasury. If any hon. gentleman is interested in seeing how far the principle has been carried in Great Britain he will be surprised to observe the enormous aggregations of capital that have been produced by the amalgamation of the largest British companies. Amalgamation, instead of being looked upon as a disadvantage, is regarded there as a national advantage, almost as a national necessity in providing for the expansion of export trade.

In this memorandum which I made from the article in question I read that there have been 300 amalgamations of British banks, more than half of them within the last fifty years. Since 1891 the number of British private banks in Great Britain has fallen from 38 to 7 and of joint stock banks from 104 to 34, so that the business of Great Britain, including the financing of her export trade, is carried on by some thirty or forty banks. The figures are very illuminating. When we find a tendency—more than a tendency, an evolution—like that, we may make up our minds that very cogent economic reasons lead to the amalgamation of these banks and the aggregation of those large masses of capital; that it is not a question of individual directors amalgamating banks for the purpose of creating a so-called money trust, but a natural process

of evolution in meeting the necessities of expanding domestic and export business.

My hon. friend has asked on what principle the Government proceeds and what will be its policy in future. I answer him that as long as the Bank Act remains as it is, unchanged by Parliament, it will be the duty of the Minister of Finance and of the Government to consider each application upon its merits, having regard to the interest not only of those who desire it, but of the public, and to reach such a conclusion as they fairly can as to whether the amalgamation should be permitted or not. That is the principle which has governed me in the discharge of the duties imposed upon me by Parliament under the Bank Act, and if there is any better policy which I could adopt, there is in this House no one more receptive to suggestion than I, because this is not a question in which any one has a personal interest, it is merely a matter of discharging a duty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the minister received any protests, especially from the grain growers in the West, and farmers' organizations, against the various mergers which have taken place.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: From time to time I think resolutions have been received with regard to the general principle of bank amalgamations, and it may be that in connection with some amalgamations that have taken place some letters have been received, but generally speaking I do not recall any serious protests against bank amalgamations except such as I have seen in the press. And in those cases what I have observed is this, that while there is usually fairly strong criticism as soon as a bank amalgamation is announced, as a general rule, when the facts are made known, when it appears that the interests of all the parties mentioned have been regarded and that the public interest appears to be served, there is no further criticism. I pointed out to the House that the duty the minister has is one which subjects him to criticism, but nevertheless it is his duty so long as the Bank Act remains as it is, and in discharging that duty he must come to a conclusion as best he can, having regard to the public interests and the other considerations I have mentioned. While I do not think there are any papers that are of service to my hon. friend, if he desires to press his motion for a return, I have no objection.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend has no objection, I would be glad to get the papers.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, the question concerning the amalgamation of the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Bank of Ottawa, is, I am quite satisfied, merely one of sentiment, as has been stated by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken. It is, of course, a sentiment we can all understand and respect. The question, however, is broader than that. We must admit that there is throughout the country a widespread feeling that there is a danger of the creation of what has been described as a money trust, and there is a further feeling that this amalgamation of banks tends to serve that end. I do not mention this for the purpose of endorsing it; I think it is magnified largely; but the very fact that there is such a state of alarm throughout the country, even if we do not all of us agree that it is justified, deserves the serious consideration of the House and particularly of the Minister of Finance. If we have been careful in the past with regard to granting these merging privileges, then the minister should feel that he needs to be more careful in the future in order that he may remove that opinion which exists. In the present state of unrest which exists throughout the country, I should feel disposed, in order to disarm it,—but for a single reason to which I shall allude—to suggest that that privilege which the Minister of Finance and the Government have now of permitting mergers be suspended, and that any bank desiring to merge with another shall have to come to Parliament for an Act. There is much to be said in favour of such a policy, and it would tend to remove the unrest which prevails. There is perhaps one difficulty in the matter. I do not know of a bank merger which has taken place, whether in the time of the Minister of Finance or in that of his predecessor, which has worked any harm. I do know of some cases in which unquestionably the merger did serve the public interest. In most cases to-day, however, the Dominion would get along very well if we had no more bank mergers. The man who agitates against what he calls a money trust and who denounces these bank mergers can make out a case which on the surface has some appearance of reason. Ten years ago we had thirty banks; to-day we have only nineteen; but although the banks have decreased in number, the resources in their hands have enormously increased, and, therefore, there is that concentration of money in the hands of comparatively few people which is

so much talked about, and which, in the minds of many people is a cause for alarm. When we had thirty banks, the authorized capital was $140,000,000; to-day, with nineteen banks, the authorized capital is $182,000,000. When we had thirty banks, the paid-up capital was $97,000,000; to-day with nineteen banks, the paid-up capital is $110,000,000. When we had thirty banks our deposits amounted to $835,000,000; to-day with nineteen banks our deposits are more than double that amount. These figures show clearly that there is a concentration of money in the hands of a comparatively few institutions. There is that feeling abroad which we should recognize, namely, that there is danger of our money affairs being concentrated in the hands of two or three groups of men in the big cities of Montreal and Toronto. The great danger I see, however, in repealing the clause which gives the Minister of Finance the power to make these mergers is that there will, although not very often, be a case where a merger may be urgently needed. A bank, owing to some misfortune, owing to some circumstances not necessarily implying even bad management, but arising from various causes which will enter into banking business, may find that it is not in a strong position and that its outlook is not for improvement, but rather for difficulty. It will undoubtedly be in the interest of the banking and financial community and the trade and commerce of the country generally that, in such a case, a stronger bank should have the power to come in, amalgamate with the less fortunate bank, and put it on its feet. There have been some such cases in the past. I think if power were not given to the Government and Minister of Finance to allow these amalgamations, there might be a case in which the desired relief could not be granted; there might be a case in which more prompt action would be needed than would be possible if the application had to come before Parliament. But for that, in view of the strong feeling throughout the country, it might be well for the Minister of Finance to consent to suspend that power which he has.

There was made in the Bank Act one change which was intended as an additional check, which has always seemed to me to be a questionable one. Formerly a bank amalgamation had to be made with the consent of the Treasury Board and the Government in Council,—we may for all practical purposes consider them one, because the Treasury Board is a large committee of the Government. The minister has introduced an amendment whereby a bank must get his individual consent. That, I am sure, was intended as a convenient check. It seems, however, to be open to this criticism, that it creates the assumption that the minister and the Government are two different organizations. It creates the assumption that you apply to the minister and he gives you his best judgment, and if you do not like it, you can then apply to the Government. That looks well in theory, but the minister and the Government are one.

After the Minister of Finance has given his consent to a bank merger, it would be almost ridiculous for anybody to ask the Governor in Council to set aside the judgment of the minister. I know that the change that was made in the Act was intended as an additional check. The Minister of Finance, however, might be placed in a very embarrassing position if he gave his consent to a merger, and then the Government overruled his decision. But that is a position that, practically speaking, would never occur. I think that we should endeavour to remove the feeling that exists among some people against bank mergers. I for one do not hesitate to say that I approve of the bank mergers that have taken place. I know of no merger which has done harm, and I know of some which have done good. All I care to say—and I am sure the Minister of Finance will accept these words in the spirit in which they are offered—is that, realizing the feeling which undoubtedly exists throughout the country on this subject, the minister ought to give us the assurance that if he has been careful in the past he will be still more careful in the future, and will see to it that there will be no good ground given for the impression that we are creating a money trust.

I entirely agree with what the minister has said as to the necessity of our institutions being strong in order to grapple not only with the enlarging business of our own country, but with the enlarging foreign trade which we all hope is going to come to us in the new order of things. What my hon. friend has said regarding amalgamations in England is true, and true to a greater degree than of anything that has occurred here. In England they are only now reaching the position we have had in Canada for many years. Prior to a recent time, there was no question of the right of banks in England to amalgamate, and when that right was challenged, all that was proposed by way of remedy was that

the consent of the Treasury should be obtained before the amalgamation took place. Now that has been the law of Canada for many years. While I realize the feeling throughout the country I repeat that I do not believe the bank mergers so far have done any harm, and I would be largely in favour of letting the Minister of Finance, in some rare case that may arise, consent to a bank merger in the future.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): From the remarks of the Acting Prime Minister I understand that he gives his consent to a merger when he considers it to be in the interests of the depositors, the shareholders, the borrowers, and the public generally. In the case of the Bank of Ottawa and Bank of Nova Scotia merger, I think it was beneficial primarily to the shareholders, without regard to the depositors, the borrowers, or the general public. That merger will in no way help the depositor, and furthermore, it will work against the interests of the borrower and the public generally. If the Bank of Ottawa gathers in from this district more money than it is able to loan out in this district, the effect would necessarily be to cheapen money to borrowers in this district. The supply of money would be greater than the demand, and the bank would naturally loan money more cheaply to people in the Ottawa valley than if it had the privilege of taking this money to Montreal, Toronto, or some other large centre and loaning it to the large corporations there. This merger works to the disadvantage of the borrowers in the Ottawa valley, and any other similar merger works to the disadvantage of the local borrower. Our present banking system is a disadvantage to Western Canada, because money out there commands 7 or 8 per cent, while in the east it commands only 5 or 6 per cent. Under our present system money is gathered by the branches and sent to the head office. It is almost impossible for a man in Western Canada who wants to borrow a hundred thousand dollars for any business, no matter what it is, to get the money unless he goes to the head office of the bank. He goes to the local manager in the first place, then to the supervisor for the district, and from him to the head office; and all these mergers make it just so much harder for the small borrower. He has fewer banks to go to, and the money is all concentrated in the big centres. The head offices of practically all the banks are in Montreal and Toronto. The eliminating of the Bank of Ottawa, the Bank of British North America and the Northern Crown Bank, and the concentration of their funds in these two cities, makes it harder for people to borrow money to develop different enterprises throughout the country. The American plan of local credits seems to have worked out much better than our system of branch banks. Under our system, the bank with a capitalization of from five to ten million dollars will have a hundred or a hundred and fifty branches scattered throughout the country, and the local bank managers are simply agents for collecting money. They are not in a position to loan money, except perhaps $500 or $1,000, although in exceptional cases they can loan up to $2,000, and in extremely rare cases even $5,000. The merging of banks eliminates the personal contact of the business man who is borrowing and the banking centre. Instead of organizing for the capture of foreign trade which we all hope to get, but as to which I have very little confidence at the present moment, bank mergers are being effected and the money which might be used for the development of local industries in the smaller places is being taken away to the large centres so that the banks can earn their interest or for the banks to send their money to New York on call loan is a detriment rather than an advantage. I certainly think that these mergers do not tend to bring about a satisfactory condition of affairs in this country.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): My hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) has pointed to the United States as an example. He says their banking system is better than ours. I do not believe that has been the experience of the United States, because rediscount banks had to be opened up to carry on the business as it should be carried on. It is absolutely impossible for the small bank to carry a big account. It is quite true that the branch banks in Canada gather in deposits, but the money is loaned out again locally when the security is good. If my hon. friend will study the bank statements he will find that the loans on call in the United States are very rarely, if ever, equal to the deposits. So the banks cannot be accused of being selfish in that respect. As a matter of fact, there is not much inducement in New York to loan money on call at two or three per cent—that is the normal rate, but lately it has been as high as six per cent—except for the fact that the money can be called at once. The word " call " is illustrative of the fact. The money can be called.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the money be called in 1907?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: They could not get it.

Mr. NESBITT: Not in currency. That is only one form of asset. As a matter of fact, the money is kept there principally because they can get it immediately. The conditions prevailing in 1907 were largely responsible for the organization of rediscount or reserve banks in the United States. Our banks, with their various branches all over the country, serve very much the same purpose.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I attempted to offer a few remarks yesterday on the banking situation and got shut off. I do not know whether this discussion will be broad enough to allow me to say what I have to say, but I will make the attempt and if I violate the rules you will call me to order. I said yesterday that the banking and money interests of this country are getting more money out of the people than the people can afford to pay. You can term that a merger or whatever you like. I think the banking interests are heading for a merger pretty strongly. I am going to try to show this House that the banking interests are getting more money out of the people than the people can afford to pay. For that purpose I wish to divide the interests of this country into four groups, namely, (1) the farmers, (2) the carrying trade by land and water, (3) manufacturers of all classes, (4) the banking interests. I am speaking now of pre-war conditions; we are not under normal conditions now, and it is hard to tell who is making too much money and who is making too little. If you take normal conditions and analyse the returns you will find that the carrying trade as a whole did not get five per cent on their invested capital. Many of them could not pay dividends out of their earnings. If you take the manufacturing interests you will find that many have had to pass dividends; that they could not even pay dividends on their preferred stock. If you take the farming interests you will find that the farmer, after getting his living out of the farm, does not get five per cent on his invested capital. On the other hand, only a few banks have failed and from the day that these banks opened their doors to do business up to the present they have never failed to pay dividends and to pay them promptly. I do not think there is a bank in Canada paying less than eight per cent, and it runs all the way up to sixteen per cent, which is the amount the Bank of Nova Scotia pays. Taking these three groups as a whole, will any man tell me that the group representing the farming community can pay sixteen per cent on its invested capital? Can the manufacturing interests as a whole pay any such dividend on invested capital?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend says sixteen per cent?

Mr. McCREA: Yes, the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Is my hon. friend taking into account the reserves as well as the capital?

Mr. McCREA: I am coming to that. I am glad the hon. gentleman reminded me of that because I might have skipped it. When we say to the banks that they are paying great big dividends, they say: Look at our surplus, our reserves. I agree with that, but where do those surpluses and those reserves come from? They come from the people who are doing business with the banks and the banks, after paying substantial dividends, promptly and on time, have accumulated these surpluses and rereserves out of the people of the country. That is where they came from.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does my hon. friend know that in the case of the bank that he mentioned new shares have been issued at a premium, so that the shareholders have paid in more than the par value of the shares?

Mr. McCREA: Very true. But the original shares were not issued at a premium. It is true that they have increased their capital many times and the shares representing that increased capital have been bought by the shareholders at an increased price. Why? Let the Canadian Northern Railway or some other of the carrying interests of this country, which are not able to pay dividends, issue new stock and see whether they can sell it at a premium. The new capital stock issued by the banks sells at a premium because they have these enormous reserves back of them. It is because they are prosperous and because they have these reserves that their stock is worth more than par. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will imagine that I am sore on the banks and that I wish to knock them. Not at all. I have been doing business with banks for over forty years, and I never asked for or wanted money that I could not get. I got all I asked for or wanted. Therefore, I have no complaint to make personally.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: How did you manage it?

Mr. McCREA: In addition to that, sometimes I got a lot of advice that I did not want or ask for. I am stating what I believe to be in the interest of the country. I believe that it is in the interest of everybody that our banking institutions should be strong. I believe also that a bank, such as those we have, which are able to carry any account that is presented to them, are very useful to the big operator or the big concern that wants a lot of money. I do not believe it is good business for either the bank or the customer to be carrying accounts in a whole lot of small banks. But there is another side to the question. The big, strong banks that we have to-day have their head offices in Toronto, Montreal or some other of the big centres. If there is an individual in a remote part of the country who wants a little money, he has to apply to the local bank manager, the local bank manager applies to the district manager, the district manager applies to the head office, and the poor customer who is in need of money is liable to strangle before he can get a decision from the head office. Consequently, I believe it is desirable, in the best interests of the country, that we should have some strong banks capable of carrying the biggest accounts that are presented to them, but I also believe it is in the interest of the country —and this is something that this Government should take particular thought of and care for—that we should have some smaller banks. If you have a bank in some remote part of the country with the directors living in the same vicinity, and a farmer or some other man of moderate means wants a little banking accommodation, he can approach those people who are close to him when it is not possible for him to travel possibly a thousand miles to the head office of some bank to get the accommodation that he has to get and that he is entitled to. Not only that but in the United States, although I do not approve of all the banking system there in its entirety, they have small banks in practically every town. The management of those banks are interested in every industry and good work that is established. They encourage and help that industry along, and if the owner of the industry needs money all he has to do is to go and see the directors and the manager of the local bank and he can very easily explain his business and get the accommodation which he needs, and which he could not otherwise obtain.

There is a tendency, which I think nobody will dispute the existence of, on the part of our large banking institutions, to prefer to do business with big accounts. They are not very anxious to get the little accounts of farmers, and I do not believe that is in the interest of the country or helpful toward the development which we are all seeking to promote. If the Minister of Finance will analyse the matter closely and carefully, and study the amount of money that the banking interests are getting from the people of Canada, I think he will conclude that they are heading in the direction of a combine. I have knowledge of a few things which have happened that to my mind point very strongly to a trend in that direction, and the customer has to treat his banking house very delicately or he will hear from some other fellow. I believe it to be very desirable that banks should have branches, not only in all parts of this country, but also in Europe for export purposes. I also believe it to be in the interest of the country generally to encourage small institutions and not to unduly favour bank amalgamations, otherwise there will be great danger of the banking system being monopolized by a few men. I am told that the great moneyed interests of this country are controlled by only nineteen banks. I am not sure but that those banks control a little more than the moneyed interests. I am rather inclined to think that those interests have put their hands on this Government once or twice and told it pretty nearly what it had to do. I think that events, of a not altogether recent character, serve to indicate that there was something more than a genuine desire to promote the interests of the country in transactions that this Government has put through within the past few years. I am not in a position to make an absolutely straight accusation in that regard, and therefore I refrain from doing so.

In conclusion, let me again express the belief that the farmers and the business men in the remote parts of Canada would be better served than they are at present by having a few small banks established in the different localities rather than concentrate the whole banking transaction at large centres where the banking magnates are looking for large accounts and do not care very much about the smaller customers.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I cannot hope to contribute very much towards a debate of this character, because

I have never been in the happy position of being able to do a very large amount of banking. However, I have a suggestion to make, and I will only occupy a moment or two in presenting my views. We are frequently told that farming is the basic industry of this country, yet I believe I am absolutely right in saying that the farming community, as a class, is receiving, and has received, less consideration from the banking interests of Canada than any other portion of the community. So far as the farmers are concerned, the branch banks in small towns and villages are nothing more or less than collecting agencies, located there for the purpose of taking their money and forwarding it to the centres of population. When the farmer wants accommodation, the amount which he can receive at the local branch bank is limited by the say of some person in Toronto, or Montreal, or other large city. The farmer may be able to give the very best security in the world, for, we will say, a loan of $50,000, but the branch bank in this particular neighbourhood is debarred by the head office from advancing any more than $5,000, and if he desires accommodation beyond the latter amount, a special application must be sent to headquarters to ascertain whether it will permit the local branch to grant accommodation desired. Even when the farmer's application is acceded to, a high rate of interest is exacted. So I think there is ground for the statement that the local branches are nothing more or less than collecting agencies, established to collect money from the farming community, and that the farmers do not receive the accommodation to which he is entitled having in mind the amount of money which they place in the hands of these banks.

I believe that a couple of years ago the United States Government established in various parts of that country a system of farm loan banks, whereby farmers were given accommodation at a fair rate of interest. The suggestion that I have to make is that the time is now opportune in Canada for the Government, and especially for the Finance Department, to look carefully into the matter and see if some such system could not be adopted in this country, whereby the farmer could obtain money for carrying on his operations, without having to pay the high rate of twelve, fourteen, or fifteen per cent interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Where is the capital taken from?

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. EDWARDS: The capital is furnished at the outset by the Government, and the money is loaned out at a small rate of interest to the farmer. The Government of Canada has already adopted that system to a certain extent in advancing money up to $2,500 to the returned soldier who wishes to go on the land, taking as security a first mortgage upon the land, and only charging five per cent interest. It has thus adopted a principle, which, in my opinion, should be further extended, and be made more generally available to the farming population.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand): I cannot allow this discussion to close without saying a word or two on behalf of the banks of Canada. I think we in Canada should be proud of our banking system, which is vastly superior to that of the United States. In the country to the south of us a number of men in a particular locality can group together, and with a very small amount of capital indeed, probably not exceeding ten or twenty thousand dollars, establish a bank. I am told by men who have had experience of the system that such banks are very poor institutions indeed to borrow money from. Their capital is small, and the management is very tight, and the result is that people there do not get the same line of credit that we enjoy in this country. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) have spoken about the difficulty which is experienced in obtaining bank credit. I live in a small town in a rural section of the country where there are three banks in operation, and I have never found any such difficulty as these hon. gentlemen speak of in connection with borrowing money from the banks. I believe that a farmer—in my section at least, and I think this applies to other sections of the country as well—providing his credit is good, who wishes to borrow a few hundred dollars from the local bank can do so without the necessity of his application being sent to the head office for endorsation. I believe that where the credit of the applicant is good he can borrow locally any amount in reason, and the local manager has full power to grant him that accommodation.

I believe that we should have strong banking institutions in this country. We have strong banking institutions in fact, and it should be the effort of Parliament and the Finance Minister to build them up and make them as strong as possible, in order that the people may have perfect security for their deposits. Where a weaker bank

opens a branch in a town the centre of a farm section—and I have seen this too in my own experience—it does not get deposits because the public do not recognize it as a strong financial institution. The result is its deposits are very light indeed; the people go to the stronger and bigger banks with their money.

The member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) is a manufacturer like myself, and I presume he has had pretty well the same kind of experience. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that I owe to the banks of this country every success I have had, because of their lending me money when I was not in a very strong position to borrow. But bankers take into consideration the character of the man and his business ability when they are lending him money, which I think they should do, because those are really his capital. In my earlier days perhaps I tried to borrow more money than the banks would let me have, but on the whole the banks have made me, as they have made every other business man in this country, by lending very liberally and often to a greater extent than they should in order that the business of the country may be carried on. I say that we are under great obligation to the banking system of this country. I do not believe that either a manufacturer or a farmer has any difficulty in borrowing money to a proper extent in connection with his business if he has behind his application that capital which is absolutely necessary—character and good business management. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a supporter of the banks because I have good reason to be, I am proud of them, and I think our Canadian banking system is something which we should all be proud of.

Motion agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE WITH FRANCE.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Lemieux:

That, in the opinion of this House, adequate means be taken to foster and develop our trade conditions in France.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the request of my hon. friend, the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, I will drop this motion because I may bring this same matter up when the House goes into Supply on the Trade and Commerce Estimates. I, therefore, drop it on the understanding—

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): I meant that when we were passing Supply relating to trade matters the hon. member might have an opportunity to bring up the same matter as is covered by his motion.

Motion dropped.

UNDISCUSSED AND UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. DUFF:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and recommendations relating to the appointment of a keeper of Free Stone Island lighthouse, County of Richmond, Nova Scotia, in the year 1918.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS ADMINISTRATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the grave charges made by Brigadier General Smart and Lieut. Colonel Pratt against the overseas administration of the Militia Department.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to this motion, I may say that yesterday the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) consulted me to know whether it would be competent for him to move such a motion. I told him that, prima facie, I felt that it was not such a motion as he could bring under Rule 39. I have had opportunity of looking into the matter a little more carefully since, and I have arrived at this conclusion. In the first place, the subject matters which he would consider are the grave charges made by Brigadier-General Smart and Lieut.-Colonel Pratt. Subsection (b) of Rule 39 says that not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion. So that the mere use of the plural there puts him out of court under subsection (b). If, on the other hand, it is contended that it is the subject matter and not the alleged charges made by those two gentlemen which is the subject of discussion, then I have to say that the subjects dealt with by them in these charges so-called cover a wide range; they deal with matters dating back to the year 1916; so that urgency cannot be asserted. It has been held in connection with this rule that the matter must be of urgent public importance, and the decisions, not only in this House, but more particularly in the British House, which has a similar rule, are to the effect that the matter must be of recent occurrence. The rule itself was designed to meet cases of extreme urgency which could not be discussed in consequence of the inelasticity of the rules of the House and it therefore permitted the discussion of

matters which otherwise it would not be permissible to discuss. But I must point out, as I pointed out to the hon. member who moved this motion yesterday, that he would have had an opportunity yesterday to discuss the matters he desires to discuss upon the motion to go into Committee of Supply. That motion was moved an hour or two hours after he spoke to me, and it seems to me that that mere circumstance alone precludes him from pleading urgency within the meaning of this rule.

There is another feature which I would point out. It is a question as to how far it is competent, or, indeed, desirable, that in this House we should deal with newspaper reports of matters which have been considered in other legislatures. If we started to encroach on one another's field or sphere in which each is sovereign, endless complications and difficulties of a constitutional character are bound to arise.

It is quite true that these charges, so called, have been published in the newspapers, and that it may therefore be contended that in dealing with them under the hon. member's motion we should be dealing not with a matter which had previously been dealt with in another legislature, but with a matter which was current in the public press. But if we could overcome the rule against discussing matters which have arisen in another House simply on the ground that these matters subsequently appeared in the press, then we might as well give up the idea of attempting to avoid the discussion of matters which have arisen in other legislatures, because the proceedings of all legislatures subsequently become matters current in the public press. It seems to me, therefore, that upon all grounds—upon the question of urgency, upon its being a matter of recent occurrences—the motion does not come within the spirit, indeed, within the letter, of rule 39. In my judgment it is not competent for the hon. member to move this motion, and I so rule.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I, Mr. Speaker, without questioning your decision, say a few words in answer to what has been said?

Mr. SPEAKER: In the nature of a point of order?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. First of all, I want to say that I humbly defer to your decision. But may I add that the reason why I did not move this motion yesterday on going into Committee of Supply was because I had a few hours previously given notice to the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) that I would bring the matter up to-day. So that it was in order to be courteous to the Minister of Militia that I waited until to-day; it was not because I did not care to bring the matter up yesterday on going into Supply. If Your Honour had asked me why I did not press the matter yesterday, I would have said what I now say.

The second point is as to the matter of urgency. I am at a loss to understand what is the meaning of the word "urgency." Has it the same meaning in English as it has in French? Without referring to the charges concerning the Bruce report or the Babtie report which are mentioned in the statements of Brig.-General Smart and Lieut.-Colonel Pratt, may I point out that in the matter of the Rhyl riots which took place a few days ago a verdict was rendered within the last few hours, and that verdict is universally criticised by the press of Canada. I may add that while deferring to your decision, I am discussing the point of order. The Rhyl riots, in my humble judgment, are a matter of urgent public importance to Canada—to soldiers, to returned soldiers, to the relatives and families of soldiers. When our boys are being killed, not at the front, but in the camps; when our boys are in dungeons, we have a right to inquire why such a state of things should be, and to contend —because that would be the conclusion of my remarks if I had been allowed to make them this afternoon—that an investigation is absolutely urgent.

Your Honour states that as the charges referred to have been made in legislative halls other than this House of Commons—namely, in the Quebec and Ontario Legislatures—this House should not take cognizance of them. I accept your judgment in that regard, but that is not my point.

5 p.m.

My point is that Brigadier-General Smart gave an interview to the press of Montreal; the day before yesterday he wrote a long letter to the Ottawa Citizen containing specific charges. It was not my intention to refer this afternoon to the speech that he delivered in the Quebec Legislature. I make the same remark with regard to Lt.-Colonel Pratt. Lt.-Colonel Pratt made very serious charges on the floor of the House of Assembly in Toronto, but he also made direct and positive charges when he landed at Halifax. I have read his interview, and I was going to refer to that interview.

As to the other point, that in a case like this the motion should deal with only one

matter of urgent public importance, the rule says:

A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order.

And so on. Section 39, subsection 2, says:

Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House (when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business (Rule 25) has been concluded and before notices of motions or orders of the day are entered upon.

The view taken by Your Honour is that only one matter of urgent public importance should be dealt with. But it might be a collective matter. I intended to—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: May I be permitted to rise to a point of order? Is my hon. friend in order in discussing the ruling of the Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave the hon. member permission to discuss the point of order.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I simply wish to present the point of order for consideration. I do not offer objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Strictly speaking, the hon. gentleman is not calling my ruling into question to the extent of protesting it. As I understand it, he merely wishes to discuss a point of order. I gave him leave to do that, but it does seem to me that he is going far afield in his discussion of the point of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope that the Acting Prime Minister did not think that I was discourteous to the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I had the impression that my hon. friend was arguing his case under the guise of a discussion of a point of order, and I should like to have the opportunity of replying to him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not so Machiavellian as that. I made a motion for adjournment based on Rule 39, and Mr. Speaker ruled me out of order, stating the reasons for doing so. I accepted your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but Your Honour made some statements in support of it, and even though I defer to the decision, I do not wish it to be understood that I accept the reasons given. However, I would not wish to be unpleasant at all. Mr. Speaker is always so courteous that I will not discuss the matter any further, except to say that I acted in good faith in bringing the motion forward and that the reason why I brought it forward to-day was because I wanted to give notice to the Minister of Militia and Defence. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to state that at the earliest opportunity I shall bring the matter up on a motion to go into Supply.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the hon. member will bring the matter up, we shall be glad to discuss it fully.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend understands the importance of the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is one point mentioned by the hon. member to which I would reply, and more especially for the benefit of proper decorum in the House on the matter of urgency. Urgency, within the meaning of the rule is not a question whether the matter proposed to be discussed is of urgent importance—it may be of infinitely urgent importance to those affected —the question is whether it is urgent within the meaning of rule 39; in other words, whether it is a matter of that urgency which would cause harm to the public interest if the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House were not able to permit the subject to be brought on early enough. I submit upon that point that the mere circumstance that yesterday afternoon the hon. member had an opportunity and that he will have an opportunity again the first time on going into Supply is a sufficient answer.

The letter of Brigadier-General Smart and the letter of Colonel Pratt are not matters of urgency within the meaning of the rule. The subject matter may be, but I have already ruled that as the subject matter extends over a period of two years it is therefore not within the rule in that it is not a matter of recent occurrence. I have only to repeat in conclusion that the motion as presented is not within the letter of the rule, nor is it within the spirit of the rule.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Acting Prime Minister says that he is anxious to have the question brought up at the earliest moment——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will pardon me. I said I shall be glad to discuss it with my hon. friend when he brings it up. Instead of desiring to prevent this matter from being discussed, I shall be very glad to facilitate its discussion when he brings it up.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was going to ask my hon. friend to be good enough to place on the table of the House the Bruce and Babtie reports prior to that debate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was making an inquiry for copies this morning for myself and I was unable to obtain any. I was told they had been laid on the table of the House in 1917.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Further consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Edwards—That, in the opinion of this House, the amount of $5,000 received by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick for the fiscal years 1915-16 and 1916-17 to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be returned by the said Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to the Treasury of Canada forthwith, resumed from March 26th.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER: If any other hon. member desires to speak, his opportunity is now. Otherwise, the mover of the motion would close the debate.

Mr. EDWARDS: The object for which the resolution was moved having been attained by the return of the money, I see no use in submitting it further, and I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORT OF GOLD.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the provisions of Bill 27, "An Act to provide for the continuance in force of a certain Proclamation made under The Finance Act, 1914," by providing that the Governor in Council, by proclamation which shall be published in the Canada Gazette, may from time to time and for any period or periods declare and proclaim that the export of gold coin, gold bullion, and fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada shall be prohibited, except in such cases as may be deemed desirable by the Minister of Finance under licenses to be issued by him; and that such provision shall only continue in operation for two years after the termination of the present war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): In common with Great Britain, the United States and other countries, Canada, for the protection of our gold reserves, has had in effect for some time past prohibition upon the export of gold coins, gold bullion and fine gold bars except under license from the Department of Finance. The prohibition which is at present in effect is under the authority of the War Measures Act. When the war is declared officially at an end the War Measures Act will of course lose its validity. As it is probable that there will be an unsettled financial

period for the next year or more, as I explained in connection with the resolution relating to the continuation of an Order in Council in effect under the Finance Act of 1914, it is deemed advisable that the Governor in Council should have power to prohibit from time to time the export of gold if it should appear to them to be in the public interest to do so. This resolution, which I purpose embodying in Bill No. 27, to provide for the continuance in force of a certain proclamation made under the Finance Act, 1914, will enable us to do this.

It is an enabling measure only, and I have no doubt as to the propriety and necessity of its enactment. Whether or not we shall have to continue to prohibit the export of gold after the conclusion of peace, I do not know. If it is not necessary, we shall, of course, not use the authority we are asking Parliament to confer. If, on the other hand, it appears in the national interest and necessary for the protection of our gold reserve, the power will be available for the Government to exercise it.

Mr. CAHILL: Have many licenses been asked for, and how will this legislation affect the rate of exchange?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The legislation will not have much influence upon the rate of exchange because I think the banks would not be disposed to send gold out of the country, even though they could obtain a handsome premium on it. I think that even without the legislation, probably a request from the Finance Department would result in the banks not sending money out of the country, but it is desirable that these matters should be regulated by authority, rather than be dependent on compliance with request.

So far as gold mining companies are concerned, the Treasury has consented to their shipping gold out of the country to be sold and refined in New York. It would hardly be fair, I think, to our gold-mining companies to prevent them sending gold to New York or to other parts of the United States to be refined and sold there, because New York funds are now at a premium of over two per cent. In order, however, to build up our gold reserve, the Finance Department has been purchasing gold produced in Canada and has been paying for it at the New York rate, so there is no unfairness to our gold mining companies, and we shall gradually increase our holding of gold. I explained pretty fully, in connection with the resolution relating to the continuance of the order under the Finance Act, our position with respect

to gold, which I think is fairly satisfactory after four years of war and in comparison with Great Britain and even the United States. It is, however, advisable that our gold reserves should be gradually built up until our note circulation is covered substantially as it was before the war. The advantage of this measure will be that the Government will be able to prevent the export of gold attracted by the higher rate of exchange in New York, which would result in the depletion of our gold reserve.

Mr. CAHILL: About how much gold have the banks on hand? I saw a statement issued by the Finance Department to the effect that the banks have about $10,000,000 in gold on hand.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I put a statement on Hansard a couple of weeks ago giving full information as to the gold holdings. I think my hon. friend is inaccurate in his statement as to $10,000,000 being the amount. I think he will find that, between the Dominion Government and the banks we are holding about $30,000,000 more than when the war broke out. Our reserve position is a very good one.

Mr. CAHILL: But how much is held by the banks alone?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not the figures here, but I think it is about $100,000,000. I would not commit myself, however, because I have not the figures.

Mr. CAHILL: If the banks have $100,000,000, the Government would have only about $20,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Oh, no. There is over $200,000,000 of gold. I can ascertain the amount of gold held by the banks for my hon. friend, if he desires it.

Mr. CAHILL: My point is that if the banks are not holding any appreciable amount of gold what is the necessity of this legislation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They are holding a very substantial amount of gold—in excess of $100,000,000, I think.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I suppose this legislation will not interfere with the marketing of gold by producers in Canada. There is not much gold-mining carried on at the present time in Nova Scotia, but our market in former years was the United States. I understand that the Finance Department will purchase gold from any producer in Canada who wishes to sell at the market rate. The point the gold-mining companies make is that while the price of wages, machinery, coal, and every other factor that enters into gold mining has gone up enormously, the price of gold itself has not gone up, and in that way the industry is unprofitable whereas formerly it was profitable. Will the producer get as good a price for his gold as if the United States market was open to him?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend must have been out when I made an explanation some time ago, in which I said that we had granted licenses to gold-mining companies to send their gold to the United States to be refined and sold there, because they could get a premium in New York funds. I stated, further, that in order to build up our reserves the Finance Department was following the policy of buying from companies producing gold in Canada, and paying them in New York funds.

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose the Government does not pay the full premium, because it will cost something to take the gold down there. That is allowed for, I suppose?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think we have paid the full premium. It is desirable that the gold-mining companies should be able to sell their product in Canada; otherwise, we should lose the benefit of the gold produced. I am not quite sure as to the precise principle on which the deputy minister calculates the amount we will pay. What we desire to do is to place the gold-mining company in as good a position as it would be if it sent its gold to New York, had it refined there and sold it.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That the amendment referred to in the resolution just reported, and which has been concurred in, be considered in connection with Bill No. 27, under Order No. 14, when said Bill is being dealt with by the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That means that this will be incorporated in the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

EXCESS CIRCULATION CHARTERED BANKS.

PROCLAMATIONS UNDER FINANCE ACT, 1914, TO CONTINUE IN FORCE.

Bill No. 27, to provide for the continuance in force of a certain proclamation made

under the Finance Act, 1914, was read the second time and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—proclamation of 3rd September, 1914, under Finance Act, 1914, continued in force for two years after war; power to terminate operation of proclamation sooner:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the Minister of Finance kindly explain?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I gave a very full explanation of this when we were in Committee upon the resolution. The purpose of this Bill is to continue in effect, so long as may be necessary and for a period not exceeding two years, the proclamation under the Finance Act whereby chartered banks are permitted to issue excess circulation from March until August in each year, and certain other provisions which have been in effect during the war. I explained to the House that it was thought that international conditions would be unsettled for a year or more, and there is no question as to the advisability of the Government continuing the power to bring into effect the provisions of the Finance Act. Under the terms of the Finance Act the provisions in question can only be brought into effect under certain contingencies—in case of war or panic. The War Measures Act comes to an end on the conclusion of peace. It is desirable, for the same reason that I explained in connection with the resolution which has been adopted by the House, that the Government should have power to continue the regulations in effect, and this Bill is for that purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have the banks taken advantage of this permission to any degree?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. The measures that were adopted at the beginning of the war, and which were embodied in the Finance Act, 1914, have worked out, I am sure I am not overstating it when I say, admirably. The banks have taken proper, and not improper, advantage of them. The result has been that Canada has been able to finance herself through this war in a highly creditable manner. I think that would be agreed by all. It has been a very great tribute to the strength and flexibility of the banking system under the provisions of the Bank Act and also under those of this Finance Act which was passed in 1914.

On section 2—Paragraph (c) re excess circulation of banks extended to 1919 and 1920 subject to termination with rest of proclamation:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I sent for the Gazette and I find that the chartered banks have on hand $86,000,000 in gold and $191,000,000 in Dominion notes, the Dominion notes, of course, being secured by gold to the percentage that I mentioned a little time ago to the House, and in addition by the deposit of securities, the aggregate of securities in gold being 88 per cent. It is a very strong situation.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): We are authorizing excess circulation by this section. Will the minister state how much excess circulation is now issued by the banks?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am unable to give that information now. My hon. friend knows that from August until March, for many years past, the banks have been authorized to issue excess circulation for the purpose of taking care of the financing of the Western wheat crop and meeting the other demands on them which expand in the fall. It was to enable them to meet further expansion, due to war conditions, that this provision was enacted authorizing excess circulation from March until August—that is, the balance of the year. My hon. friend also knows that the banks are charged five per cent upon that excess circulation, which is a check upon them.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): By the Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: By the Government. It is not any object to a bank to issue excess circulation beyond the strict necessities of its business, because it has to pay five per cent upon that excess circulation. That is the restraint upon it. If my hon friend is interested in the subject I will give detailed information at a later date when the estimates of the Department of Finance are under consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I think it would be interesting to the country to know the extent to which the banks take advantage of this provision, and also the amount which the Finance Department has realized out of its five per cent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be very glad to get that information and furnish it to the House when the estimates of my department are under consideration.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the Acting Prime Minister explain the $10,000,000 of gold deposit?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I sent out for the Gazette, and pointed out, probably in my hon. friend's absence, that the banks hold

$86,000,000 in gold and $191,000,000 in Dominion notes, part of which, of course, is covered by, and immediately convertible into gold, and part of which is also secured by the deposit of securities, as I explained to the House when the resolution preceding this Bill was under consideration.

I have now an amendment to propose. The committee will recall that I moved that when the resolution under Order 25 had been concurred in, it should be considered when Bill No. 27 was in committee. The intention is to have one Bill instead of two, and I beg to move therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the following be added to the Bill:

3. The Governor in Council, by proclamation, which shall be published in the Canada Gazette, may, from time to time and for any period or periods, declare and proclaim that the export of gold coin, gold bullion and fine gold bars from the Dominion of Canada shall be prohibited, except in such cases as may be deemed desirable by the Minister of Finance, and under licenses to be issued by him.

This section shall only continue in operation for two years after the termination of the present war.

That merely embodies the resolution which has just been adopted by the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have also an amendment to propose to the title. I move that the title of the Bill be amended by adding thereto: "and to authorize the prohibition of the export of gold." The title will now read:

An Act to provide for the Continuance in force of a certain Proclamation made under the Finance Act, 1914, and to authorize the prohibition of the export of gold.

Amendment agreed to and Bill reported as amended.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Steam Service between Canadian Atlantic Ports and Australia and New Zealand.. .. .. $140,000

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is the same amount that was voted for this purpose prior to the war. The contractors for this particular route are the New Zealand Shipping Company, New Zealand.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): How many boats have they on the line?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There were five, namely: the Mahana, Mahia, Parattah, Sussex and Whakatane. Since 1914, however, the service has been limited owing to some of the boats having been requisitioned by the British Admiralty. Under the contract they are to sail monthly on the 20th, during the St. Lawrence season of navigation from the port of Montreal, and during the winter season from either Halifax or St. John.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Do they go direct to Australia without calling at intermediate ports?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The ports of call are Auckland, Wellington, Lyttleton and Dunedin, New Zealand, and the ports of Melbourne and Sydney, Australia. The boats are to call at such other ports in Australia and New Zealand as the Government may from time to time determine. While the rate of traffic was apparently growing prior to the war, I notice by the figures that since that time it has been gradually decreasing. For instance, in 1914 the tonnage carried amounted to 44,245 tons; the following year it amounted to 29,124 tons; in 1916, to 19,738 tons; in 1917, to 11,882 tons; in 1918 no service was performed at all apparently.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does it not seem rather inconsistent to subsidize these vessels to bring freight to Canada and at the same time to have a tariff wall so high as to prevent the importation of goods? It seems to me to be an actual waste of money to subsidize shipping companies to bring goods to Canada when we will not allow them to enter the country except over a high tariff wall.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend's protest involves a great many questions which I would not like to discuss on the vote before the committee. He had better reserve that very broad question for the Budget debate. I know, however, that Canadian producers were very, very anxious for the restoration of the subsidized service to Australia and New Zealand after the armistice, in order that they might resume a trade that was growing in a very satisfactory manner before the war. I think it is quite true that we are more interested in our outward freight to Australia and New Zealand than in any inward freight those boats may bring back. This particular service has been of some use in developing our export trade.

Mr. ROBB: What control has the department over the freight rates charged? I notice that they are subsidizing these vessels on the basis of $7 a ton on the tonnage carried during the last year, and a little more than $3 a ton on the highest tonnage carried in 1914.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under these contracts the Government reserves the right to approve of the freight charged. I have not the form of contract before me and I cannot give my friend the exact terms of that provision. I have already given the ports of call. The speed required of the ships in the service is 10 knots, and each ship shall be capable of carrying 7,500 tons at 40 cubic feet to the ton. The subsidy is $140,000 per annum, payable in monthly instalments. The ships are to be fitted with reasonable cold storage accommodation. There is a deduction for short cargo; the provision is as follows:—

An average cargo of 5,000 tons on each monthly trip is to be carried throughout the year, and $2 is to be deducted from the subsidy at the end of each year for every ton short of the total measure or weight that should have been carried upon such number of sailings as may have been performed, based upon the said 5,000 tons per voyage.

An hon. MEMBER: Does that mean that each steamer must take 5,000 tons per voyage?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. I am sorry that I cannot give my hon. friend the provisions of the contract dealing with the rates, but I do know that they are quite favourable as compared with the rates ordinarily charged by mercantile boats.

Mr. ROBB: Are the mails carried free under that consideration?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, and the Trade Commissioners of Canada are also carried free.

An hon. MEMBER: Are similar grants made by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not to this particular line of steamers. I think this is a purely Canadian service.

Resolutions reported.

The House adjourned at six p.m.

Thursday, April 3, 1914.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

JUDGE F. S. MACLENNAN.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has His Honour Judge F. S. MacLennan, of Montreal, filled any permanent or temporary positions under Federal Government control since the First of January, 1912?

2. If so, on what dates was he appointed to such positions, and what was the remuneration or salary attached thereto?

3. What amounts, if any, have been paid to His Honour Judge F. S. MacLennan by the Government, since January 1, 1912?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Appointed Judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec; appointed Judge of Appeal of Tribunal No. 7, Montreal District, under the Military Service Act; appointed under a Commission of Inquiry respecting the Chambly-Vercheres election; appointed under a Commission of Inquiry respecting unrest in Quebec shipyards.

2. Date of appointment Judge of Superior Court, 3rd February, 1915, salary $7,000 per annum; date of appointment as Appellate Judge under Military Service Act, 23rd November, 1917, no remuneration; date of appointment re Chambly-Vercheres election, 10th June, 1918, remuneration $50 per day and disbursements; date of appointment re unrest at Quebec shipyards, 29th July, 1918, remuneration $20 per day and actual travelling expenses.

3. Salary as judge paid monthly at rate of $7,000 per annum; paid for fees and disbursements re Chambly-Vercheres election, $848.60; paid re Quebec unrest, fees and travelling expenses, $1,374.30.

COPPER REFINERIES IN CANADA.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Is copper refined in Canada? If so, at what places are copper refineries located?

2. What quantity has been refined in the years 1916, 1917 and 1918?

3. What quantity of copper refined in Canada was sold or marketed in Canada for manufacturing purposes?

4. What portion was exported direct to Great Britain?

5. What portion was exported to the United States or other countries?

6. If any refineries are operating, did they receive any assistance from (a) the Dominion Government, (b) the British Government or the Imperial Munitions Board?

7. If so, what was the nature of such assistance?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, at Trail, B.C., (by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Co., of Canada, Ltd.).

2. Quantity of copper refined in 1916-1918, as follows: In 1916, 966,000 pounds; in 1917, 7,804,755 pounds; in 1918, 7,617,339 pounds.

3. The Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company reports that practically the entire production in 1918 was sold to the Imperial Munitions Board.

4 and 5. Refined copper is not enumerated as such in the Customs classification of exports but is included with blister copper. It is probable that little, if any, refined copper was exported as the Imperial Munitions Board used the refined copper in Canada in shell manufacture and still have a considerable quantity on hand.

6. No information.

7. Answered by No. 6.

CANADA—GREAT BRITAIN STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has there been any communication between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government with reference to the carrying out of the recommendation of the Dominion Royal Commission, advising the establishment of a line of fast steamers of twenty knots, between Great Britain and Halifax in winter, and Great Britain and Quebec in summer?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to take any steps to bring this about?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No information.

2. Answered by No. 1.

REMOVAL OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS' BODIES.

Mr. HAROLD:

What is the policy of the Government relative to the removal to this country of the bodies of Canadian soldiers where desired by the relatives?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Bodies of officers and soldiers will not be brought back from France or Belgium.

2. Bodies of officers and soldiers may be brought back from the United Kingdom, but not at public expense.

PATENT MEDICINES WAR TAX.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to collect a war tax upon patent medicines, lotions, etc.?

2. Does the Government propose to continue to oblige the retail traders and country merchants to affix war tax stamps to these articles?

3. Is the Government aware that in many places these stamps are not affixed as required by law?

4. Why is the manufacturer and importer not obliged to affix these stamps instead of the country merchant and retail dealer?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. Announcements respecting taxation are made in the Budget Speech.

3. Yes, and in all known cases prosecutions have followed.

4. This is governed by the provisions of the Special War Revenue Act, 1915.

LT.-COL. G. H. BRADBURY.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

Referring to the following questions on page 2397 Revised Hansard, May 22, 1918—

In what rank did Lt.-Colonel G. H. Bradbury serve in France?

In what regiment did he serve in France?

Under whose command did he go to France?

Was he wounded? If so, what is the nature of his wounds?

to which the Hon. Mr. Burrell replied:

"Definite information is not available in Canada, but is being requested by letter from the Overseas Military Forces in Canada."

1. Has the Government received the information necessary to reply to these questions?

2. If so, what are the replies to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4?

3. Just prior to the granting of Colonel Bradbury's pension, did he write the Pension Commissioner asking for a special medical board?

4. If so, in said letter did Colonel Bradbury state that he would prefer a medical board in Montreal?

5. What was the purport of that letter?

6. What pension was granted Colonel Bradbury?

7. For how long was the pension paid Colonel Bradbury?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. Lt.-Colonel Bradbury, after his Battalion (the 108th) was depleted and utilized as reinforcements for the Canadian Corps on the field, made a two week's tour of instruction in France.

3. No such letter received by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

6. Colonel Bradbury was orginally awarded a Class eleven pension at the rate of $780 per annum. After medical re-examination on April 26, 1918, this was amended to a Class six pension at the rate of $1,170 per annum.

7. The only payments of pension made were at the rate of $780 per annum for the period February 2, 1918, to March 31, 1918. Total amount paid was $69. A further cheque mailed to Colonel Bradbury was returned to the Board of Pension Commissioners with the following letter:

Ottawa, December 12, 1918.

The Board of Pension Commissioners,
Ottawa.

Gentlemen,

Yours of the 9th containing cheque No. C. 68,195, drawn in my favour for $455.00 is received this morning, I may say I was amazed to receive this cheque as I wrote you on November 11th, nearly a month ago, a few days after the armistice was signed, informing you that I had intended to use any pension money

coming to me for the benefit of my Ladies' Auxiliary in connection with the 108th Battallion, but that now that peace was at hand, the Auxiliary's efforts would likely cease, informing you that I had no desire to receive any pension.

The fact is I never sought a pension in the first place, it came to me by being boarded as a Colonel on leave. I now desire to emphasize what I stated in my former letter that I have no desire to receive this pension money. You will find enclosed the cheque with "Refused" written across the face of it. I trust this will be definite and final.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd) Geo. H. Bradbury.

MISLAID FILES—CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. HAROLD:

1. Where the records of members of the C.E.F. have been mislaid or lost through no fault of such members, is the Government aware that such soldiers are on that account being unduly detained overseas?

2. If so, does the Government propose to remedy this cause of delay?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many men of military age who registered as being in class 1 under the Military Service Act, 1917, applied for exemption from military service in each of the nine provinces of Canada?

2. How many of these applications were granted in each of the nine provinces?

3. How many of these applications were refused in each of the nine provinces?

4. How many of these applications were pending, in appeal or otherwise undecided on November 11, 1918, in each of the nine provinces?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Alberta	25,389
British Columbia	15,075
Manitoba	20,124
New Brunswick	15,553
Nova Scotia	23,556
Ontario	116,092
Prince Edward Island	4,231
Quebec	113,291
Saskatchewan	43,318
2. Alberta	17,934
British Columbia	8,473
Manitoba	10,102
New Brunswick	8,225
Nova Scotia	14,689
Ontario	65,089
Prince Edward Island	2,631
Quebec	58,644
Saskatchewan	30,440
3. Alberta	7,306
British Columbia	6,414
Manitoba	9,372
New Brunswick	7,092
Nova Scotia	8,210
Ontario	42,366
Prince Edward Island	1,572
Quebec	51,856
Saskatchewan	12,450

Note.—Many thousands of these exemptions granted for limited periods of time were under review by registrars on November 11, 1918.

Note.—These figures are inclusive of cancelled exemptions of the 20-22 Class, and also of some exempted men who voluntarily reported for duty before their exemptions expired.

4. Alberta	149
British Columbia	188
Manitoba	650
New Brunswick	236
Nova Scotia	657
Ontario	8,637
Prince Edward Island	28
Quebec	2,791
Saskatchewan	428

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the Government any information concerning the number of men in each of the nine provinces of Canada who refused or neglected to register as being in Class 1 under the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. If so, what is the exact number for each of the nine provinces of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The only information this department has relative to the number of Group 1 defaulters, i.e., those who refused or neglected to register as being within Class 1 under the Military Service Act, consists in the number of such men who have been apprehended, taken on and kept on military strength, which number is given in Hansard (unrevised), page 784, in reply to a question by Mr. Tobin.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many men of military age who registered as being Class 1 under the Military Service Act, 1917, were ordered to report for military service from each of the nine provinces of Canada?

2. How many of the said men had reported for military service on or before November 11, 1918?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The following numbers of Class 1 registrants were either ordered to report or reported in advance of their orders:—

Alberta	9,310
British Columbia	7,162
Manitoba	9,470
New Brunswick	6,661
Nova Scotia	7,977
Ontario	44,796
Prince Edward Island	1,121
Quebec	46,104
Saskatchewan	11,079

2. Of the above the following numbers had reported for military service on or before November 11, 1918:—

Alberta	7,870
British Columbia	6,417
Manitoba	9,044
New Brunswick	6,069
Nova Scotia	6,643
Ontario	40,637
Prince Edward Island	1,082
Quebec	27,277
Saskatchewan	10,016

Mr. TOBIN:

What is the meaning of the words "defaulters on strength" used in the answer given to my question concerning the Military Service Act, 1917, on Monday, March 24, 1919?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The expression "defaulters on strength," occurring on page 784 of Hansard (unrevised) refers to those men of Class 1 age and description who failed to register under the Military Service Act, who were apprehended by the police or who surrendered, and who, being found upon medical examination to be of sufficiently high medical category, were taken and kept on the military strength of various C. E. F. units. The expression referred to, i.e., "Draft 1 defaulters on strength" should read "Group 1 defaulters on strength."

SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is the Right Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick entitled to a pension as a retired judge? If so, what would be the amount of his pension per annum?

2. Has he been receiving and accepting such pension since his appointment as Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec?

3. Are there any retired judges receiving from the Crown other moneys than their pension moneys? If so, what are their names?

4. Have any of the retired judges, receiving from the Crown other moneys than pension moneys, remitted or declined to accept the whole or part of either moneys since the outbreak of the war? If so, who are they?

5. Has the Government under consideration the question of discontinuing the payment to judges retired on the ground of ill-health, besides their pension moneys when receiving any other moneys as salary, emoluments or fees for work performed for the Crown and requiring as much physical and mental capacity and activity as in the discharge of their official duties on the bench?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes, $6,666.67.

2. No. He has renounced the same during the term of his office as Lieutenant Governor.

3. No information.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. How many contracts given by the Government at the beginning of the war for war supplies or equipment were investigated into by the Davidson Commission?

2. What were the findings of the Commission upon each?

3. If any showed excessive profits made by individuals or companies, what action has the Government taken to recover such amounts considered as excessive profits by the said Commission?

4. If the Government has not yet taken any action to recover such amount, does it propose to take some in the near future?

Mr. PROULX:

1. What amount was paid to J. S. Wilson, of Hanover, Registrar for South East Grey, in connection with the Dominion Registration in June, 1918?

2. What are the names of the Deputy Registrars and their assistants who received payment for services in connection with the Dominion Registration of June, 1918, in the County of South East Grey, Ont?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many men enlisted under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, in each of the nine provinces of Canada had been sent or were on their way overseas on November 11, 1918?

2. How many men enlisted under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, in each of the nine provinces of Canada had been sent or had left their respective training barracks to be sent to Siberia on November 11, 1918?

Mr. DUFF:

1. Is Major Charles Gordon, of Winnipeg, still in the Canadian Military Service?

2. If so, what are his duties?

3. Where is he at the present time?

4. What amount of remuneration has he received since August, 1914, as salary and expenses, respectively?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

WEDNESDAY SITTINGS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That on Wednesday, the 9th April, and on all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the Session, the House shall meet at Three o'clock, p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I would suggest to my hon. friend that this motion be amended so as not to become operative until after the Easter holidays.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows how difficult it is for the Government to refuse any request of his. I have therefore much pleasure in amending the motion to read:

That on Wednesday, the 23rd April, and on all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the Session, the House shall meet at Three o'clock, p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days.

Motion as amended agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That after Wednesday, the 16th day of April, Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays until the end of the session over all business except questions by members and Notices of Motion for the production of Papers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister when the Easter holidays will begin?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I announced yesterday that I should move that the House would adjourn at six o'clock on the Thursday before Easter and re-assemble on the following Tuesday.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not make this include Wednesday, the 23rd? It would mean just one more day and would give hon. members an opportunity to finish any work they might have on hand.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No; let us get through.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSORSHIP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): There is a despatch in this morning's paper to the effect that the British censorship will cease on the 30th of the present month. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if it is the intention to put an end to Canadian censorship on the same date?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: While the matter of censorship regulations has been under consideration, I have no official announcement to make on the subject at the present time.

U. S. COASTING TRADE—CANADIAN VESSELS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if the attention of the Government has been directed to the fact that the American authorities have discontinued the practice of granting licenses to Canadian vessels to engage in coasting trade within the United States, and, if so, what steps the Government are taking in the matter?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yesterday the hon. member for Kingston was good enough to transmit to me a telegram from one of the officials of the Dominion Marine Association indicating that licenses had been refused permitting Canadian steamers to engage in the coasting trade in the United States. In order that I might learn the actual facts I immediately transmitted to the proper authorities at Washington the following message:

Ottawa, April 2, 1919.

Chairman, United States Shipping Board,
Washington, D.C.

Will be obliged if you will inform me officially by wire of reasons why applications made by Canada Steamship Lines for permission Canadian steamers "J. H. G. Haggarty" and "W. Grant Morden" engage in United States coasting trade Great Lakes refused.

Deputy Minister Marine.

The department has not yet received any reply to this communication. If it should transpire that Canadian shipping has been refused permission to engage in the coasting trade of the United States, it will be quite proper for Canada to immediately cancel the like privileges granted to American shipping in Canadian waters.

CREDIT TO ROUMANIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (Waterloo North): It was announced some time ago that the Government had arranged a credit of twenty-five million dollars to Roumania. I see according to the press that that country is again at war, and a despatch seems to indicate that there is a probability of its coming under the rule of Bolshevism. As we know, Bolshevism means the repudiation of national obligations, and under these circumstances is it intended to proceed with the granting of that credit?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Finance): No financial obligations will be incurred by Canada in the granting of credits to Roumania until the Government is fully satisfied that political conditions there will justify such action.

CANADIANS ENTERING THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Canadians entering the United States are assessed a certain sum of money which is placed on

deposit as a guarantee that they will return to Canada. A number of Canadians are not acquainted with this rule and find it difficult to raise the money on short notice. Is a similar custom in force in Canada applying to people coming into this country?

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): The American authorities demand from every person entering the United States a head tax of eight dollars, but Canadians returning to this country have that amount refunded to them. There is no similar provision in our law at the present time.

ADVANCES FOR THE PURCHASE OF SEED GRAIN.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of Interior) Bill No. 24 respecting advances for the purchase of Seed Grain was read the third time.

BRONZE COINS—CURRENCY ACT, 1910, AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 25 to amend the Currency Act, 1910, was read the third time.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORT OF GOLD.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 27 to provide for the continuance in force of a certain proclamation made under the Finance Act, 1914, and to authorize the Prohibition of the Export of Gold was read the third time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Dominion Lands Act, chapter twenty of the statutes of 1908, and to increase the rate of interest charged by the Dominion upon deferred payment of money due to the Crown in the right of Canada, for the sale, lease, or other disposition of natural resources under the provisions of the said Act.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: By amendment to the Dominion Lands Act of last session the rate of interest on school lands was increased from five to six per cent, with provision for seven per cent to be charged upon arrears. The seven per cent chargeable upon arrears applies to past as well as to future sales. The purpose of this amendment is to make the same rates apply to all cases of sales of natural resources, and particularly to arrears due the Crown in respect of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads. The amendment will have application to all sales of course that it is within the power of the Governor in Council to make of the natural resources of the Dominion. The object is to, if possible, correct an abuse which is all too prevalent at the present time—that is to say, of purchasers of lands from the Crown and of other resources as well, but chiefly lands, financing upon the Dominion, inasmuch as our rate of interest has been far below that ordinarily obtaining in the locality.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it proposed to extend the operation of the Act to other natural resources besides lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act as amended last session added to the rate of interest in sales of school lands in the way I have described. This resolution is to make the same addition to the rate of interest upon the same principle, apply to all sales of natural resources.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there a fixed rate of interest now, and if so what will the increase be?

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to amend the Railway Belt Act.
An Act to amend the Yukon Act.
An Act to amend the Statistics Act.
An Act to authorize a further extension of time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Gagetown and Westfield.
An Act to amend the Representation Act.
An Act to authorize the Reclamation of Dominion Lands by drainage.
An Act respecting the Units of Electrical Measure.
An Act to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.
An Act to amend the Irrigation Act.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1920.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed consideration in Committee of the Whole of the resolution providing for the amendment of the Dominion Lands Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Leader of the Opposition was asking whether the rate is now fixed. The answer is yes, it is fixed at 5 per cent. That is where the trouble comes in; it is too much below the normal commercial rate.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does this amendment give the hon. minister discretion to use his own judgment as to what the rate should be?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The resolution would indicate that, but the Bill itself fixes the rate.

Mr. VIEN: Will it affect deferred payments due by a debtor whose obligations were contracted with the Government before the enactment of this new law?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the passage of the Act will not affect any obligation that now exists either to increase or diminish such obligation; but after the rate is fixed for arrears, and the contract is already in existence, our procedure will be to notify the man that he must undertake to pay the rate fixed by statute on arrears in future, and if he does not do so then we shall have to consider whether or not it would be in the public interest to cancel his sale.

Mr. VIEN: I note that the resolution says, "or other disposition of natural resources." Are there any other natural resources than Dominion lands to which this amendment will apply?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the section covers such natural resources as mining, grazing, or timber limits. There is a general clause in the Act which refers to the disposition of other resources, and the interest rate is fixed there. This is to change the interest rate in that clause.

Mr. HAY: Does this refer to homestead lands held by the Government at the present time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it must refer to lands that we own, but it does not enable the Government to sell anything that we have not the right now to sell. This clause is intended to cover more particularly homesteads, where men have been only too prone to allow their payments due to the Crown to run into arrear and to pay their other debts first. This allows the rate of interest in future to be fixed at 6 per cent instead of 5 on deferred payments, and on arrears at 7 per cent.

Resolution reported.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

BILL TO APPOINT A RECEIVER.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 28, to confirm two Orders of the Governor General in Council respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Orders in Council 7th and 13th March, 1919, confirmed:

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): Mr. Chairman, it is highly regrettable that this Bill, confirming the Orders in Council putting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System under a receivership, should be proceeded with in the absence of a decision on the part of the Government as to what our future railway policy is to be. It is also to be regretted that the Government thought it advisable to take any step which would have the effect of causing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to cease operating that portion of their system which is called the Grand Trunk Pacific. A more democratic and a more constitutional way of dealing with this matter would have been to bring it before Parliament and to examine into it carefully before taking any such important step as is now under consideration.

The people of Canada at large and this Parliament in particular have not been fully seized of all that is involved in the nationalization of the Grand Trunk Pacific and consequently, of the Grand Trunk Railway system; nor have they had opportunity of studying the matter carefully. Last year, during the session of Parliament, it was announced by the Prime Minister, in answer to a question put by this side of the House, that pourparlers or negotiations were in progress between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company concerning the sale to the Government or the nationalization of the two systems. When we inquired as to the policy of the Government in this matter, the Prime Minister said that it would not be in the public interest to advise the House and the country of the nature of negotiations which were under way. Notwithstanding that, however, the Government have committed the country to a definite policy

which they have consistently carried out—because they had absolutely made up their minds at that time to expropriate the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. How did they do it? First, they refused to agree to the proposal made by the two companies; they did not agree as to the amount to be paid.

We all agree that the Government should oblige the Grand Trunk Railway Company to live up to all its obligations. The Government should not allow the country to undertake all the obligations of that company. But, as I say, the Government had made up their minds to take over the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, although they would not let the House know under what conditions they intended doing so.

The Acting Prime Minister gave the House the other day the first comprehensive information that we have received since the beginning of the negotiations. He read at length various letters which passed between the Government and the company. He gave the House full details of the difficulties which the Government had met in attempting to reach an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We now know that that company, which in 1903 or 1904 had entered into an agreement with the Government for the building of the section of the Transcontinental from Winnipeg to the coast, could not live up to their obligations on account of various difficulties which had arisen between them and the Government in the carrying out of the original scheme. Under the original scheme the Government was to build the section of the Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company was to build the section between Winnipeg and the Pacific coast. This new undertaking was to be called the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, its shares being entirely in the hands of the Grand Trunk.

At various stages of the operations carried on under the agreements of 1903 and 1904, difficulties arose between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as regards the building by the Government of the Transcontinental railway. For instance, in 1912, 1914 and 1915, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company advised the Government that the changes which had been made by the Government in the construction of that section of the road which the Grand Trunk Railway Company was ultimately to lease from the Government, would render it impossible for the company to take over the National Transcontinental, and to live up to the obligations undertaken under the agreements of 1903 and 1904. May I speak more plainly what is in my mind? Under the agreements of 1903 and 1904, the Government was to build that section of the road which extends from Moncton to Winnipeg according to certain specifications, plans and details which had been agreed on between the Government and the company. Subsequently, particularly after 1911, when the change of Government took place, the Government took upon itself, through the Department of Railways and Canals, (because at that time the Transcontinental Railway Commission had been superseded by the Minister of Railways and Canals), to change, without the approval of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, not only the grading but the specifications and the terminals of the railway. The Government, therefore, did not live up to the agreements of 1903 and 1904, and by so doing gave to the company the right to refuse later on to take over the National Transcontinental railway.

The House is now in possession of the correspondence exchanged between the Government and the company. In 1912 the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company stated clearly to the Government that any change in the grading or in the specification of the railway would put that company in an impossible position because they would not be able to take a lease of the Transcontinental railway as per the agreement of 1903. The Government did not take any notice of this formal protest by the company, but went on changing the grading in such a manner that the Transcontinental railway would not have for the company the same usefulness. Some time after, when the Government had completed the construction of the Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, the Government offered to the company a lease of the Transcontinental railway. That offer was flatly refused. I have not been able to put my hand on the document by which the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company declined to take over the National Transcontinental on the conditions of the agreement of 1903, but from my recollection of that document, I think I can cite the three main reasons advanced by the company for declining to live up to the agreement.

The reasons were, first, because the cost of the railway had been greatly in excess

of what had been provided for by the agreement; second, because the grad-
4 p.m. ing of the railway had been changed without the authorization of the company, and third, that many changes had been introduced by the Government in the terminals of the railway particularly in Quebec and other big centres where expensive terminals had been built. The Government having failed to obtain the company's consent to such changes, the company considered it was relieved of all its obligations as regards the National Transcontinental railway. At that time the Government apparently admitted the contentions of the company because they did not compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to live up to the agreement of 1903. If in the opinion of the Government the contentions of the company were without any foundation, it seems only reasonable that the Government should have forced the company to live up to their agreement and to lease the National Transcontinental railway. The Government, however, did no such thing and, therefore, impliedly admitted the contentions of the company. So far from compelling the company to lease the National Transcontinental railway, the Government put that railway under the jurisdiction of the board which then had the management of the Canadian Government railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To what company does the hon. gentleman refer that should have been compelled to lease the National Transcontinental?

Mr. VIEN: According to the agreement of 1903 the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should have been compelled to lease that section of the road which had been built by the Government from Moncton to Winnipeg. That would amount to the same thing as compelling the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself to live up to their agreement, because we know that all the shares of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are in the treasury of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I think I am right in saying that according to the agreement of 1903 the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was bound to take over under a lease that section of the road which had been built by the Government. The Government have impliedly admitted the contentions of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. They have taken over the National Transcontinental railway from Moncton to Winnipeg; they have connected it up with the Canadian Government railway system and they are continuing to operate it as a Government railway.

What was the effect of the Government's failure to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to live up to the agreement of 1903? The effect was, first, impliedly to admit the company's contention that it had no further obligations in respect of the National Transcontinental. Secondly, the effect was to deprive the Grand Trunk Pacific of a very important part of its transcontinental system. The National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific were built for the purpose of establishing a second transcontinental railway in Canada. That transcontinental system could not exist except as a whole; that is, the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The taking over of the Transcontinental left the Grand Trunk Pacific without any connecting link with its own system, which extended from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, and naturally the Grand Trunk refused to admit any further obligations in respect of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific which it had guaranteed. Then what happened? The Grand Trunk Pacific Company advised the Government that as they had been deprived of their connecting link they could not meet their obligations. Again the Government advanced money to the Grand Trunk Pacific, impliedly admitting the contention of the company that it could not continue to operate without the National Transcontinental, and admitting also that the Government had a certain responsibility in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Then what happens? The Government, seeing that it would be compelled to vote money year after year to make up the deficit in the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, immediately opened negotiations for the expropriation of both the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Government was in negotiation with the company last year, but would not disclose to this House or to the Canadian people the exact nature of those negotiations. When, however, it became imperative for the Government to advance further moneys to meet the interest on the bonds, the Government, after the opening of the present session, and without apprising Parliament of the condition of affairs, made up their minds to threaten the company They said to the company: "We will not ask Parliament to vote any further advances so long as the negotiations between the company and the Government remain in

their present unsatisfactory condition." That was a threat, designed to bring the company into such a position that it would be bound hand and foot to the Government. The company replied: "We will cease to operate that section of the road extending from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast." What did that declaration amount to? It was tantamount to saying: "We have a section of the road which does not pay, and therefore we are going to close it up." As the company had refused to take over the National Transcontinental, and as it owned the entire stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that section of the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast was simply a branch line of the Grand Trunk Railway system; there was no difference whatever between that section of the road and a branch line of the Grand Trunk system. The company therefore said to the Government: "As you will not subsidize our branch line from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, we will close it." Now, if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to find one morning that one of its branch lines was not a paying proposition, would it not be perfectly right for it to say that it would close that branch line? I submit that the Government had absolutely no right to compel either the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate that section of the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, until the company had defaulted in paying the interest on its bonds. We know from the information laid on the Table that neither the Grand Trunk nor the Grand Trunk Pacific had defaulted in their interest payments. But when the company said to the Government: "We will cease to operate that section of the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast," the Government said, "Then we will put the road in the hands of a receiver, under the authority of the War Measures Act."

We all agree on the principle that Canada should not take over the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. We all agree that the Grand Trunk itself should not be relieved of its obligation in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was the policy of the Government not to relieve either the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific of their obligations. Yet I contend that, at law, the Government has done exactly what it intended to avoid. I contend that the action of the Government has absolutely relieved the Grand Trunk Railway Company of its obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I contend that the Government's action was the last step in impliedly admitting the contentions of the company in respect of the agreement of 1903.

Let us consider the action of the Government when they were informed that the Company would cease its operation of that section of the line. Did they compel the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway Company to meet their obligations? No. They could not do so because the companies were not in default; and under the provisions of the Winding-up Act they could take no steps for the same reason, that the company had fulfilled all its obligations. Instead, they invoked the authority of the War Measures Act and forcibly took over that section of the road extending from Winnipeg to the coast; and in order to establish that point clearly we need only read the first paragraph of the Order in Council, which says:

> Re—Grand Trunk Receivership.
>
> Provisions of Order in Council.
>
> (1) Order recites that the continued operation of the G.T.P. System is essential in the present position of Canada resulting from the war, especially in connection with the transport of returning Canadian troops and of supplies, equipment and freight, and that the duty of continuing such operation is thrown upon the Government of Canada inasmuch as there are no effective provisions in the existing laws whereby such continued operation could be otherwise secured and that therefore immediate action is imperative.

In that first paragraph the Government admit that the company has fulfilled all its legal obligations, while the paragraph is also an admission that there was no other course open to the Government than to proceed under the War Measures Act. But I unhesitatingly say that it was never the intention when the Act was passed to allow them to forcibly take the railway, and I am of opinion that taking over that section of the road by virtue of that Act is tantamount to an expropriation of it by the Government. If, then, it is an expropriation, surely the Government is liable for compensation just as much as they would be if they took a house or a farm, or any other property for a public work. There is an Expropriation Act under which the Government could have taken over that section of the road. They did not elect to proceed under that Act. But under the terms of the Order in Council which I have just read, their action amounts to an expropriation, and in doing so the Government incurred the obligation to compensate the company for the forcible taking of their property. Now, I hardly think the Government could very well act more imprudently. If they did

not desire to advance any further moneys for the purposes of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—which might be an advisable and even a commendable policy—they should at least have waited until the Grand Trunk Railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was in default. Had they done so, the Government would then have had a legal right to wind up the company and put it into receivership. They did not do so, but from the very beginning of their negotiations with the company the Government have impliedly admitted the contention of the company that they had no further obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and have virtually relieved them of all such obligations. I believe that the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have a good case at law and can meet the contentions of the Government and repudiate their obligations by the argument, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company having been forcibly expropriated under the War Measures Act, they are now relieved of any responsibility in connection with that railway. The Government should they decide to forcibly take not only the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway but also the parent company, will be obliged to pay a compensation to the Grand Trunk Railway Company which will be calculated, without taking into account its obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I want to be clear on that point. At law the Grand Trunk Railway Company will contend that it is relieved of its obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; and the Government if they take over the Grand Trunk Railway Company will have to pay the price. And in calculating the assets they will not be able to put by way of set-off the obligations of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

I think it is a matter for very much regret that the Government did not see its way clear to take Parliament into its confidence, particularly when Parliament was in session, before taking an important step that will undoubtedly mean a heavy responsibility, financial and otherwise, on the shoulders of the people of this country. It is regrettable that they did not consult Parliament in the matter, and that they did not wait until the Grand Trunk Railway Company were in default before relieving it, as they have virtually done by their Order in Council, of all obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

[Mr. Vien.]

It is true that the Government says in its Order in Council that it takes over that railway without incurring any responsibility in connection with its operation, but surely, Sir, regard must be paid to the general underlying principle that we cannot forcibly take over a property without first justly and fairly indemnifying the owner. Whatever the Government might say in its Order in Council as to declining to assume any responsibility due to the forcible taking over of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, surely in accordance with common law and the dictates of common sense, it will have to indemnify the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies for the property so forcibly taken. Moreover, the Grand Trunk Railway Company can now say: You have taken one of our branch lines. In so doing you have undertaken all the obligations of operating this branch line, and we are relieved of our obligations in respect of it. I say, Sir, I would be very much surprised indeed if the law courts, and the highest legal tribunals, did not maintain such a contention. Therefore I say that before committing the country to such an important policy as the forcible taking over of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, Parliament should have been consulted, and the Government should have made a careful study of the subject in consultation with it. It would have been a more democratic and constitutional way of dealing with the question.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): It is not my intention to attempt any reply to the points that my hon. friend from Lotbinière has attempted to make in connection with this question. The members of the Government will be able to make that answer, and I think they will not find it an exceedingly difficult task.

I wish to say at the outset that if the opinion which the hon. gentleman has expressed on railway questions, and particularly in reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk, is shared by his friends who sit on that side of the House, and by any very large number of the people of Canada, God help the country. If there is one question—

Mr. CAHILL: Might I ask the hon. member if he is in favour of relieving the Grand Trunk of their obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? That is the point the hon. member for Lotbinière was making.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. member for Lotbinière was blaming the Govern-

ment for insisting that the Grand Trunk should live up to its obligations.

Mr. VIEN: No.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is what I understood.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. gentleman says that if members on this side of the House share my views in respect to the policy that should be followed as to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, " God help the country."

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, and I repeat the statement.

Mr. VIEN: What view has the hon. gentleman particularly in mind that causes him to say that? On what expression of views by me does he base that statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the hon. gentleman will just allow me, I hope to be able to make myself and my position perfectly clear and I hope to present facts to the hon. gentleman that will satisfy him that he is entirely wrong in his attitude on this question. What course could the Government pursue but take over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway—when the Grand Trunk threw it on their hands and refused to operate it?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We are only taking the Grand Trunk Pacific railway as receiver.

Mr. BUREAU: They might have given it bonuses as they did the Canadian Northern.

Mr. RICHARDSON: But the Grand Trunk Pacific was in an entirely different position; it was thrown on the hands of the Government. Had the Government refused to act as it did, what would have been the position? That vast country in the West, depending on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway,—because it has a very large mileage throughout that territory,—would have been absolutely deprived of any railway accommodation whatever. I am not here to defend the Government especially, but it seems to me it had no option in the matter; it did the only possible thing it could do. Had the Government refused to appoint a receiver, under the War Measures Act, the position to-day would have been one of chaos, and my hon. friend from Lotbiniere would probably have been denouncing the Government in the strongest possible language for permitting such a state of affairs.

Mr. VIEN: Not in the least.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It was a case of " You will and you won't, you shall and you shan't; you'll be damned if you do, and you'll be damned if you don't." That was the situation, and the Government was obliged to do something. My hon. friend from Lotbinière says that as a result of its action the Government has probably given the Grand Trunk a legal hold, probably a stranglehold, on it, but this Parliament is supreme. It represents the people of Canada, and can correct any situation at will.

Mr. VIEN: Parliament was not consulted.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Never mind, the Government had to act hastily and without the opportunity of consulting Parliament. I think that when the people of this country get through their brains what this railway problem means, they will see that the Government and Parliament do the right thing by them in regard to the railroad question. Does my hon. friend not know that the party with which he is associated, in order to solve the transportation problem as they put it, loaded this country with a debt of one billion—just a round billion—in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railways? They brought about a state of chaos, the like of which Dante could scarcely describe. Now that is the position we are in at the present time.

Mr. BUREAU: Will you itemize the billion?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was struck the other day by a statement in a speech delivered by the Hon. George P. Graham, who was Minister of Railways, when my hon. friends opposite were in office, upon accepting a nomination in Essex county. That gentleman said: " If you will put us back we will resort to those Liberal principles that made Canada such a great nation after 1896."

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In using the expression " Liberal principles " he must have meant " Opulent principles," because the Liberals spent money like drunken sailors on the railways, and did nothing but hopelessly tangle up the situation, as I shall prove before I conclude my speech. If that is what Mr. Graham meant by Liberalism I entirely agree with him.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps at this stage matters can be cleared up if I ask the hon. gentleman, does he say that this road should not have been built?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Decidedly it should not have been built. Sir Robert Borden was

opposed to the building of this railroad and proposed as an alternative the double tracking of the C.P.R. around Lake Superior with running rights to other lines. That was the correct policy. I think it was the most insane policy that was ever entered into by a free people, and I think that can be demonstrated. The construction of the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific railways represent the fastening of a debt of a billion of dollars on this country, because we now have to take those roads over. There is no use in my hon. friend from Lotbinière, and other gentlemen, saying: "The Government is going in for public ownership, and God help the country when it adopts that policy." The Government cannot help itself. These railway children are unloaded on the Government as a result of the policy of the so-called Liberal party in 1896. I would like to, and perhaps later on I shall, give a brief sketch of the inauguration of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental railway projects, because, as hon. gentlemen know, the Canadian Pacific Railway had had the monopoly in the West up to a certain date. In the early days the Canadian Pacific Railway was very arrogant, sometimes insolent, although the people of Canada, let me tell my hon. friend from Lotbinière, gave to that company enough money, in cash and donations of one kind and another, to build and equip the road two or three times over. I want the hon. gentleman to rivet that fact upon his mind —the people of Canada gave, in cash and other donations, enough to build and equip the road two or three times over.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman detail the amounts?

Mr. BUREAU: Did not the Canadian Pacific Railway give value for what it got?

Mr. RICHARDSON: In answer to my hon. friend from Lothbinière, I cannot give the exact amount of the several subsidies offhand, but I have the information in my desk and am willing to go into details with him. I certainly do not overstate the facts; they are as I have told you. I freely acknowledge that the Canadian Pacific railway is a well managed and a courteously conducted railway to-day. But in the old days they were very domineering and dictatorial to the people of the West, and they swaggered about that country just as if they owned it. When the so-called Liberal Government got into office they undertook to solve the transportation problem by supplying a competing railroad. Now, competition is not desirable even if it is possible; and it is not possible even if it is desirable. If the Canadian Pacific had been taken over by the country as it should have been—because I believe in public ownership if properly administered; there is no reason why we cannot get men to run transportation companies as well as private corporations can—I repeat that if the Canadian Pacific had been taken over by the people in the early days, properly operated and branch lines built to accommodate the settlers where necessary, it would have developed that country and would have furnished the people of the West with the railroad transportation that was necessary, instead of which, as my hon. friend knows and as the members of this House know, subventions in land were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to other railway companies, and those lands were held by those companies in order that they might profit by the unearned increment, by the settlement in that country of a large population. Those companies did not sell their land holdings, and the result was that the settlers were obliged to move off ten, fifteen and twenty miles from the railway lines, instead of occupying these rich railway lands that were available for settlement. The result was that the people there almost reached a state of armed rebellion in one case, for they did not want that kind of policy. Thereupon the friends of my hon. friend undertook to "solve" the question, and they talked with indescribable foolishness about the whole proposition. They said: "If you endow another great railway corporation and let them into the West, then that will help solve the problem." The outcome of that talk was the contract with the Grand Trunk for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Transcontinental. While I think of it, let me tell my hon. friend this fact—and I want him to put a pin in the argument and just keep it there, because it is the crux of the whole thing—it was not the Government of Canada that forced the Grand Trunk to build the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Transcontinental; the Government of Canada had nothing to do with it; it was the directors of the Grand Trunk, lead by the late Charles M. Hays, the Grand Trunk president, that forced this contract on the people, and if by virtue of this contract we find this state of chaos at the present time, and that the Grand Trunk has piled up this enormous debt on the coun-

try, why should we come to the rescue of the Grand Trunk?

Mr. VIEN: We are all agreed on that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am delighted to know that my hon. friend agrees with me on that point, because I did not so understand him; I thought he was arguing that the Grand Trunk had got a legal grip. I must tell my hon. friend that neither he nor his friends will ever get into office by defending these corporation tactics, and that it is high time that the people's representatives took a right position on questions of this kind. The people of Canada have been swindled in the most appalling style for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and our politicians on both sides of the House are almost equally to blame—there is a frank confession. But, in the name of all that is sensible, has not the time come when we should put an end to it? Let the Grand Trunk live up to its obligations. Why should we come to the rescue of the Grand Trunk at the present time? They got themselves into the difficulty; let them get out of it the best way they can.

Mr. VIEN: But you have come to the rescue by the Order in Council.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend having interrupted me, will he tell me in a word what should have been done?

Mr. VIEN: I said it was only necessary to wait until they were in default, and they would have been in default in a very few days.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, but let me inform my hon. friend again that not only were they in default, but they notified the Government: "Take the road; we cannot operate it any longer."

Mr. VIEN: They did not say any such thing. The hon. member will not find anything in the papers to substantiate his statement.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I appeal to the hon. leader of the Government whether the Grand Trunk did not say that they would cease to operate. What does that mean?

Mr. VIEN: They closed a branch line.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Oh, they closed a branch line! No wonder the Acting Prime Minister laughs, as everybody in this House must laugh who knows the facts. What is closing down the road but ceasing to operate? Why, of course it is.

Mr. VIEN: Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend is somewhat younger than I am and I am going to give him a little advice. When you undertake to criticise a policy, you are in duty bound to propose an alternative. If the Government had not done this, just the state of affairs that I have already described would have existed, and my hon. friend and the other members of the Opposition would have been railing at the Government about the outrage perpetrated on the West, of allowing the Grand Trunk Pacific to cease operation. And what sort of situation would we have had in the West where this line serves the people? It would have been indescribable. There was absolutely no other course for the Government to take.

But my hon. friend must know, and his friends must know, that they have been guilty of bringing about a highly disturbing state of affairs in this country, and we are to-day faced with difficulties that I would hardly like to describe. This railroad question is almost of as great, if not as great, importance as the tariff, because it means so much to the people, and we are so tangled up at the present time with its intricacies that I do not know how we are going to evolve ourselves from the difficulty. It will take the Government all its time to pilot the ship through the rough waters created by our railroad policy, and unless there is some criticism that should properly be directed towards the Government, I do not know that anything of the tenor offered by my hon. friend from Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) ought to be indulged in this afternoon.

Before the hon. gentleman spoke I had my notes prepared, and I proposed to go into this question very fully. I was going to criticise the Government somewhat, for its failure, through the Acting Prime Minister to speak out in as plain Anglo-Saxon as I think the circumstances of the case demand, because although I was not in the House—unfortunately I was sent for last week and did not hear what my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister said—but in reading the papers I gathered the impression that he said, "We want to treat the Grand Trunk with fairness if not with generosity. We must be pretty fair to them." Now, it seems to me that the position is not one of generosity at all, it is one of simple justice, and this country may just as well understand now as later that it cannot any longer afford to be generous. It has been too generous—generous with the railway exploiters and promoters to the extent

that has almost involved the country in disaster. The time for generosity is past. The Grand Trunk is not entitled to generosity, because its own financial management got the country into this difficulty. Let it take the consequences, whatever the consequences are, instead of railing at the Government. I should think that if the members of the Opposition desired to stand right with this country they would, like me, be demanding that the Government should make the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific toe the mark. That is the only kind of policy that will appeal to the people of this country; no other policy, I think, should be tolerated.

Now, I intended at the outset to refer to what I regard as a press conspiracy in this country to try and do the work which my hon. friend from Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) was attempting to do, to help the Grand Trunk inferentially at the expense of the public. I have three or four newspaper clippings here. Perhaps I should first refer to the financial papers. With one or two honourable exceptions, the financial papers that derive their living from the corporations are, of course, disposed to excuse and to help the Grand Trunk—we might expect that. But to have a string of newspapers in this country pursuing a similar policy is very disturbing to the people and must be very distressing to the Acting Prime Minister. I assume that the Acting Prime Minister is going to stand absolutely by the people and by his duty, and until I find him taking another position I propose to give him my confidence.

Here is the Montreal Gazette, a virulent opponent of public ownership. It is all very well to oppose public ownership by pointing to the Intercolonial and saying: "The Lord forbid; let us have no more public ownership." But the Intercolonial was built—begun decades ago—as a condition of Confederation. It was not run as a commercial enterprise. It tapped this place and that place; it ran along around the coast; it was designed to cement the Maritime Provinces together and to weld that part of the country to the rest of Canada. Many things were done that should not have been done; we have had political management of that road and it has not been good. But let me tell my hon. friend that until recent years the people of the Maritime Provinces had their freight carried at one-quarter the rates prevailing on privately-owned railways. Had the rates prevailed on the Intercolonial that prevailed on other lines, I believe that the Intercolonial would have paid. It has been making ends meet; occasionally it has had a little deficit and occasionally a surplus. So that it is not quite to the point to refer to the Intercolonial, hold up our hands in horror and say that we must not have public ownership.

When the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook to make this deal with the Grand Trunk, Sir Wilfrid himself said that public ownership was a dangerous fad and should be avoided; that our railways should be built by private enterprise. And that marvellous man, Clifford Sifton, who always looked like a sphinx and went about with his mind absolutely concealed, giving the impression that there was a reservoir of deep wisdom in his cranium, went out into his constituency and denounced public ownership in the strongest terms. He even said: "I do not want anybody who believes in public ownership to vote for me."

Mr. VIEN: Does the hon. gentleman wish to be complimentary to Clifford Sifton?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I give my hon. friend credit for sufficient intelligence to place his own interpretation on my words.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend may be sarcastic.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I may tell my hon. friend en passant that I ran against Clifford Sifton that time and I had him pretty well beaten up to a night or two before the election; but the "Liberal" emissaries spread over the constituency like a miasma, and it took me all my time to make a decent showing at the polls.

Mr. MURPHY: The overseas vote came in.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The point I wish to make is this: even as prominent a man as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and as great a bluff as Clifford Sifton utterly ignored what history showed that the nations of the world had accomplished. I dislike quoting Germany in this House; everybody dislikes Germany so that I mention the name under my breath. But Germany's railroads are owned by the State, and were a great success. Hungary owns its own railroads, or most of them. Italy owns most of her railroads. My hon. friend will agree that when I speak of that glorious and glorified country, France, in this connection, I am giving a good instance: France owns most of her railroads. The Australasian colonies own their railroads; in fact, the best of the countries all over the earth own their own

railroads. I bring this up merely to emphasize the indescribable foolishness that those men talked when they denounced public ownership as a fad or a fancy and said: "In Heaven's name, let us not have it here." And then they entered into contracts entailing a liability of a billion on the country—to get rid of what? Of public ownership. And ye gods! That very expenditure has forced public ownership on our country. Just think how the wheel of fortune turns; just think of the irony of fate: these people who undertook to solve the transportation question by springing these contracts and these railroads on the country did the very thing that now forces the Government to adopt public ownership. The Government cannot do anything else.

Take the Canadian Northern, which we discussed last session and which I shall not spend any time referring to this afternoon. But what an appalling mess the Canadian Northern is or was: four hundred millions of liabilities, to say nothing of the liabilities of all these other railroads, and yet we have prominent newspapers lauding private ownership as if it had always proved a great success. How are we going to avoid public ownership? The Montreal Gazette, the Montreal Star, and one or two other publications that I might mention, think that we ought to continue private ownership. But if we do, we shall keep pouring the country's millions into the same capacious maw—and at that, where are we going to get to. Absolutely nowhere. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but if the policy of the Government is followed; if we have an intelligent, responsible, wise, businesslike commission of management for the publicly owned system—and I think we will get it; my hon. friend can help force the Government to see that we get it—appalling as these mistakes have been, appalling as the liabilities in connection with these railroads are, we shall be able to co-ordinate the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Northern, perhaps utilize the Transcontinental, and, get rid of unnecessary mileage, and furnish this country with a proper transportation system. And in addition—mark my words: I may not live to see it but you will—we will force much better rates than we have at present.

If there is one question that hon. gentlemen should study it is the railway question, because we have to deal with it at the present time; it is knocking at our door. Letting politics into it will not help us. We are up against the real thing in Canada, with an expenditure of nearly $500,000,000 contemplated this session. Half a billion—where are we going to get the money? It behooves every member of this House and every individual in the country to consider carefully what policy we ought to adopt in order to save this country from ruin. Nothing will be gained by playing politics. I am an old Liberal. I believe in what I regard as Liberal principles. But we shall not get anywhere by blaming this Government or blaming that Government or by making legal arguments about this point or legal argument about that point. To do that may sound clever and may have an effect upon a few of one's own partisan constituents who vote for you once when you are right and twice when you are wrong; but it does not help the country and it will not get the individual member anywhere. We have a great task to perform.

I had hoped that my hon. friends opposite would be absolutely sound on this railway question. I hope the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), who has just spoken, is the only one on the opposite side from whom we shall, during this session, hear a similar kind of criticism on the railway question.

Mr. BUREAU: What does the hon. member mean when he hopes that we shall be absolutely sound? Is he speaking of public ownership?

Mr. RICHARDSON: In my judgment, there is no other solution for the question than public ownership. The railroads—the babies have been placed on our laps, and we have to nurse them. Would my hon. friend hand back the Canadian Northern to Mackenzie and Mann or would he continue pouring tens of millions of dollars into that enterprise? Would he still keep pouring tens of millions of dollars into the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific? The hon. gentleman has asked me a question. I would like him to answer that.

Mr. BUREAU: I just asked my hon. friend what he meant when he said that he hoped we would be absolutely sound. If he says "public ownership," that is an answer; but I do not agree with him.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend, between whom and myself has existed a lifelong friendship, will have an opportunity later on of telling the House what policy he would adopt.

Mr. BUREAU: I shall.

Mr. RICHARDSON: As I have stated before, a man who criticises what you do

is in duty bound to suggest what should be done.

Mr. BUREAU: Not necessarily.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the hon. member for Three Rivers thinks this country should go on pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the maws of these railroad corporations and exploiters to fatten upon, then he is out of touch with the spirit of this country and he is following a policy that is bound to result in disaster later on.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a question of opinion.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Only one position can possibly be taken. I was going to read some extracts from the Montreal Gazette and the Montreal Star. Let me read one from the Montreal Standard, and I want to commend it to the consideration of the Acting Prime Minister. The Montreal Standard is a paper, I understand, owned by Lord Atholstan, proprietor of the Montreal Star. Lord Atholstan came out to the West two or three months ago to study the railway question, and since his return the Montreal Star and the Montreal Standard have opposed public ownership and denounced those who advocate it as faddists and dangerous men. This is from the Montreal Standard, and it rather startled me:

Here Canada stands to-day bent under the burden of war's aftermath;—

Always bringing in the war. What a multitude of sins it will cover in the future.

—with a war debt whose interest is bigger than her total income a few years ago; with problems of repatriation and reconstruction which are staggering the Government; with a financial obligation to the men who fought for her honour and safety, which will constitute a vast first lien on her treasury for a generation to come; with a smouldering discontent against Government in general which could easily be fanned into red flame!

It is almost incredible that in a time of such stress and peril the public ear should be open to wild projects for further national expenditure and commitments on a scale that would startle sane financiers in our most prosperous times.

I wish the Acting Prime Minister would listen to this:

Yet it is a fact that a clique of scheming politicians at this moment is frantically endeavouring to induce the Government of Canada to force the Grand Trunk Railway to sell out to the Government as a part of a wild-eyed policy for the nationalization of all Canadian railways—careless of present financial dangers and future obligations; oblivious to the fact that great experiments in national operation are already under way both here and in the States, and deaf to the voice of common sense which urges a waiting time while these attempts are on trial.

In the name of national safety and business sanity, let the people of Canada call a halt to this folly! We have now on our hands the National Transcontinental which was to cost $13,000,000 and has already cost over ten times that sum, with its operation by the Government only begun.

I think about twenty times would be nearer the mark.

We have the huge blunder of the Canadian Northern and its infinite possibilities of further waste, as a burden by day and a fear by night. We have the Intercolonial, with its lamentable record.

Is it sane to assume more loads until we see if we can carry this?

Then it says further on:

Is it sensible for Canada to plunge headlong into a similar pot of trouble before we are in a position to profit by what our neighbours shall learn, as well as by our own dearly bought experience? . . . This is no time for gambling. Even if there were prospect of something great to gain and not the risk of utter disaster.

Let the voice of prudence be heard. Let the Government repel the exploiters and close its ears to the specious pleadings of the plungers who would perpetrate another gigantic railway folly that would bring us to the very verge of financial ruin.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is the title of that article?

Mr. RICHARDSON: "Gamblers or grafters? Railroading to bankruptcy." I clipped it out of the paper as I was travelling on the train the other day.

Now that the railroads have been deposited on the lap of the Government and that the Grand Trunk is in a position from which it is perfectly clear it will hardly be able to extricate itself, you find these papers that were strongly opposing public ownership offering advice to the Government about being generous to the Grand Trunk. I read now from the Montreal Star of April 1, 1919:

American railways which were prominently operated by private companies have under Government operation acquired huge deficits which the people must pay, and in addition have given less useful service at largely increased rates. People who use the railways are paying more for less service and the people as a whole are having their national liability increased at the rate of about a million dollars a day.

In spite of these illuminating experiences, many Canadians and a strong element in the Canadian Government seem determined to force similar burdens upon this country. The theoretical argument for public ownership has a strong appeal to those who can shut their eyes to unpleasant facts. Like a thirsty traveller in the desert, fascinated by lakes and palm trees in the distance, they will not admit to themselves that what they see is a mirage.

Let me read one or two extracts in order to show the position that some of these journals take with regard to treating the Grand Trunk generously. I read from the Ottawa Journal of March 31, 1919, and I may say I am rather surprised to find this article in that newspaper. The proprietor of the Ottawa Journal is a gentleman very well known to me and, I believe, a man of high character and integrity. He is out of the country at present, or I would almost be inclined to conclude that this article would not have appeared. It is headed "The Real Sufferers:"

5 p.m.

For Canada to seize the Grand Trunk Railway without consideration for the interests of its owners may seem a quite justifiable proceeding to those who regard all public corporations, like Governments, as fair spoil. It is so easy to forget whence comes the capital of these corporations and the money that passes through the state exchequers. Among the owners of Grand Trunk stock and bonds are thousands of widows and orphans—

You may be sure the widows and orphans would come in.

—in Britain the loss of whose income would result in much distress. In the last analysis it is these who have invested their savings in good faith who will be the real sufferers from any policy of grab against what tre popularly known as "soulless corporations."

But confiscation by Governments of private property is also apt to prove a boomerang. Already Canada has received some publicity of a dangerous character as the result of the attitude the Government has felt compelled to take. The London Observer says:—

"Investors have a high opinion of Canadian credit, and the Grand Trunk did magnificent work in opening up the country with the minimum of assistance. The Pacific difficulties were not of their seeking."

Which, of course, is not true. I suppose that refers to the Grand Trunk Pacific liabilities. The Grand Trunk Pacific difficulties were of the Grand Trunk seeking.

The Government appear to have treated other concerns generously, especially that semi-wild cat, the Canadian Northern. It leaves an unpleasant impression when we note the treatment meted out to the Grand Trunk. The Government offer was hopelessly unfair and unjust.

I purpose later on to refer to the offer which the Government made. The London Sunday Times comments:

If the Canadian Government insists upon its legal rights and refuses to recognize the exceptional circumstances created by the war the result will be disastrous to Canadian credit in this country.

And the Journal continues:

The problem the Dominion Government has to solve in regard to the Grand Trunk is not as easy as some irresponsible advocates of seizure would have us believe. Fortunately Sir Thomas White and his associates are not likely to be led astray by counsellors more noisy than wise.

The Montreal Gazette also takes the same position about treating the Grand Trunk shareholders generously. It says, in part:

Nor does it appear that exposition of the imprudence of private ownership and operation of railways will avail. What the people want will obtain under our democratic system of government; and the people ask that the experiment be tried out, compliance with which request circumstances have rendered somewhat easy.

The Gazette is wrong there. The people have not asked that public ownership be tried out. As I have stated repeatedly, that public ownership has been forced on the country: there was no alternative open to the Government and the country. To continue:

The Government holds the winning hand, and undoubtedly has the power to compel the shareholders of the Grand Trunk to part with the road. The statement of Sir Thomas White is that "unless a satisfactory situation ensues the Dominion Government will be obliged to pursue whatever legal remedies it may have, and it has many." Now, the parent Grand Trunk company is a solvent concern—

I do not believe that statement.

—is not in default in respect of its own securities, has a fine system of roads, and a great volume of traffic. But the Grand Trunk has a heavy direct liability as guarantor of bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and in a few days there will be a large indebtedness to be met in this connection, an indebtedness which it appears the Grand Trunk does not intend to liquidate, and if this conditions occurs the Government will be in a position as creditor to force its claims. . . . . The Government offers the company—

This is worth reading!

The Government offers the company a rental of $2,500,000 for the first three years, $3,000,000 for the succeeding five years, and $3,600,000 annually thereafter. The Company, on the other hand, asks an annual rental of £997,000, plus such further sums as may be awarded by arbitration, or a fixed annuity of £1,163,000 without arbitration. There is thus a difference in appraisement of the value of the property of approximately $2,000,000 annually—

Quite a large sum!

—not a very formidable sum in these days of billions. What course should be adopted? Arbitration. Arbitration is the normal procedure in such cases. Arbitration was had to determine the value of the common stock of the Canadian Northern Railway.

If we arbitrate, what we witnessed with regard to the Canadian Northern arbitration last year will be repeated. In that case the Government set a limit of $10,000,000 which the arbitrators should not exceed. Yet the arbitrators gave the Canadian Northern nearly $11,000,000. If the

Grand Trunk was referred to arbitration, we can be quite sure of what the result would be. The country would be heavily mulcted in the long run doubtless for tens of millions. Just here, I want to make this point, lest I forget it. These papers that are opposing public ownership, when it comes down to the inevitable and the railways simply must be taken over by the Government, want to impose conditions that will make public ownership if not impossible at least to suffer from an irreparable handicap. They say: Treat the Grand Trunk generously. But in view of the enormous liabilities the country has to face in respect of the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, if we increase the amount which the old Grand Trunk should get, how can we ever make a success of public ownership? If you load public ownership with conditions in advance that make it practically impossible, you are taking the course that is directly opposed to the interests of the country, and opposed to the successful carrying on of public ownership.

I have another extract to read. I hope I do not weary the House, but this is an important subject, and I am talking not only for the purpose of reaching the members who are here; I want to spread before the country some aspects of this question, and if I take up the time of the House, I do it in the hope that I shall be able to render some little service to the people of this country. I want to read an extract from a letter which I received from a prominent gentleman in Toronto, who is also a very strong Liberal. He says:

> I am of opinion that emissaries of the C.P.R. are at the back of the Gazette and Star performances and I warn that corporation that, whilst its importance as an economic factor is recognized, it is no longer regarded as a governing force in this country; that any efforts on its part to exercise functions of government or to obstruct openly or indirectly any public policy will re-act disastrously upon itself, and that the carryings on of the Gazette and Star cannot fail to do it injury.
>
> The country recognizes that the whole source of railway troubles has been a disastrous policy of allowing the railways to be made a tool of the exploiters and stock operators like the Grand Trunk directors in Canada, that the country is determined to eliminate this element and is going to have a show-down to the very last card with these fellows. The "credit of Canada" bogey must be exploded. Financial bluffers and fakirs who reside in London are not less fakirs than those who reside in New York or Montreal. As a matter of fact they are merely groups of the same Camorra. All the tricks that are being worked just now, such as the threatened tying up of the American ends of the G.T.R., are part of the game of the Camorra. Nothing is too mean or despicable for them. But the Government holds the trump cards, and it must not delay in playing them. It is strictly up to the Government. Assuming that they are in earnest, they have the game in their own hands and can easily win. In the West there is but one view on the question. Opinion is even more unanimous than on the tariff. The West is thoroughly "on" to the "big interests" and will not tolerate any more of that pretence of following the public wishes whilst really working in with the grafters, of which we have had so long and painful experience in past years. Why should the "credit of Canada" be used as an excuse for handling the Grand Trunk with gloves, and excusing the authorities from fulfilling their credit and just obligations. The Government ought to be asked to define what the "credit of Canada" means and to explain how the "credit of Canada," under any common sense definition, could be injuriously affected by Canada demanding not that the Grand Trunk live up to its contracts (it has already hopelessly fallen down) but that it perform at least sufficient of its obligations to enable the Government to avoid the catastrophic loss which would be entailed by having those frightful white elephants, the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific both thrown helplessly on its hands, without the link which is absolutely necessary to give them any value whatsoever. The Grand Trunk financiers are acting more like a crew of pirates or blackmailers than the preposterously high-grade persons whom they pose as being.

That is pretty strong language, but probably it is justified.

> It seems to me that the offer which the Government is understood to have made to take over the Grand Trunk system incorporated with the G.T.P.R. and go on paying the Grand Trunk Guaranteed and Preferred shareholders dividends at the rate which they were receiving for a term of years prior to 1917 in a quite generous one under the circumstances and should have been readily, if not eagerly, accepted by the company. Unless its members desired to flout and defy decent public opinion instead of eagerly jumping at such a proposal, the managers ostentatiously rejected it and assume a most ridiculous and offensive attitude of pained surprise and offended dignity. They affected to regard the proposal as the initial step in an effort of the people of Canada to deprive them of their property. Did they make reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific contract, their delinquencies and their huge obligations to the country in connection therewith, all of which they were responsible for dragging the country into? They did. They proposed that this contract should be annulled, that the Grand Trunk indebtedness to Canada should be cancelled and that the money of its own, which the Grand Trunk had actually invested in the Grand Trunk Pacific, should be repaid to it by the Government, which, of course, as in the case of the National Transcontinental, meant taking over the costly and unwieldy white elephant.
>
> The reasons or conditions by which they supported this proposal were some of them even more monstrous and insolent than the proposal itself. In short, for icy effrontery and for cold-blooded disregard of all the decencies, this proposal probably excels anything, even in the annals of Canadian high finance.
>
> In addition to the offer which the Government had made, I fancy, under all the circumstances, public opinion might support an offer

of say two or three millions for the ordinary stock. That would be generous but it ought to be the limit and if it be not accepted the whole issue should be fought to a finish, by receiver's proceedings if necessary, leaving as a matter entirely for secondary consideration what might happen to the American ends. The only way to deal with these financial buccaneers is to let them understand that the people of Canada, through their representatives in Parliament, are going to fight them to the bitter end.

I have been referring to what the newspapers say and to the criticisms that have been made, and now I want to briefly mention some points brought out in the Drayton-Acworth Report—one of the most valuable reports ever presented to Parliament. In view of the position of the country with regard to the transportation question and the difficulties that have been rapidly piling up, the Government appointed a commission composed of Sir Henry Drayton, Mr. Acworth, an English railway expert, and Mr. Smith, an American railway expert. It was a strong commission and cost the country a large sum of money, but they went very carefully into the whole question and submitted an important report. Now, if we select a commission that goes over the entire ground and considers the subject in all its bearings, would it not seem to be the duty of Parliament and of the country to accept the findings of that commission? Hon. members will no doubt expatiate on the question of justice to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and will probably, as the session progresses, indulge in considerable "camouflage," if I may use the term; but I shall read to the House from the report of this commission an extract or two which I think will serve to put the subject in its proper light. These commissioners have no axe to grind; they have no desire to injure the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, their duty being simply to consider the whole question as experts and to suggest to this House the best solution of the transportation problem. I do not want to weary the House, but the time I spend in reading these extracts will not be wasted. On page 26, under the caption "Grand Trunk Company's Proposal" the following appears:

> The Grand Trunk Company have, in the letter of their president, addressed to the Prime Minister and dated December 10, 1915, officially acknowledged that they cannot fulfil their obligations in reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk company have already obtained a tacit release from their contract in reference to the Transcontinental half of the original Grand Trunk Pacific undertaking. They have now, by their chairman's letter, put it on record that they are "at the end of their tether." They say that it is "quite impossible for them to meet the extra liabilities arising from the Grand Trunk Pacific company." They propose to retire altogether from the concern; that in return for their handing over to the Government the $25,000,000 common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which is in their possession, but for which they only paid a nominal amount of actual cash, the Government shall not only relieve them of all liability for the interest on the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific and subsidiary companies, and for any deficiencies of operating expenses of the Grand Trunk Pacific system, but shall "repay the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company any money advanced to the Grand Trunk Pacific or its Branch Lines and Development Company and other subsidiary companies."
>
> We cannot think that this is a reasonable proposition or one that we could advise the Government to accept. What would be thought if one partner in the business were to say to the other: "We entered jointly on an enterprise which we thought would be profitable. It has turned out the reverse. I propose that you settle with the creditors, pay out to me the whole of the capital I put in, and let me retire. Provided I go free, I am content that you make what you can out of the business." We think the Grand Trunk Company cannot thus escape the consequences of its own action. We quite agree that the Grand Trunk Company cannot meet its Grand Trunk Pacific liabilities. But, if the Government is to relieve the Grand Trunk Company of liabilities which it voluntarily incurred, but which it now finds it impossible to meet, it is for the Government, not for the company to fix the terms.

Surely that is clear. Now I will read another extract from page 30:—

> If the company has been taken advantage of, or in any way deluded or defrauded by the Government—

I would like hon. members to pay particular attention to this language:—

> —the fair name of Canada requires immediate redress. On the other hand, the country ought not to be called upon to accept on the ground of good faith, a large loss and responsibility unless this ground is well established. We accordingly arranged to hold a viva voce examination.

Now I turn to page 32:—

> Our inquiry has fully satisfied us that the Grand Trunk management was content at the time with the arrangement made; that it deliberately took its business chances, and proceeded with the undertaking. On the evidence there is nothing whatever to justify any charge of lack of fairness or good faith on the part of the Government in its dealings with the company. We have no hesitation in saying that, neither legally or morally, have the promoters or shareholders of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company any basis for a claim that the country shall make good the Grand Trunk's mistaken investment in the Grand Trunk Pacific. Any aid given to them must be looked upon not as a matter of obligation, but as spontaneous bounty. The question is really so left by the Grand Trunk officials themselves. The record reads (page 176), as follows:—

"Sir Henry Drayton: Doesn't it really come down to this, that the statements in your letter mean that in your view, in order to protect the finances of the Grand Trunk, and as a corollary to protect the finances of the country, the Government ought to relieve the Grand Trunk in regard to its investment; isn't that the whole thing?

Mr. Chamberlain: That is the whole thing.

Sir Henry Drayton: There is nothing else to it?

Mr. Chamberlain: Nothing else."

It is obvious from the report that in the judgment of the commissioners the Grand Trunk has no claim whatever upon this country. The Grand Trunk exploiters—or shall I call them the financial managers—induced the Government of the day to enter into these contracts. Hon. members will recall that the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking of the necessity of haste, when the proposal to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific was before Parliament, said, "We cannot wait, because time will not wait, and unless we go on with this contract at once the future of Canada will be bound in shallows." And those who have good memories will also probably call to mind the retort of the Hon. Mr. Blair, who, I think, was then Minister of Railways. He said that it was not time that would not wait, but Cox, who was one of the men associated with the Grand Trunk exploitation at the time. Cox could not wait. That, however, by the way.

Now, the credit of Canada bogy has been raised by the Grand Trunk exploiters in the Old Country.

They say, "If you do not treat the Grand Trunk generously you will interfere with the credit of Canada," and they use that statement on every conceivable occasion. Let me read an extract from the Financial Times, of London, England. I was almost forgetting it, but it has just occurred to me, and it is very important that hon. members should hear this. The journal in question speaks as follows:

Are these unfortunate shareholders to get nothing, as apparently suggested in the Drayton report? It is quite impossible to believe that a government which has during the great war—

The war is invoked again—

—which has just ended acted so splendidly could ever behave in such a disgraceful manner. It would be a serious blot on the Canadian Government if, by taking advantage of the adverse factors which have forced these stocks to their present low levels, they were to endeavour to obtain the railway at a knock-out price. The railway has fought gallantly against adverse conditions for many years, and has never paid to the ordinary shareholders any dividends, and now, after sixty-five years, has got a system in completeness and efficiency second to none on the American continent, capable in normal times of earning good dividends. It would be beyond belief that its property should be taken from it at anything but a fair price.

A writer who quoted this extract comments on it, and I adopt his language because I think it is admirably adapted to the subject under the circumstances, as follows:

Note the insidious appeal to the just pride of the people of Canada, in the vigorous, wholehearted, and effective manner in which they discharged their duty of Imperial patriotism, and in doing which they "acted so splendidly."

If the people of Canada should absolutely ignore those ordinary shareholders of the Grand Trunk, they would, from no moral standpoint, be acting in any way inconsistently with their record in the war, although the Financial Times insidiously and menacingly suggests that such a course would be "disgraceful behaviour," and in violent contrast with Canada's war record. This, however, is quite in keeping with the sordid ethics and ideals of exploiting finance, which are those of Prussianism, and which justify such doctrines as that necessity knows no law, that the end justifies the means, and that no subject of human thought, or no field of human effort, however lofty, need be sacred, if its invasion will further the invader's purpose, however sordid or base it may be.

Note also the whining and mawkish appeal to the sympathies. This appeal is also based on falsehood, and false inference. The "adverse circumstances," against which the railway fought, were not created by the people of Canada, but almost entirely by the bad judgment, bad management, and devious financing, of its directors in the past.

It is a gross travesty on the facts to say that the Grand Trunk Company "has got a system in completeness and efficiency second to none on the American continent, capable, in normal times, of earning good dividends." In view of the fact that the railway did not, in times, some of which were better than normal, earn half the dividends which it actually paid; in view of the written statement of its own officers that it would at present require a sum of $51,000,000 to put it in a "state of completeness and efficiency," and in view of the whole report of the Royal Commission, such stuff as the quoted paragraph must be published by men who either are grossly ignorant of, or uninformed upon, their subject, or who care nothing about the accuracy or falsehood of these facts or conclusions, provided they create the desired impression in the minds of their readers. It is time the public should be thoroughly awakened to the publicity methods and devices of exploiting finance, and of its press mouthpieces. At the present moment an insidious but vigorous and unscrupulous press campaign, in the interest of financial exploitation, is being conducted in nearly every part of Canada, with the purpose of preventing the release of the great public services of the country from the paralyzing and corrupting tentacles of high finance.

With regard to the four issues of preferred shares, the suggestions in the Financial Times which doubtless embody the views of the Grand Trunk magnates, are even more extravagant and impertinent than those with reference to the ordinary shares. In short the Times writer thinks that for the shares of all kinds, which had a stock exchange value of some $70,000,00 to $75,000,000, which value, at that, was based

on unearned dividends and fictitious net earnings Canada should pay the holders at rates, which would bring the total payments to over $150,000,000!

When we think over the facts relating to these shares, already recited, when we reflect upon the methods by which such commercial value as they had was sustained, when we reflect further on the actual condition of the property as disclosed in the report of the Royal Commission, when we remember the summing up of that report in regard to these shares, "we regard the share capital of the company as being intrinsically of small value at the present time," it is only when we mass all these reflections before our mind's eye that we may adequately appraise the "gall" and the greed and the moral turpitude which are necessary to enable such claims as those in the Financial Times article to be even suggested.

I want to deal with another point or two, although I realize that I have already spoken at too great length on this subject. The Grand Trunk Company during the last ten or twelve years, as pointed out in the Drayton-Acworth Report, actually failed to make the necessary improvements for upkeep, etc., on the line, actually failed to keep the line in proper condition, and in doing so, jeopardized the interests of the country, because they were unable to give the adequate service that was required. These payments they have neglected to make in the upkeep of the road amount to a very large sum. I think it is something like $21,000,000, but hon. gentlemen will find the exact figures in the Drayton-Acworth report. Notwithstanding their failure during that period to meet the necessities of the road, they paid to their own shareholders during the period of deferred improvements the immense sum of $36,000,000 in dividends. Now they have the audacity to blame the Government for the position in which they find themselves at the present time. To ask for relief, and to raise the bogy of the credit of Canada suffering unless they get that relief. If the credit of Canada is so fragile that a pistol can be held at the head of the Government by any exploiter, then the Dominion is in a very serious condition indeed.

I would like to say in conclusion that I trust the Government will deal with this matter in the only way in which it should be dealt with. I reiterate that the Grand Trunk got the country into the present trouble of their own seeking, and this Government has no right whatever to come to the rescue of the company at the present time.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the Government be good enough to tell us where we are expected to land under this legislation, where we are heading for?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I might take advantage of the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) to explain the present position, and in doing so answer my hon. friend from Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) with regard to certain matters which he raised this afternoon. This legislation which we are asking from Parliament is for the purpose of confirming and ratifying an Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act which, as I stated when the resolution was under consideration, has the force and effect of a statute. The Minister of Railways, under that Order in Council has been appointed a receiver of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, and is operating that system by virtue of the powers conferred upon him by that Order in Council, and under the direction and control of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. hon. friend from Lotbinière this afternoon appeared to me to be under a misapprehension as to the true position. He seemed to be of the opinion that the Government, as a government, had expropriated the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System. Now the Government has not expropriated that system; it has merely appointed a receiver, with the statutory powers of a receiver, under Section 26 of the Exchequer Court Act. The Minister of Railways as receiver is precisely in the same position as a receiver appointed by the Exchequer Court, because the Order in Council states that he is in that position. This Parliament has given the Exchequer Court power to appoint a receiver in certain cases; this Parliament has likewise power to name the Minister of Railways as receiver, with the powers given by Section 26 of the Exchequer Court Act, and subject to the jurisdiction of that court.

Mr. VIEN: Under what statute?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Under the authority of Parliament. When we pass this legislation my hon. friend and all others in this House, together with the Senate, and with the assent of the Crown, will have made the Minister of Railways receiver of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He is now receiver, as I stated before, by virtue of the Order in Council which has been passed.

Let me elaborate that again from my point of view for my hon. friend's information. Parliament authorizes the Exchequer Court to appoint a receiver in certain cases. Parliament can also author-

ize an individual to be the receiver of a railway system, subject to the Exchequer Court jurisdiction. That has been done in this case. Why has it been done? Because, as I pointed out when the resolution was under consideration by the House, an application could not be made to the Exchequer Court except for foreclosure and sale. My hon. friend said this afternoon: Why did not the Government, instead of taking possession of the road immediately under the War Measures Act, wait a few days until default took place? My hon. friend has evidently not looked up the trust mortgages—and I hardly blame him for that because they are very complex documents—securing the various issues on the Grand Trunk Pacific system. For example, the Dominion Government has guaranteed the first mortgage securities on the Grand Trunk Pacific system. Now, if we desired to apply to the Exchequer Court for the appointment of a receiver under the Exchequer Court Act, we should have had to wait until default occurred upon the payment of interest on the Government guaranteed securities and for a period of six months afterwards as provided for in the trust mortgages. The Canadian Government was confronted with this position: The Grand Trunk Pacific Company was unable to continue in operation. Why? Because the company had no money. The Grand Trunk Railway of Canada having decided to wash their hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific system, so to speak, said: "We cannot give you any money." The Dominion Government had reached the point where it said, "We shall not continue to pay seven or eight million dollars a year to carry on this system whlle the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada are in their present unsatisfactory position." Now, what would have happened, supposing the Government had not appointed a statutory receiver? I have shown the committee that the Dominion Government could not have applied to the Exchequer Court for the appointment of a receiver under the Exchequer Court Act—

Mr. VIEN: Until the company made default?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Until the company made default, and six months afterwards under the terms of the trust mortgages. No trust mortgages that I have ever seen provide that immediately on default of payment of interest application can be made for the appointment of a receiver. There is usually a waiting period of three or six months, and quite properly, because a company might recover. In this case, as I have stated, the Government was confronted with this notice: We have not any money. We are going to discontinue operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific system. The Government in the public interest had to act, and it did act, but it did not expropriate the system. What it did was to appoint a receiver, because, having regard to the Exchequer Court Act, it was not possible to make application in the usual way to the Exchequer Court for the appointment of a receiver. Further than that, there is not complete jurisdiction in the Exchequer Court to grant a receivership in the case of a system like the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the reason that there are telegraph lines in connection with it over which the Exchequer Court has no jurisdiction, and also a development company, a branch lines company, and a provincial line. Therefore, under all the circumstances the Government, as I have stated, acted so as to ensure in the public interest the operation of the system. I am sure that every one in the committee will agree that it would have been disastrous to the country at this time to have permitted its discontinuance.

Now, as to the question of liability that my hon. friend has raised. I am sure that he has not studied the matter seriously or he would not have put that forward. The Minister of Railways, as receiver, is precisely in the same position as a receiver appointed by the court and subject to direction and control by the court. He is there to carry on the system. That is made perfectly clear by the Order in Council. More than that, that Order in Council has the force and effect of a statute, and Parliament now, by its ratification, will enact that the Minister of Railways, as receiver, shall have no liability towards the Grand Trunk Railway Company or to any bond holders or other creditors. My hon. friend seemed to doubt whether that would be valid. Well, it is valid because Parliament has said so, in the War Measures Act, which gave the Dominion Government the authority to pass this Order in Council, which Order in Council, as I have stated, has the force and effect of a statute. If my hon. friend has any doubt about that, then when this Bill becomes law and this Order in Council is validated by Parliament, no doubt possibly can arise, because the Order in Council is embodied in the Act of Parliament..

Mr. McKENZIE: At that point might I ask a question? The hon. leader of the Government says that the Minister of Railways

in this case will be to all intents and purposes the same as a receiver ordinarily appointed. The receiver so appointed has to manipulate his finances by virtue of the property that is put in his hands, and is receiver under the direction of the court. Will the Government in this case supply moneys to the receiver to run the enterprise?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The money which the Government will furnish will only be to the extent necessary to continue the operation of the system upon the receiver's certificates authorized by the Exchequer Court, precisely in the way that my hon. friend has in mind. In other words, this receivership does not differ essentially from the receivership of an industrial concern or a railway over which the Exchequer Court usually has jurisdiction to appoint a receiver. That is the legal position, and what we are asking Parliament to do is to ratify and confirm that Order in Council; and I have no doubt it has the same force and effect as an Act of Parliament, for this reason: If hon. gentlemen will look at the War Measures Act they will find the question of transportation during the war is made subject to the jurisdiction of the Government by Order in Council. The Minister of Railways as receiver is in possession of the system and is running it.

Now then, what is the position to-day so far as the Grand Trunk Railway Company is concerned, because, after all, hon. gentlemen want to know. At the meeting of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, held in London March 21, 1919, they passed a resolution, which I brought down in the papers which were laid upon the table of the House recently, and which I have no doubt hon. gentlemen have seen. This was the resolution:

> That this meeting, having heard from the chairman a statement of the course of negotiations which have taken place between the Government and the board, approves of the action of the board and is of the opinion that the amount offered by the Government for the purchase of the Grand Trunk Railway is inadequate and will not enable the board to formulate a friendly and agreed scheme which would satisfy claim of different classes of stockholders; but it urges the board to convey to the Government the desire of all classes of stockholders to arrive at a friendly understanding:
>
> And that the board be asked to form a committee selected from the largest holders of various stocks to consult with the board on the subject.

Since this matter was before the House, Mr. Kelley, the President of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the Grand Trunk Railway Company has returned from England. He came up to see me, presented this resolution and opened up negotiations on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That is the situation to-day so far as the Grand Trunk Railway Company is concerned.

The member for Lothbiniere spoke of there being no default. I am sure he realizes that the only reason why there has been no default is that the Government of Canada has been voting seven and a half or eight million dollars a year to pay not only the deficit on operations of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but also the interest upon the guaranteed bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific, including those guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself. In other words, the Government has borne the entire burden. To give my hon. friend an idea of what the situation would have been this coming year, I may say that the interest which would have been payable upon all the securities this year is estimated at $8,000,000, to which must be added $4,000,000, estimated deficit in operating expenses, or a shortage of about $12,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system for the year 1919-20.

Mr. VIEN: Which the Government is going to pay in any case? The receiver will have to pay it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, the receiver will not pay the guaranteed interest. The receiver will, on the order of the court, raise money by receiver's certificate to the extent necessary to meet deficit in operating expenses only. The Government, under legislation passed previously is liable, of course, to pay the interest upon bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific which it, the Government, has guaranteed; but the receiver will not pay the interest upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific which have been guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. McMASTER: Was the Government of Canada advancing money to pay interest on Grand Trunk Pacific bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk and not by ourselves?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Absolutely, and that is what has not been clear to the House. The Government of Canada has been paying everything; the Grand Trunk Railway Company has been paying nothing.

Mr. McMASTER: And paying out dividends to their shareholders meanwhile.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, they have not paid out any dividends recently, I think

But the whole load of the Grand Trunk Pacific has been cast upon the Government of Canada. What I think my hon. friend did not understand, and what has, perhaps, not been made plain in London, is that the Dominion Government, by its votes every year has been providing money to pay for all guaranteed interest, including, of course, interest guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

My hon. friend spoke of the National Transcontinental, Eastern division, and said that the Government should have compelled the Grand Trunk Pacific to take it under lease as provided by the statute. Theoretically that is correct. But my hon. friend knows what various defences would have been raised and what litigation would have resulted—for what good? To what end? The interest which would have been payable by the Grand Trunk Pacific in respect of the Eastern division of the National Transcontinental would have been $5,000,000 or $6,000-,000 a year. So that if what my hon. friend suggests had been done, the present position would simply be this: Instead of there being an amount of $12,000,000 to meet for 1920, there would be $17,000,000 to meet, representing the interest upon the Eastern division of the National Transcontinental. My hon. friend needs no counsel from me on the question whether the Grand Trunk Pacific would have been able to bear that burden; so that I think we can dismiss that phase of the question. It belongs to the past, and I do not see very much object in discussing it.

The question of our credit in London has been touched upon. Well, we are always very desirous of maintaining our credit in London, in New York, and elsewhere. Canada has always had a very self-respecting position in London. We have appreciated the opportunity of placing loans there, but we have thought that while there was a degree of sentiment in the matter, at the same time the transaction was advantageous to the lender as well as to the borrower. I therefore emphasize the assertion that our position with respect to loans which we have made in London has been an entirely self-respecting one.

A certain section of the London press—the matter was referred to this afternoon by the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson)—has endeavoured to give the impression that Canadian credit would suffer by reason of the action which we have been compelled to take. I noticed some little time ago a despatch from London in the Montreal Gazette which stated:

[Sir Thomas White.]

Canada is expected to meet her loans in the British market as they fall due. About twenty-five million becomes due in June. The British claim that if Canada can offer credits to European countries, she cannot expect Britain, who needs all her available money, to extend credits to Canada. This view is endorsed by Canadians here, who feel that we must finance our growing foreign trade on our own money, and not on British loans.

It struck me as rather strange that a despatch should come to Canada indicating that Canada was not to be allowed to renew an existing loan in London at a time when I was using my best efforts as Minister of Finance to renew a loan of $100,-000,000 made to the Imperial Government by the chartered banks of Canada. It occurred to me that if this view prevailed, it must prevail in very narrow circles. It could not be the view of the Imperial Government, because my relations with them could not have been more satisfactory than they have been, not only during the war but ever since I have been Minister of Finance. I took the opportunity of cabling Sir George Perley, Canadian High Commissioner, to inquire as to the truth of this despatch. I have this from him, dated March 24:

Have seen nothing in press and have no information of anything which would give ground for report that Canada would be expected to meet her loans maturing here. Have seen Treasury who say no foundation for press despatch. Am authorized to send you following message:

"Chancellor Exchequer states that Treasury appreciates greatly assistance given by Canada in financing war as the Dominion has been able to loan to British Government more than she has borrowed from it. Regarding loan maturing next June, Treasury will, on request, immediately grant permission for fresh issue here to replace it, or will consider favourably proposal that they should pay it off and offset same against portion of their dollar indebtedness to you if you prefer that course."

All we are asking the committee to do this afternoon is to approve of the ratification of this Order in Council under which the Minister of Railways is placed in the position of statutory receiver of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister has not answered my question. I asked the Government what they expected this matter would lead to; what would be the ultimate course.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I thought I had answered what my hon. friend had in mind when I stated that the Grand Trunk had opened up negotiations through Mr. Kelley. I cannot, of course. forecast what the course of these negotiations will be, but my view is that the Grand Trunk railway of Canada will come into the possession of the Domin-

ion Government. I am not in a position to say that definitely, because we have not reached an agreement in the negotiations. My hon. friend probably has in mind: Supposing that our negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada continue in their present unsatisfactory condition, what will the Government do? I stated the other day that the Dominion Government had many remedies which it could pursue. For example, when legal action can be taken, an application to the Exchequer Court for foreclosure under the first mortgage securing bonds of the Grand Trunk Railway Company guaranteed by the Dominion Government, may be made. There are other mortgages under which the Dominion Government, in the event of default, can proceed—and there has been default—to foreclose and offer for sale. Then the Dominion Government is in a position to sue upon obligations which have matured. I have answered my hon. friend. I think it is unwise to indicate the precise course which the Government will pursue. There is the Grand Trunk Railway situation, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway situation, the Government guarantor of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk Railway Company guarantor of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and with a large amount owing from the Grand Trunk Railway system. I cannot tell my hon. friend what will happen out of all that. I have indicated to him what is in my mind.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAHILL: Just before six o'clock, the Acting Prime Minister stated that negotiations were proceeding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I should like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to acquire the Grand Trunk railway system, in accordance with the proposals made previously.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I stated that negotiations had been resumed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company with the Government. I think it undesirable to add anything to that statement.

Mr. CAHILL: What I should like to find out is whether the Government has definitely made up its mind to acquire the Grand Trunk as a public-owned railway, if that road can be got on terms approximating the offer which was made some time ago.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I can only repeat that I do not think it desirable to make any specific statement respecting the negotiations that are under way.

Mr. MURPHY: In view of the very important announcement just made by the Acting Prime Minister, may I with all respect say that it is unreasonable to ask the House to proceed with this legislation in view of the negotiations that are afoot, and in view of the bearing these negotiations may have on the effect of the present legislation. Surely we ought to be in possession of that information before we are asked to advance this legislation another stage.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not think the negotiations have any bearing upon the question before the House, with all due deference to my hon. friend.

Mr. MURPHY: We cannot tell.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The question before the House is this: The Government by Order in Council has made the Minister of Railways receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system. He is acting under the authority of that order, and under the direction of the Exchequer Court. We are asking Parliament to validate our action. Irrespective altogether of the negotiations with the Grand Trunk, a certain situation exists with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. That situation is that the system cannot operate, cannot discharge its duties to the public, without this receivership. We are asking Parliament to ratify the Order in Council under which that receivership was created for the purpose of carrying on the Grand Trunk Railway system, so as to serve the public in Western Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: What, then, was the meaning of the statement made by my hon. friend in introducing this legislation, when he said that the next move was up to the Grand Trunk? If we are taking over this road under a receivership, how long are we to be expected to continue in that position? If a receiver were appointed in the ordinary way, he would not be coming to the Treasury of Canada for money to operate the road, but would have to get the money elsewhere. Are we going to assume all the obligations and continue to manage the road until we have arrived at some conclusion with the Grand Trunk? What bearing has the Grand Trunk on the present legislation? If the Government do not make a deal with the Grand Trunk, what

then? How long shall we continue to operate the road under present conditions? Will the Government foreclose and take the road over, put it up for sale, or what?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is for the Government to determine. The immediate situation is that a receivership is absolutely necessary in order that the Grand Trunk Pacific may continue to operate and discharge its duty to the public. The immediate cause of this receivership was that the public interest might be served through the continued operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system. My hon. friend asks how long? That depends upon the course which the Government pursues. The Minister of Railways is acting as receiver under the authority of the Exchequer Court. Money is needed to make good the deficits in operating expenses, so that the system can carry on. The Minister of Railways could offer his receivership certificates, authorized by the Exchequer Court, to private individuals if he so desired, but there is no necessity for doing that. The Government is quite content to take receivership certificates, which would be made a first charge on the system prior to all existing charges, under an order of the Exchequer Court. Our immediate duty, however, is to operate the road. That is so obvious that it does not seem to me to be debatable. If the Government had not appointed a receiver, the alternative would have been to allow the system to come to a standstill, resulting in great disorder, and almost disaster, to the western sections of the community which the road serves. Apart altogether from any negotiations with the Grand Trunk, our immediate duty is to provide for the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that is what we are doing. My hon. friend asks, what further? I have already stated that the Government have many remedies. We could resort to foreclosure and sale proceedings, under the first mortgage securing the bonds guaranteed by the Dominion Government, or under other mortgages securing issues which the Government has in its possession. What course the Government may take will be as we may be advised, and as we may decide, but I submit that the immediate question before the committee is whether this receivership order shall be validated by Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: Would it be a correct interpretation of the remarks just made by the Acting Prime Minister to say that he has informed the committee that no matter what the outcome of the present negotiations may be, they cannot have any bearing upon the effect of the legislation now before the committee?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not say that exactly. I said that, apart altogether from the negotiations with the Grand Trunk, the Dominion Government had the duty of providing for the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system. A receivership was essential to that, and we have established the receivership. The reason negotiations with the Grand Trunk came into the question was that the Grand Trunk had not been discharging its liabilities to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system. As I have already pointed out, the company sought to cast the entire burden upon the Dominion Government. We stated to the company, in reply to their request that we should continue to finance the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system and find the money to pay the interest on the bonds for that system, which bonds were guaranteed not only by the Dominion Government but by the Grand Trunk Pacific as well, that the Dominion Government did not propose to do that in view of the present unsatisfactory condition of the negotiations with the Grand Trunk. That was explained to the House when the resolution was under discussion, and before six o'clock I stated that the Grand Trunk Railway had entered upon negotiations with the Dominion Government since this matter was last before the House. I think I gave a perfectly frank and clear statement of the matter.

Mr. CAHILL: It is not quite clear to me yet. If this legislation has no relation to the Grand Trunk, I do not think it is unreasonable to ask the Government what their proposals are with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Do they intend to hold it, and for how long? Why not let it go into the hands of a receiver?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not let it go to sale? Why should we by this legislation tie up the Dominion Government and the people of Canada to an indefinite expenditure of money? I do not quite understand what the Acting Prime Minister means by "the present unsatisfactory condition of negotiations with the Grand Trunk." If I understood him correctly, he said that this legislation had nothing to do with the Grand Trunk, and then in the same breath he said we must pass this legislation because

of the present unsatisfactory state of the negotiations with the Grand Trunk. I think the Government should tell us whether it is their intention to acquire the Grand Trunk, and whether they have committed themselves to a policy of public ownership of railways. I do not think there has been any discussion here about public ownership of railways, and I think before we embark upon this great expenditure we should have more information as to the intentions of the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) made a full statement on the subject at the last session of the House.

Mr. VIEN: Oh, no. He refused to give information.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not wish to repeat unduly, but it seems to me that what I have stated is perfectly clear. That is, when the directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company served notice on the Dominion Government that they would no longer operate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, the Government was at once confronted with a situation that called for the appointment of a receiver, as the best means of protecting the public interest. That action was taken and is now before Parliament for ratification. I do not think it has been seriously contended by any one that the Government of Canada should allow the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific system to be discontinued.

Mr. CAHILL: There would be no necessity.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend says that there is no necessity.

Mr. CAHILL: I say there would be no necessity.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member says there would be no necessity for it, and that would be true under certain circumstances. If the Dominion Government, in addition to putting up all the money it has advanced since the original agreement was entered into between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government of Canada—that is to say, $10,000,000 advanced in 1909, $15,000,000 more in 1913, $16,000,000 in 1914 and $22,000,000 since—if, in addition to all that, we are prepared to put up $12,000,000 for the coming year and assume all future liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific system, then there certainly is no necessity.

Mr. CAHILL: Has not the Government the same power, under the War Measures Act, to amend the law regarding the Exchequer Court as they have to appoint this receiver?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is precisely what we have done. My hon. friend has not read the Order in Council. We have enlarged the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court so as to enable this receiver to act exactly as if he had been appointed by that court. The jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court was enlarged because it was not applicable to a railway system like the Grand Trunk Pacific system, and the Minister of Railways, as I have pointed out, is in the same position as a statutory receiver as regards duties and powers, and is under the direction of the Exchequer Court. For this reason it is entirely inaccurate to say that the Government has taken over the system. The Minister of Railways is receiver, and to-morrow, if the Government or Parliament decided to appoint a private individual as receiver in his stead, he would stand in precisely the same position and be subject to the Exchequer Court of Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway Company desires the Government to continue making advances by way of loans, eight, ten or twelve million dollars a year, relieving them entirely of their liability in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. This the Government said they would not do while negotiations with the Grand Trunk were in their present unsatisfactory condition. Since this matter was before the House on resolution, the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company have passed a resolution indicating a desire to resume negotiations with the Dominion Government, and Mr. Kelley, President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, has come to Ottawa to see me with a view to re-opening these negotiations.

Mr. CAHILL: With regard to what?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With regard to acquiring the whole system of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. My hon. friend knows perfectly well the enormous liabilities which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has assumed in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It is obvious that if the receivership goes on to a legitimate end—in which probability the Dominion Government would apply for foreclosure and sell under its first mortgage—the Grand Trunk Railway system would have no other alternative than to come to the Government either for assistance or to be taken over.

That is the situation. The Government cannot allow the Grand Trunk Pacific system to continue as it has been in the past, or as it is to-day. We certainly have no intention—and have so expressed this view in the correspondence brought down—of voting this money every year. This year it would mean $12,000,000 more. The Grand Trunk is quite well aware of that, and as I have stated, they have come to negotiate with us.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the intention of the Government, before committing the country, to submit to Parliament the agreement that is in course of negotiation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government would have to come to Parliament for legislation.

Mr. VIEN: Yes, but before or after?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That would depend. An agreement might be entered into subject to ratification by Parliament. If my hon. friend thinks that an extraordinary thing I would refer him to the legislation of 1903-4. That is the usual course, which is entirely in accordance with the principles of responsible government. The Government will have no desire to conceal from Parliament any completed negotiations they have with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. VIEN: It appears to me that the gist of the situation is this: Everybody agrees that we should not undertake any new obligations, nor relieve the Grand Trunk Railway Company of its liabilities in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Our serious complaint is that the Government has just adopted the worst course it possibly could, in that it has actually given the Grand Trunk Company a new argument in their contention that they have no more obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. In the correspondence which was laid before the House by the Acting Prime Minister some time ago, the Prime Minister stated that the difficulty between the Grand Trunk and the Government has been mainly the contention of the Grand Trunk that they are no longer under any obligations as regards the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That is one of the difficulties that arose in the discussion between the ministers of the Crown and the Grand Trunk in London. The ministers offered two million odd dollars a year, three millions after a certain period, and eventually $3,600,000 in perpetuity. The Grand Trunk contended that this amount was not reasonable, and to establish their case they claimed that the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific should not be considered, since they were no longer responsible for such obligation. But the Grand Trunk were armed with several arguments, one of them, which I explained this afternoon, being that the Transcontinental railway having been taken over by the Government they had been deprived of a connecting link which was essential to their system. Their second argument is that during the war the Government, under the War Measures Act took 150 miles of rails which they sent to France and other countries; while the third argument is that the Grand Trunk Pacific, being disconnected with the east, cannot be a paying proposition. They impliedly admitted them in 1912 or 1913, when the Transcontinental railway was completed and the Grand Trunk Railway Company refused to take it over. And in the Drayton-Acworth Report, at page 26, we see this:

> The Grand Trunk Railway have already obtained a tacit release from their contract in reference to the Transcontinental half of the original Grand Trunk Pacific Railway undertaking.

The Drayton-Acworth report has ascertained that by virtue of the various understandings which haven taken place between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the undertaking of 1903 and 1904 has practically by common accord between the company and the Government been laid aside. Surely if the company sets up that contention the Government has helped it in establishing its case if it goes to court. What has occurred for years? The Government has paid the indebtedness of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The company came to the Government and said that it could not make both ends meet. The Government accordingly paid the bill, and applied yearly to Parliament for the money wherewith to do so. When the Grand Trunk said, on the 4th of March, that it was going to close its branch line on the 10th, what did the Government do? It virtually expropriated that line. The Acting Prime Minister has stated that it was not an expropriation, but to realize that it is we need only read the terms of the Order in Council which recites:

> And whereas the continued operation of said system is essential in the present position of Canada, resulting from the war, which has not yet been terminated by peace, especially in connection with the transport of returning Canadian troops and of supplies and equipment and freight, and other services made necessary by the war.

The Government could have done two things. It could have taken the Grand Trunk purely and simply and transferred to itself the ownership of both systems. It could have caused the title of the Grand Trunk Pacific to be vested in the Crown. That would have been an expropriation, not only of the administration or the use of the road, but of the property itself. The Government has not done that but it has expropriated the road to a certain extent. It has forcibly taken the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which is a branch line of the Grand Trunk, and put it under the supervision of the Minister of Railways, who, for the time being, is called a receiver. The Government may call this anything it likes, but surely the objects are clearly set forth in the Order in Council under which the Grand Trunk Pacific is taken over and placed under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways as receiver. Well, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company does not satisfy the Government, and if the Government has to go to court, I say, the company will be in a far better position to decline any responsibility in respect to its obligations to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The company will say: We have closed the branch line and you have taken it over; that being so, you are not going to be responsible merely for the operations of the road, you will also be responsible for all the other obligations and we refuse to assume further responsibility.

I think the Government could have done otherwise. It could have taken other measures so as not to force the issue just now. It could have ascertained whether it really was advisable to take over the Grand Trunk at this period, and if deemed not advisable, the necessary legislation could have been introduced. If the Government thought it inadvisable to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific until the Grand Trunk was in default in meeting its obligations, it could have maintained the system that had hitherto prevailed until an agreement could be reached. The Government says: We are not going to advance any further money for the purposes of the Grand Trunk. And yet it has not taken over either the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk, but has simply placed the former road under a receiver. What is going to be the immediate result? The immediate result will be that all the operating expenses will have to be carried by the Government, or by the receiver acting for the Government. The Government will have no recourse against either the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific for these operating expenses. If the Grand Trunk Company chooses to close a branch line and the Government decides to operate that branch line, surely the operating expenses will be a charge on the Government. And not only the operating expenses, but the interest on the bonds, and this not because of the Order in Council taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, but because of the other reasons advanced by the Grand Trunk for some years past, and which have been impliedly accepted by the Government, and which reasons I have fully explained.

Besides all this there is the other question, that Parliament has been absolutely ignored in this matter. The Government was advised on the 4th of March that the Grand Trunk would cease to operate the Grand Trunk Pacific railway on the 10th. Surely the Government could have taken Parliament into its confidence before entering upon a course, which, in my opinion, if the Grand Trunk Company fails to reach an agreement with the Government, will tend to do exactly what we wish to avoid. That is, it will give further ground to the Grand Trunk to claim they are relieved of, and to decline their responsibilities in respect of, the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend, I think, has not a proper conception of the Grand Trunk Company's obligations in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. He thinks the Government has made itself responsible for those liabilities. I pointed out, before the committee rose at six o'clock, that the Minister of Railways was in the position of a receiver; that there had been no expropriation, and consequently there is no legal liability in respect of the interest on any of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. My hon. friend says that we have put the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the position that it is relieved of its liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway system. The hon. gentleman does not appreciate the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has issued many million dollars of securities that are in the hands of the public, guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The coupons will be presented from time to time, as interest becomes due, and it will be for the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to make good its guarantee. In the meantime the advantage is this as far as the Government of Canada is concerned: If we had gone on as before—and that is

all that my hon. friend suggests, he says you must go on—we should have had to bring down an estimate to this House for $12,000,000 to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to go on this year as it did last. In doing that we should be relieving the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada from its liability in respect not only of the bonds which it has guaranteed, but really in respect of the system whose stock it owns.

Mr. VIEN: Did not the Grand Trunk Railway Company decline to admit their responsibility in connection with their obligations for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, they have not declined to admit them. What they have said is that they are at the end of their tether; they said that two years ago; and in Mr. Smithers' cablegram, which I brought down yesterday, he states that it is because they have not the money that they are not able to take care of any of the obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and he wants the Dominion Government, as he has for years past, to carry the entire load of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Now, it comes down to a question of policy. It would be perfectly open for the Government to come before the House, as it did last year, with a grant to take care of all the liabilities for the fixed charges, the deficit and the operating expenses in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, only instead of the $7,500,000 estimate of last year, we should be obliged to bring down a $12,000,000 estimate this year. The Government did not adopt that policy, as it came to the conclusion that the public would not support it in continuing to bear the entire expenses for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, all of whose stock was owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Dominion Government, years ago, made the arrangement which I outlined to the House in connection with this resolution. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was to lease the eastern division of the National Transcontinental; the Dominion Government was to guarantee certain bonds, which they did; the Grand Trunk Railway Company was to guarantee certain bonds, which they did; and all the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was to be owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. I am not going to review again all the various advances which the Dominion has made; that is unnecessary; but we have come to the point where the Government has decided that it will not carry the entire load, that it is not fair; and in our negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada we have said, in contradiction to what they have put forward, that the question of their liability toward the Grand Trunk Pacific must be regarded as an important factor. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada have never said, as far as I know, that they have no legal liability in regard to the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company which they have guaranteed, and I do not think they could set up such a contention. What they have said in substance is this: We cannot provide money for the Grand Trunk Pacific or any part of it; we think the Government ought to take it over, because really the Government persuaded us to do something years ago that we did not want to do. In addition to that they have said that in 1911 the Dominion Government gave a guarantee to the Canadian Northern in respect of its branch from Montreal to Port Arthur—

Mr. VIEN: But do they not contend that they are no longer responsible for their obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I do not think so; I do not see how they could.

Mr. VIEN: Will the acting Prime Minister allow me to read this from his recent speech?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: He said:

> The Grand Trunk Railway Company said to the Dominion, "We want to assume no responsibility for the Grand Trunk Pacific."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is what they still say. They say, "We want to assume no responsibility." The Dominion Government say, "You will have to assume certain responsibility." That is the difference.

Mr. VIEN: That is the legal issue.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is the legal issue. The Dominion Government's policy is not to provide money in payment of the interest upon all the securities; in other words, the fixed charges, and also the deficit upon operation. That is where the issue lies between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If the Government is wrong in that policy it is for the House to say so; but I do not believe the House will say

anything of the kind. On the contrary, I am satisfied that if the Government brought down an estimate this year of $12,000,000 in order to carry on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, this House would say to the Government that we should not have done it. That is the position, and that is the issue before the House. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has a liability toward the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and in any negotiations we have for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system that liability must be taken as an important factor, and for that position I say the Government is entirely responsible, and is willing to take the responsibility.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): I would not presume to detain the House while it is in committee on this Bill but for two reasons. I spoke briefly on the resolution in connection with this Bill two weeks ago, but there seems to be a manifest effort in the press throughout the country and in the House to jockey the country into a wrong position in its relations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and I feel it to be my duty, as a member of this House and in justice to my constituents, to place my opinion clearly before the House and the country in regard to that issue, and in doing that to give the House and the country some information that I believe neither has yet been really seized of. Another reason is because the Acting Prime Minister has announced that further negotiations are being entered upon between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada in connection with the solution that must be found for the situation in which we find ourselves in relation to the Grand Trunk Railway and its subsidiaries, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. The hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) this afternoon, in building up a case for the Grand Trunk Railway Company, laid down three reasons why the Grand Trunk Railway Company should not be called upon to assume their obligations in relation to the Transcontinental—and he used these as an argument why we were being placed in a wrong position in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The first reason was the cost of the National Transcontinental Railway east of Winnipeg; the second was the change in grades, and the third was the change in terminals. Now, at the risk of wearying the House I am going to give you the reasons put forward by the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to why they could not assume their obligations in relation to the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. When being examined by Sir Henry Drayton, Mr. Chamberlin gave these reasons:

Sir Henry Drayton: There is the other matter: You think that the Government as a matter of fairness to the Grand Trunk, ought to relieve the Grand Trunk Railway Company of its total Grand Trunk Pacific investment?

Mr. Chamberlin: I do.

Sir Henry Drayton: And repay to the Grand Trunk the money it has in the Grand Trunk Pacific, and relieve the company of all its responsibility. That is a large order. We want to give you every opportunity to state every ground on which you think that should be done.

Mr. Chamberlin: Well, Sir Henry, if you will look at this map you will see where the Grand Trunk Pacific stretches away off up through the north country, while the Grand Trunk is away down in this part of the country. It is not a natural connection of the Grand Trunk, is it? It is not only not a connection of the Grand Trunk, but it is not of any benefit to the Grand Trunk.

In the first place, we are under contract to send all business over this north line, away from the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk cannot derive any benefit from it, under the contract with the Government.

I want the House to take particular notice there—

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. member let me mention this—and even from a Bolshevik it may be of some use—that I never said any such thing in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I said that those were the reasons put forward by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for not taking over the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): If the hon. member will listen carefully he will note that I am not referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific exclusively. I am referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental, and Mr. Chamberlin in his answers was referring to the whole system.

When he says " We are under contract to send all business over this north line," what does that mean? They entered into a contract with the Canadian Government to send their western business over the north line, away altogether from the Grand Trunk. Would that not be sending it over the Transcontinental? Mr. Chamberlin goes on to say:

The Grand Trunk cannot derive any benefit from it under the contract with the Government.

Commissioner Acworth: That is a new point, to me.

Mr. Chamberlin: In addition to that, the company is bound to put steamers on the Atlantic and steamers on the Pacific, to accommodate all that business.

Were they going to put steamers on the Atlantic to accommodate business that they were bringing as far east as Winnipeg, and no further? It is obvious that he was referring to the National Transcontinental and its terminal on the Atlantic ocean. The evidence continues:

And yet it does not bring one dollar of business to the Grank Trunk.

Commissioner Acworth: How does that obligation arise?

Mr. Chamberlin: It arises out of the contract with the Government.

Commissioner Acworth: The original contract with the Government?

Mr. Chamberlin: The original contract.

Mr. Biggar: Of July 29, 1903.

Commissioner Acworth: Is the agreement a schedule to the Act?

Mr. Biggar: Yes, sir, a schedule to the Act of 1903. Chapter 80, I think it is.

Commissioner Acworth: Therefore, if the Grand Trunk, as it does at present, operate or control the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, were to send traffic through Portland instead of through Halifax, it would be a fraud on the agreement?

Mr. Chamberlin: Yes. We are bound to go on with all that tremendous outlay and to carry that load, and yet not get one dollar of benefit from it. The Grand Trunk simply cannot carry it.

And a little further on:

Sir Henry Drayton: But the obligation is there; the burden is there, and the carrying costs are there.

Mr. Chamberlin: Yes, but it is really a matter of financing, to-day.

Sir Henry Drayton: Your first point Mr. Chamberlin is that the Grand Trunk is not interested in all this development at all, and that the railway as contracted for and laid out is something which takes traffic away from the parent Grand Trunk System instead of giving traffic to it.

One answer that might be quite easily made to that is that the representatives of the Grand Trunk must have known all that when this contract was entered into?

Mr. Chamberlin: I don't know. They must have. Of course, I do not want to criticize my predecessors.

Sir Henry Drayton: What is the next ground?

Mr. Chamberlin: What do you mean?

Sir Henry Drayton: You have just advanced a reason why you think the Government should take the whole burden of the Grand Trunk Pacific away from the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

Mr. Chamberlin: Yes.

Sir Henry Drayton: That reason being that the position and the manner in which the line has been built, it is really for a separate system and not for the Grand Trunk System at all?

Mr. Chamberlin: Yes.

And still further on:

Sir Henry Drayton: Your second ground is that of impossibility?

Mr. Chamberlin: It is an impossibility.

Sir Henry Drayton: If it is impossible now, it was always impossible?

Mr. Chamberlin: It was always impossible.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. Biggar: It was not thought to be impossible, by the men who made the contract.

Sir Henry Drayton: I think it was.

Mr. Biggar: Of course Mr. Hays is now dead. He was very optimistic about it, we all know that.

Sir Henry Drayton: Mr. Chamberlin, you have already, through Mr. Biggar, submitted a letter to this Investigating Commission, pointing out first that your scheme was a scheme for building from North Bay; secondly, that your scheme from North Bay was changed at the request of the Government.

That does away with my hon. friend's contention as to the reason why the Grand Trunk Railway Company was endeavouring to get out of its obligation to operate the Transcontinental in its entirety, because it is obvious from the evidence of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that the Grand Trunk Pacific was designed not to assist the Grand Trunk but to take traffic away from it.

Mr. VIEN: In the same report Sir Henry Drayton admits that at the time of the Drayton-Acworth inquiry it was agreed that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk were relieved of their responsibility in respect of the Transcontinental railway. If my hon. friend will refer to that portion of the report that I read a moment ago, he will find the following:

The Grand Trunk Company have already obtained a tacit release from their contract in reference to the Transcontinental Railway, half of the original Grand Trunk Pacific undertaking.

So that the evidence of Mr. Chamberlin as read by my hon. friend refers only to the further obligations of the Grand Trunk in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to the coast.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I am giving the statement of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If it was Sir Henry Drayton's opinion that because the Government had not, up to that time, forced the Grand Trunk to live up to their obligations there was a tacit understanding under which the Grand Trunk were to be released, all well and good. But no hon. member can show that any agreement was ever entered into by the Government or the people of Canada releasing the Grand Trunk Railway Company from any of their obligations.

Mr. VIEN: Nor can the hon. member show in this evidence of Mr. Chamberlin any reference to the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am not responsible for the density of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien). When Mr. Chamber-

lin was referring to traffic that was to be routed by the Transcontinental to Halifax, what did he mean? Was that traffic to be sent over the Grand Trunk Pacific line or was it to be routed by the Transcontinental? His whole statement, from A to Z, refers to the routing of the traffic via the North line to the Atlantic seaboard, altogether away from the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps I can help my hon. friend to understand the argument contained in the evidence which he has read from the Drayton-Acworth report. There is a letter from Mr. Chamberlin to the Government—it may not be in the report—in which it was stated that the Government had broken the old agreement by the changes they had made in the road, and now he is contending that there is no use in asking him to do his part when the Government did not do theirs. That must be read with what the hon. member has been referring to.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I am taking the sworn evidence of the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company given before the Drayton-Acworth Commission, in which he stated the reasons why it was impossible for the Grand Trunk to fulfil its obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was impossible—those are his own words; and he goes further and says that it was always impossible so far as he was concerned. If he comes along later and qualifies that statement by a letter to the Government in order that he may be able to drive a hard bargain, that is a different matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: The letter that I refer to is much older than the Drayton-Acworth report.

Mr. NICHOLSON: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. McKENZIE: July 18, 1912.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Would the hon. member read the letter, or pass it over to me?

Mr. McKENZIE: I will pass it over to my hon. friend. It is not in the same report that he was quoting from.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Copied from the speech of the Hon. George P. Graham, member of Parliament, re the Lynch-Staunton-Gutelius report. I do not think I shall weary the House by reading it.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. member wishes to be fair, he will read the letter; if he does not wish to be fair, he will not read it. It does not matter whether the letter is in Mr. Graham's speech or in the Drayton report, it is the same letter, and my hon. friend is not courageous enough to read it.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): It is not necessary to read it. The leader of the Opposition stated that the letter was written in 1912.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): In 1916 or 1917 Mr. Chamberlin was put on oath and on his oath he makes the statement that it is and always was impossible for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to operate the National Transcontinental because it was designed not to furnish traffic to but to take it away from the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chamberlin's argument all through is that the reason was because the original contract was broken by the Government.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): There is not in Mr. Chamberlin's evidence one line to justify the contention that it was because the contract was broken by the Government. If hon. members want to take up the question of the contract having been broken on account of the change of grades, I would be perfectly willing to discuss that with them; but as I have stated in this House before, I do not know that we shall get very far by harking back to what took place in connection with the construction of the National Transcontinental. The changes that were made in the construction of the National Transcontinental were simply changes from dead .4 gradients, long inclines to the introduction of short velocity grades. Hon. members may be able to satisfy themselves that dead, long .4 inclines are preferable in the operation of a railway to short velocity grades, but they had better not tell that story to any man who knows anything about the operation of a railway. Just in that connection I will quote something that I think in all human probability
9 p.m. the leader of the Opposition will find in the same booklet from a speech by the Hon. George P. Graham as regards the handling of long freight trains over the National Transcontinental. I listened to the Hon. George P. Graham making this statement:

> What are we going to do with a 200 per cent train of freight cars on one of these velocity grades when the thermometer is 30 below zero?

I will ask any hon. member to tell me what he would do with a 200 per cent

freight train on a 4 grade when the thermometer is 30 below zero. If that train stood still for ten minutes, what would they do with it? They could not introduce sufficient motive power on either end of the train to move it in one piece, and that is why a practical railway man introduced velocity grades wherever possible on the National Transcontinental, and instead of the road being deteriorated as regards operating purposes it was to that extent improved. I do not wish, unless I am forced to do so, to deal with that because if we are to find a solution for the railway problem with which we are confronted to-day, we must deal with conditions as they are. The whole question of the construction of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Winnipeg is a matter that cannot be of very much pride to any one who has had anything to do with it.

I shall not refer again to the National Transcontinental east of Winnipeg, but as regards the question of cost, I shall refer briefly to the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Winnipeg, that part for which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was directly liable. When the Grand Trunk people start to talk about excessive costs on the National Transcontinental, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) or any other hon. member might do well to present them with these figures The total gross cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert was $295,779,370, an average cost of $163,000 per mile. Those are the figures right down to date with the inclusion of the sums advanced by the Parliament of Canada during 1916, 1917 and 1918 to take care of interest charges.

Mr. VIEN: Who compiled those figures?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The hon. member will get all the figures in the Drayton-Acworth report, and if he wishes to have them in detail, I shall give them to the House.

Mr. VIEN: If they are in the report, that is not necessary.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The details are:

G.T.P. FINANCE—CASH AND GUARANTEES BY DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Direct cash aid from the Dominion Government under the Implementing Agreement.	$6,263,716	
4% Prairie Section Bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company at par.	$10,000,000	
4% Debentures No. 1923 at par, guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.	15,000,000	
Loan in 1914, secured by pledge of $7,500,000 4% bonds.	6,000,000	
1913-1914 3% 1st Mortgage bonds.	33,048,000	
Total direct cash investment, Dominion Government.		$70,311,716
Dominion Government Guaranteed Bonds 1st mortgage, 3% bonds.	$34,992,000	
4% Sterling bonds.	8,440,848	43,432,848
Making a total from the Dominion Government in cash and guarantees		$113,744,564
Made up of cash under the Implementing clause.	6,263,716	
Dominion Government investment in securities.	64,048,000	
Dominion Government Guarantees.	43,432,848	
In addition to the above the Grand Trunk Pacific received:—		
Cash subsidies from the Provincial Government of.	$376,320	
From municipal bodies.	350,000	
Making a total of.		$726,320
The Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company received Provincial Government Guarantees on bonds outstanding to the total		
Making a total sum for amount of.		13,469,004
which the public of Canada by way of cash advances and bond guarantees are responsible.		127,939,888
Of the above sum the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is contingently liable as joint guarantor with the Dominion Government for.	$25,000,000	
made up of 1909, 4% Prairie Section bonds.	$10,000,000	
and 1913, 4% Debentures.	15,000,000	

G.T.P. FINANCE—CASH AND GUARANTEES FROM GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA.

Amount of liability of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the Grand Trunk Pacific:	
4% Series A, Prairie Division Bonds.	$10,206,000
4% Series B, Mountain Division Bonds.	9,963,000

4% Lake Superior Division Bonds	$7,533,000	
4% Perpetual Debentures	34,879,252	
5% Secured Notes	9,720,000	
Total		$72,301,252
Add to this $25,000,000 for which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is joint guarantor with the Dominion Government, and the total outstanding bonds for which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is directly and contingently liable is		25,000,000
		97,301,252 00

In addition to this the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada had up to the end of February 1916, advanced to the Grand Trunk Pacific and its subsidiaries the following sums in cash:—

Grand Trunk Railway Company	$ 801,783 54
Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company	13,369,737 83
Grand Trunk Pacific Saskatchewan Railway Company	214,500 00
Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, Ltd.	11,793,907 46
A total Grand Trunk commitment of	$123,280,980 83

Made up of —

Guarantees totaling	$97,301,252 00
Cash advanced	26,179,728 83

G.T.P. FINANCE—TOTAL CASH COST.

Total cash cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as indicated by the above figures:—

Cash direct from the Dominion Government	$70,311,716	
Proceeds of Dominion Government Guarantee Bonds	43,432,848	
Provincial and Municipal Subsidies	726,320	
Provincial Guarantees to Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines	13,469,004	
Bonds guaranteed by Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada exclusive of $25,000,000 for which the Dominion Government is joint guarantor	72,301,252	
Direct cash advances made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada	26,179,728	
Total		$226,420,870
Add to this $8,000,000 advanced by Parliament in 1916, $7,500,000 in 1917 and $7,500,000 in 1918, a total of		23,000,000
And we have an aggregate of		$249,420.870

that has already gone into the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Of the above amounts there are cash subsidies, provincial and municipal, amounting to	$ 726,320	
And cash advanced by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to	26,179,728	
Making a total of	$ 26,906,048	

This is not a direct charge from the interest bearing standpoint, providing always that the cash advanced by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is not treated as such a charge.

In addition to this there is the sum of	13,469,004	
For which the several Provincial Governments who have guaranteed Grand Trunk Pacific Bonds can be held liable.		
Making a total of		$40,375,052
Deduct this from the total and we still find that the amount for which the Dominion Government will become directly responsible when they assume control of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is		$209,045,818
Add to this the sum necessary to bring the road up to standard, including ties, rails, ballasting, terminal facilities, station buildings, water tanks, etc.		25,000,000
For locomotives, rolling stock, etc		21,358,500
And we have a total of		$255,404,318

This represents the amount for which the Government will be responsible when they assume control of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Add the amount previously deducted for cash advanced by or chargeable against the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and provincial and municipal governments, and we have the following:

Total already given	$255,404,318
Add amount previously deducted	40,375,072
Making a gross cost for the Grand Trunk Pacific of	$295,779,370

Or over $163,000 per mile. When the management of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company of Canada, who were directly responsible for every dollar of that expenditure, undertake to come before the people of Canada and say: We do not want to accept our responsibility because you spent $100,000 or $110,000 per mile on the construction of the National Transcontinental east of Winnipeg,

the Grand Trunk Railway Company are out of court because they have no argument. I will repeat what I stated in this House once before: that at least $130,000,000 was expended west of Winnipeg presumably in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that went into something other than the construction of a railroad; and that can be demonstrated by any man who will take into consideration the physical condition of the road and the amount of cash that has gone into it.

This whole question relates to what is ultimately to become of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. I think it is well, therefore, that we should just consider for a minute the relationship that this has to that company, who are not only the stockholders—the proprietors—of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but who are also the guarantors of a large block of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and as such cannot escape their responsibility. The total cost of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—the Grand Trunk proper—according to the Drayton-Acworth report, is $424,169,310. Let me qualify that by saying that the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company a few days ago questioned these figures, and when challenged to give the correct figures he stated he could not give the exact figures, but he presumed it would be about $200,000,000. I have made a calculation of the obligations of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, based on the figures given by the chief solicitor of the company, Mr. Biggar. The outstanding bonded indebtedness is $200,000,000. Then add to that for betterments, rolling stock, etc., as per page 28 of the Drayton-Acworth report, the sum of $51,000,000. The liability of the Grand Trunk for the Grand Trunk Pacific is $97,310,252, and the sum required to take care of betterments and rolling stock for 1916-17, 1918 and 1919 is $27,529,438; or a total of $375,839,690. Now the Grand Trunk liability, taking the figures of the bonded indebtedness as given by Mr. Biggar, is $278,529,438. The Grand Trunk Pacific liability exclusive of provincial guarantees and cash advances by the Grand Trunk Railway is $255,404,318; or a total of $533,933,756, or $103,837 per mile.

I should just like to supplement something that was said by the hon. member for Springfield in connection with Grand Trunk financing, because there has been a persistent effort made to put this country in the position of exacting the pound of flesh, and, as some of the newspapers say, not dealing fairly with the widows and orphans who own the Grand Trunk Pacific stock. As the hon. member for Springfield pointed out, during the very period when the Grand Trunk officials themselves stated that they were not maintaining their system as it should be maintained, they paid out in dividends $36,000,000, and I want to refer to this particularly. The Drayton-Acworth report says (page xxxii):—

> A few weeks after the chairman's letter acknowledging that the company could not meet their Grand Trunk Pacific liabilities—with short-term notes, issued to make advances to Grand Trunk Pacific companies, which those companies evidently cannot meet at maturity, outstanding to the amount of $25,000,000—the Grand Trunk Company paid away $2,500,000 in dividends.

At the very same time they came before the Government of Canada and said: We cannot maintain our system unless you advance us further sums of money, or provide means by which we can get the money. Grand Trunk financing from its inception has been based on the payment of dividends out of money that should have been used for the maintenance of the system itself. Is it a reasonable proposition for the president of the Grand Trunk to come forward and say, as he did (page 28 of the Drayton-Acworth report): "If we had $25,000,000 now from some other source than the earnings of the company we would be in a fairly good position." What did they want that $25,000,000 for? Was it to project needed railway lines in parts of Canada that required to be served by railways? Was it to do anything for the development of the resources of Canada? It was to put in ties and rails and repair cars and locomotives that had become derelict because the Grand Trunk railway had been starved in order to pay dividends to the shareholders in London. And dividends on what? Dividends on stock that in my judgment, if the whole situation was analysed, would not represent one single dollar that ever went into the physical assets of the Grand Trunk railway. The Grand Trunk railway has been built up and financed and maintained by the sale of bonds and debenture stock on the English market and, as was stated in this report, one reason why they desired to pay large dividends was in order that they might stabilize the money market in London so far as the Grand Trunk railway was concerned.

In view of the fact that the people of Canada are faced with the obvious necessity of getting out of this difficulty by taking over all the physical assets of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pa-

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

cific, I believe it would be well for us to stop and consider some of the reasons why the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has not been able to operate as economically as other railways running parallel to it, and through territory very similar and handling equal quantities of freight and passengers on just as favourable terms. In that connection I have made some very brief personal investigations to satisfy myself as to some of the possible causes.

Before the Drayton-Acworth Commission the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company said that they required then 200 locomotives and at least 10,000 box cars. I stated in this House last year that the last locomotive I had seen turned out of the shops for the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was obsolete before she turned a wheel, but in order that I may make this point clear I am going to deal very briefly with the question of equipment of the Grand Trunk. Taking the capacity of a modern freight car as 40 tons, the locomotive of a train made up of 1,000 tons net freight, loaded in 40-ton cars, hauls 500 tons of non-productive dead weight in the form of tare, or the net weight of the car before it is loaded. With the same amount of freight in 30-ton cars the locomotive hauls 612 tons of non-productive dead weight.

Take a twenty-five ton car and move 1,000 tons of freight and you have 650 tons of non-productive weight to move. Take a 20-ton car and for the same quantity of freight you move 750 tons of non-productive weight. As between a 20-ton car and a 40-ton car you have a 20 per cent increase on account of wheelage, bringing the total amount of non-productive weight that must be moved up to 900 tons as against 500 tons. The Grand Trunk railway moved in 1916, the last year for which a complete report is available, 37,686,255 tons of freight a distance of 100 miles, equal to 37,686, 1,000-ton trains for 100 miles. So that if the tare and wheelage was only increased 25 per cent on account of defective or inefficient rolling stock—from personal investigation, my opinion is it would be 50 per cent, but we shall assume it is only 25 per cent—they would have 37,686 trains each hauling 100 tons of unnecessary unproductive load a distance of 100 miles, or a total waste of 3,768,600 ton miles at a minimum cost or minimum waste of $2,826,450.

I shall now refer briefly to locomotives, and I may repeat that one of the reasons why the Grand Trunk are in the position in which they find themselves as regards their old lines is the fact that they have never had, and have not yet, modern rolling stock. Equipment being standard, a freight train 1,000 net tons should be hauled 100 miles at a fuel cost of $33.75, assuming that the locomotive is of modern type and in a proper state of repair. The same net load with an obsolete type of locomotive consuming an increase of 25 per cent of coal would cost $45, or an excess of $11.25 for every 1,000-ton train handled 100 miles. Multiply this by 500 locomotives in daily use and you have an approximate sum of $2,000,000 wasted in fuel alone. I shall refer briefly to the condition of the Grand Trunk locomotives, as stated by the company's officials in the Drayton-Acworth report. They required at that time 200 locomotives. If you take all the locomotives that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have in their service—1,055 I think is the exact number—you will find that 50 per cent of them if taken into repair shops could be converted or remodelled at a cost of about $3,000 each making them fairly modern locomotives that could operate in competition with locomotives of a similar type on other railways. Of the remaining fifty per cent, one half, 25 per cent of the total—would cost $10,000 each to remodel.

Mr. McMASTER: What is the cost of a new locomotive?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): In the present condition of the steel and labour markets a new locomotive of modern type 170 to 200 per cent is worth about $65,000 to $70,000. In pre-war times the same locomotive could be obtained for about $43,000, but as conditions are, and, I fear, will be for some time to come, the cost will be as much as I say, namely about $70,000. Then the remaining 25 per cent of the locomotives to-day in the service of the Grand Trunk railway might very well be thrown on the scrap heap. If 300 locomotives in the Grand Trunk service were absolutely scrapped and 200 new ones built to take their place there would be an enormous saving, because each of those locomotives is not only consuming 25 to 50 per cent more fuel than it should in doing the work for which it was built, but it is not able to do the work that a modern locomotive can do. We are therefore faced with this condition, that to bring the motive power alone of the Grand Trunk railway up to standard in order that they can compete with railways in Canada or the United States that have standard equipment, will take $35,000,000.

Mr. POWER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that 33⅓ per cent of the locomotives of the Grand Trunk railway might just as well be relegated to the scrap heap—that is about 300 of them?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): From the standpoint of economical operation I state, without fear of contradiction, that if the Grand Trunk railway were efficiently managed and properly financed, and if it had officers such as any modern railway company should have, 300 of these locomotives would have been in the scrap heap five years ago, and 200 modern locomotives substituted for them.

Mr. POWER: Did I understand the hon. member to refer to locomotives to be repaired at a cost of about $10,000 each?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I say that about 300 Grand Trunk locomotives should be abandoned and, in addition, 25 per cent of their locomotives should be rebuilt and remodeled at a cost of $10,000 each; while every one of the remaining locomotives should have $3,000 to $3,500 spent on it. Hon. members need not take my word for it. Any one, if he desires to verify my statements, may consult any modern mechanical engineer, or appeal to the man who, as I stated in this House last year, is second to none as a mechanical engineer and who is now Chief Mechanical Superintendent of the Canadian Government Railways,—Mr. Hungerford.

Mr. POWER: I do not wish to question the hon. member's statements. I merely wish to get the facts. So far, we have 25 per cent which can be repaired at a cost of $10,000 each, 33 per cent which should be thrown on the scrap heap, and a certain number which can be repaired at a cost of $3,000,—I understand, another 25 per cent. Therefore, there would be about 20 per cent of real locomotives on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The hon. member misunderstood me. I said, or at least intended to say, that 50 per cent of the locomotives of the Grand Trunk were of such a type that by the expenditure of $3,000 to $3,500 each, to standardize them, they could be made modern and up-to-date; 50 per cent, at an expenditure of $10,000 each, could be re-modelled and brought up to a standard of efficiency that would enable them to be used for all purposes for which locomotives are required; the remainder, which I take to be in the neighbourhood of 250 or 300—I may be wrong in the exact figures—should be absolutely scrapped as utterly obsolete and worse as far as operation is concerned, and 20¢ modern ones built.

In addition to that let me say this: That due to wrong practice in the whole question of motor power and rolling stock, the lack of standards on the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, has cost these roads hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. I had the privilege, and took the liberty, of spending one whole day with one of the mechanical superintendents of the Grand Trunk, going through one of their shops, and I counted forty-six different types of one kind of casting used in connection with the drawbar equipment on their locomotives. Any man who knows anything about this subject, not only with regard to locomotives but anything else in the mechanical line, can realize in a moment what that means in connection with keeping up the whole system —what it costs in unnecessary repairs, and all that kind of thing. So that I say I believe one of the reasons why the Grand Trunk is in the position in which it is today, the reason why it has never been able to maintain itself out of revenue as it should have done, is because it has never been efficiently managed and efficiently operated. What the cause is I do not undertake to say. In the final analysis the question of the operation of the Grand Trunk is not at the moment the matter we are interested in. The question that intersets us is how we are going to finance the railway situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of paying the Grand Trunk, or the Grand Trunk Pacific, anything for their stock if the Government takes over the road?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): So far as I am personally concerned, I would simply take the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific and value their physical assets, having in view all the time the obligations of the former company with respect to the latter company. I would treat the whole thing on that basis. At this moment I am personally not in a position to say what the guaranteed charges of the Grand Trunk are, but the Drayton-Acworth report, as I have stated, put them at over $400,000,000. I used these figures in the presence of the chief counsel of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and he challenged them. I then asked him if he would favour me with the figures, and he

said he could not, but he assumed they were about $200,000,000. If the fixed charges of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are only on a basis of $200,000,000 of debenture stock or bonds then there is a possibility that there may be some equity in the stock of the Grand Trunk railway, but so far as I am concerned—

Mr. CAHILL: Would that have reference to the obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway? There would still be an equity in the Grand Trunk.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): Yes, having regard to the obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Let me say this: All these pleas with regard to being charitable and generous to the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, so far as I am concerned, may sound very nice, but are not the right pleas to be advanced in this House. We have some responsibility, I believe, to at least see to it that the Canadian people get a reasonable measure of justice, notwithstanding all this talk of charity towards the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. However, that company comes to be in the position it is in with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific it is entirely and solely liable. If it placed men in charge of its operations in Western Canada who squandered its money ruthlessly, as was done without question, then the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and not the people of this country, is responsible; and so far as I am concerned my final word is simply this: If negotiations are being opened up with the Grand Trunk Railway Company its responsibility must always be kept before it, or the people of Canada will not get even-handed justice. As against any question of fair play to the Grand Trunk stockholders, to whom dividends were paid out of moneys that, the officials themselves admit, should have gone into upkeep, I am one of those who say we should uphold the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to say a few words about the resolution that is before the House, as it has a bearing upon the railroad that we are really taking over. That, as I understand it, is the question in which the committee is particularly interested. A certain section of railway, known as the Grand Trunk Pacific, extending from Winnipeg to the coast, has been taken over by the Government through the instrumentality of a receiver. The last time I spoke upon this question I took the ground that we should have taken that road over, if through a receiver, in the ordinary way, that we should have proceeded as the courts, and the laws governing those courts, provide. The Acting Prime Minister gave as a reason for the procedure adopted by the Government, that the Winding-up Act should not apply to certain branches of the company. Now the minister may give perfectly good reasons from a financial point of view, but when he cites reasons of law, we are bound to call his attention to the statutes. Section 6 of the Winding-up Act, which is Chapter 144 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, declares as follows:

> This Act applies to all corporations incorporated by, or under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Canada.

That provision is wide enough, Mr. Chairman, to comprehend any company regardless of its character, whether it is a telegraph company or a railway company, or any other corporation. If it receives its existence or incorporation by virtue of the powers of this Parliament, then the Canadian Winding-up Act applies to it. Therefore, there is sufficient scope in the Winding-up Act to deal not only with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company itself, but with all its subsidiary companies. The reason which the Acting Prime Minister gives for not following the ordinary procedure was that the Winding-up Act would not apply to some branches of the company. He told us further that there would have to be a default before foreclosure could take place, and the Order in Council itself makes reference to section 26 of the Exchequer Court Act. Now, referring to the Exchequer Court Act, being chapter 140 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, subsection 3 of section 26 says:

> The Exchequer Court in any of the cases in this section mentioned—

—and let me say, Sir, that the cases mentioned are clearly within the circumstances which apply to this railway—

> —shall have all the powers for the appointment of a receiver either before or after default.

Now that is perfectly clear. First, that the Winding-up Act applies to every phase of this company with which we are dealing, and secondly, that section 26, which is quoted in the Order in Council, has within its scope the power of appointing a receiver before, as well as after, default.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under what circumstances?

Mr. McKENZIE: The section is too long for me to read. I am taking the responsibility of saying that it covers such a case as this. If the company is unable to go on with its work, and that is the ground——

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very important to know just what the circumstances are.

Mr. McKENZIE: I refer to the whole of section 26. It is a long story, and I am not fond of reading in this way and taking up the time of the committee. I say that the sections are there for any person to read them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This was a failure to operate.

Mr. McKENZIE: They will be unable to go on with the work. That is one of the conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think you had better read the whole clause.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very well, I will read it:

> The Exchequer Court shall have jurisdiction as regards any railway, or section of a railway, not wholly within one province, and as regards any railway otherwise subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, to order and decree in such manner as it may prescribe,—(*a*) The sale of such railway, or section of railway, and all of the rolling stock, equipment, and other accessories thereof.
>
> (1) At the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or, with the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, at the instance of any creditor of any person or company owning or operating such railway, or section, whenever such company has become insolvent, or has for more than thirty days failed to efficiently continue the working or operating of such railway, or section, or any part thereof, or has become unable to do so.

Now I submit to you, Sir, that the reasons put forward here for the last two weeks are that a letter was received from this company that on a certain day they would not operate beyond that day. That clearly comes within this proposition: or has become unable to work or operate the road. If the evidence received by the Government was good one way it was good the other. They received a letter from an official of this corporation which said: Beyond the 10th day of March we are not going to operate this road. Then the railway company must have become unable to do so, and it was because they had become unable, to do so that the Government appointed the receiver; and if the Government was justified in moving upon that letter, they would also be justified in going before the judge of the Exchequer Court with that evidence and saying: We ask for a receiver because the Company says it has become unable to operate the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How long does it say we have to wait before proceeding?

Mr. McKENZIE: You have not got to wait at all, I submit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the operation is continued under a receiver how long does it say we should wait?

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend knows that he can get an interim receiver appointed on the spur of the moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are you sure of that?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, he can get an interim receiver. All my hon. friend has to do is to go before the Exchequer Court and say: Conditions are such that I must immediately have an interim receiver; put him in to-day, we shall issue a notice, and ten days from to-day everybody interested will appear before this court and say whether this receiver should be continued or not. Therefore no notice is necessary, and so far as expeditiously taking hold of this road is concerned, the one method was just as expeditious as the other. It would not take any longer, except of course it was in the hands of the Government in the one case, and in the other they would have to go to a friendly court that would be willing to help them out when the necessities of the country required it. So it seems to me that the practice of the courts and the provisions of the law do not justify the contention of my hon. friend. I am not saying that the course taken by the Government will not lead to the same result, but I do not want the Acting Prime Minister or any other member of the Government to give laymen in this House reasons which are not good reasons, and reasons which those laymen appear to accept with alacrity and say: Of course that was all right, and the Government was perfectly justified in taking the course they took because they could not do anything else.

Some of my hon. friends on this side of the House were asking the Acting Prime Minister to-night: What are we going to do with this road? We can call the Minister of Railways a receiver or any other name that we please, but he is nevertheless the Minister of Railways, he is subject to the directions of this House, and he represents the Canadian people. I care not what he

calls himself, he is Minister of Railways in charge of this system, and the people of this country are paying for its operation. That is where the striking and material difference is between the ordinary receiver and the Minister of Railways as receiver. The ordinary receiver would have to so operate the property placed in his hands as to get money out of it to run it, and the creditors of that company could take an interest in seeing that the property was run as efficiently and economically as possible. In this case the receiver does not need to care how things go; he gets the money from the Treasury.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where would the other receiver get his money?

Mr. McKENZIE: By selling some part of the property.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would he sell?

Mr. McKENZIE: He would have the stock and could sell the property. But the Acting Prime Minister, says that this receiver gets money now on certificate, on the credit of this road. That is what I understood him to say. If that is the case, why would not an ordinary receiver get it just as well?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The receiver is an officer of the Crown and he gets any necessary money from the Treasury of Canada; the other receiver could get money by selling the road. What would become of the road when sold? What was it built for?

Mr. McKENZIE: This company is in default. We are told that this is an insolvent concern, and that every step that the Minister of Railways is to take in connection with it is to be under the direction of the Exchequer Court, as is the case with every other receiver. Now, if we are to introduce other elements into it, according to the Minister of the Interior, which are foreign to what we have been told by the Acting Prime Minister, it is an entirely different case. We have a right to believe what the Acting Prime Minister told us, that this is to be conducted in every respect under the laws governing receivers. If that be the case, why finance this concern and go on with it indefinitely? That is what hon. members on this side of the House want to know. How long is this condition of things going to last; are we going to bring the receivership to a speedy determination and know where we stand? If we are going to take this road over and own it as part of the Canadian National system of railways, we must do a good deal of housecleaning, we must not take it over with all its concommitants, with all this $200,000,000 of debt. Surely this process that must be gone through by the receiver should be gone through as speedily as possible, he should eliminate what we have not got to carry, and let us know what we have to pay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean that the debt now represented in the bonds of the road can be avoided? Does he desire that we do that? If so, who loses the money?

Mr. McKENZIE: There are some bonds, I understand, in connection with this road that we have guaranteed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We lent all the money ourselves. Would not the first money we squeezed out be our own?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is penny-wise-and-pound-foolish to try to protect those moneys if it would cost us too much to do so. Even if we lose some of them, it is better to get this property down to a business basis. The idea of a receivership is to get a property down to a proper working basis, down to what it is worth. Are we to carry $10,000,000 of somebody else's simply because below that there is a substratum of a few thousand dollars of our own? That is not business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want the hon. gentleman to misunderstand me. The first mortgage is guaranteed by us; the second by the Grand Trunk. Subsequent to these are a series of mortgages that are our own; consequently, the only advantage we could get would be by taking proceedings under our first mortgage and then seeking to eliminate—unless it was protected—the mortgage guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. As to the rest, it is all our own money; nothing is to be gained by squeezing that out.

Mr. McKENZIE: This railroad has a certain value. The business of the receiver is to get that much money for it and to divide it equitably and fairly, under our laws, among the creditors. Let us get at the value of this road and let the money that it brings be properly divided. If we are going to take the property and keep it, that we do not get the cash out of these second or third mortgages does not make much difference. To-day the property is owned by nobody; let it be put in the category of proper ownership. If it is the intention of the Government to own it, we should get at it as speedily as possible,

clean out the wreckage and get down to business. Whatever we are obliged to pay for it, under the law, let us pay it. The Acting Prime Minister tells us that unless we take this system over we may have to pay $12,000,000 this year to keep it going. That is a large sum, but the Acting Prime Minister should tell the House what it will cost us under the present plan. The receiver is not obliged to account to Parliament; he accounts to the court. Possibly it will cost us more than $12,000,000 before the end of the year. Why should we be frightened into doing extraordinary things on the supposition that we are saving money if we do not vote the $12,000,000? We may have to vote more. The Government should tell us what money they are going to save and when they are going to bring this thing to an end. To keep it going indefinitely under the receivership of the Minister of Railways is not going to get anywhere, except in a continuance of the wild expenditure of money which this railway has involved ever since we had anything to do with it.

The member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) said that the Grand Trunk Pacific should not have been built and that he was always opposed to its construction. On that ground the hon. gentleman is in conflict with a great many people in this country. In 1903 an agreement for the building of this road was entered into and a contract signed between the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Government. Parliament was dissolved and a general election was held in 1904. The principal issue before the people was whether the Government should go on with that agreement and build that road. The agreement itself was discussed on the hustings from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Canadian people, by their votes at this election, said: Go on with the construction of the road. I think that is the most democratic way of finding out what the will of the people is on any given subject. In 1908 the people had another opportunity of discussing the matter, which they did, though not so vigorously as four years before. The Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was again returned to power, while the work on the project was proceeding. In 1911, when the whole conduct of the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was again under fire, the question of building the Transcontinental was not under discussion; everybody had accepted it as the proper policy. The only criticism made by Sir Robert Borden against the Laurier Government in 1911 was that it was moving too fast; that it was too progressive; that the Canadian people had better " let well enough alone." In view of the fact, therefore, that the Canadian people took that stand with regard to the building of this road, it does not lie in the mouth of any of us to say that the Government which undertook that work had no mandate and no authority from the people. Whether it was right or wrong, whether it was a sound proposition or not, is a question which the Canadian people have to answer. We are all stopped from saying anything further on that subject. For many years in this House the railway critic on the Government side was our good friend the late member for Hamilton, Mr. S. Barker. Mr. Barker was regarded as an authority on railway matters; always when the question of railway building or railway management was under discussion in the House, he was put forward as the authoritative speaker on the Conservative side.

Speaking in the House of Commons in 1912 on the subject of building this road, he said:

> If I understand the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) aright, he is under the impression to-day that when this question was first opened in the country, there were a great many people who thought that the construction of the railway was not needed then, that it was premature. I do not know just what my hon. friend is referring to. If he says that many people at that time thought there was no need for additional railway facilities for the transportation of the grain produce of the great Northwest to the ocean, then he is altogether outside the facts. I was in the House at that time and I can vouch for the opinion of every member of the Conservative party; I venture to say there was not one man on the Conservative side who doubted for a moment the absolute need of another through railway at the earliest possible moment.

That is the position taken by the railway critic of the Conservative party at that time, and I never heard Mr. Barker's authority of his right to speak for his party questioned. I will direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the first Burget Speech made by the hon. gentleman who leads this House (Sir Thomas White). They will find in that speech entire and absolute approval of the policy of building this road and of what was being done. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might have complained that the amount spent was too much, but there was not one word of criticism as to the building of the road. Hon. members will also find that in that speech the Minister of Finance, now also Acting Prime Minister, said that this road was an asset to the country and not a debt as it was certainly bound to be of vast usefulness and impor-

tance to the great development that was then taking place and that would take place in Canada.

As regards hon. gentlemen taking shelter under the excuse that the Liberal party was responsible for building this road, there is nothing to that. We were all responsible for it and it looked like a splendid enterprise up to the time that there appears to have been a so-called conspiracy to smash the whole thing. A successful effort was made to break the first agreement, and when that agreement was broken, then of course the whole thing went to pieces and the Transcontinental railway was disconnected—the eastern part was disconnected from the western. The letter that Mr. Chamberlin wrote to the Government on the 18th July, 1912, which the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) refused to-night to read to the committee, throws a flood of light on this whole business. The argument and evidence of Mr. Chamberlin, speaking at any time since the date of that letter, must be read and construed in the light of the position that he took at that time. Mr. Chamberlin said: We truly have made a contract with the Government; we are prepared to carry it out, but we are prepared to do so on the terms of the agreement; if the Government breaks the agreement and will not keep up their part, the whole business is broken up. This is Mr. Chamberlin's letter:

July 18, 1912

Major R. W. Leonard,
Chairman, Transcontinental Commission,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—I learn from our engineers that the standard of work on that portion of the Transcontinental Railway between Lake Superior Junction and Cochrane, which was at the outset adopted and has so far been complied with, is being departed from, and that instead of four-tenths grade and permanent structures, you have authorized grades up to one per cent and the erection of temporary wooden structures. In regard to this I would call attention to clause 7 of this agreement of the 29th July, 1903, which provides that the work of construction of the eastern division shall be done according to the specifications approved by the company and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of our chief engineer and the chief engineer of the commission. I beg to say if this work is done in accordance with what I understand to be your recent instructions, it will not be in compliance with the agreement nor satisfactory to this company and cannot be accepted.

E. J. Chamberlin.

That is the origin of the difficulty. This Government, after they came into power, began to put up wooden bridges where it was agreed to put up steel bridges; they changed the grades, putting momentum grades in place of practically level grades, and they so changed the bargain that the company could not any longer agree to carry it out. There is not, and never was, any denial of this letter. The hon. member for East Algoma refused to read it because it appears in a speech delivered in this House by the Hon. George P. Graham. His speech was delivered in this House; it is not like a speech that he might have delivered somewhere in the country, and for which there would be no very grave responsibility. This letter was quoted; it was not questioned then, and it was read in the presence of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Cochrane) himself who was then Minister of Railways. I do not question it to-night, but it already throws a whole flood of light as to why Mr. Chamberlin was speaking in this way. He says: You have taken away from me the eastern end of the road; you can no longer carry out the old agreement because you are changing the whole road, and if that be the case, how can you expect me to carry out my part of the agreement?—we will not do it. For that reason he and his company had a perfect right to assume that if they were getting out of part of the bargain, the whole thing had fallen to the ground and there was no reason for any struggling to keep up with it. I want to be absolutely fair in this matter. I am not going to say whether the full carrying out of this agreement would be a good thing for the Canadian people or not, because I do not know. All I say is this, that the entering upon this agreement and the breaking of it have, at all events, landed us in a position in which we are to-day that we must either take over the road or deal with it in some other way. I ask the Government not to drag the matter along and involve the country in unnecessary expense. Let us own this road and run it, like any other property we possess in a business like way.

10 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee has been very patient in listening to this discussion and has had its patience pretty sorely tried, but I earnestly ask that it bear with me for a moment while I make some reference to the address just delivered by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). He comes back to a subject very frequently referred to throughout the day, and alluded to in the letter quoted from Mr. Chamberlin of some date in 1912, namely to a claim put forward by the Grand Trunk Railway Company that there had been some violation of the agreement in respect of four

momentum grades east of Cochrane, which violation gave them the right to recede entirely from their obligation to take over the line.

And, to use the graphic language of the hon. member, that throws a flood of light on this whole situation, and he intimates to the House that but for these four momentum grades we would now have a good proposition in the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific; the Grand Trunk would be anxious to take over the road and operate it, and all the troubles of these later years would have been avoided. These four momentum grades have been discussed for a long time, and no one knows better than my hon. friend that when a company or an individual gets into difficulty it is ready to hang its hat on any little peg it comes across,—four momentum grades or anything else—in order, if possible, to have an excuse for getting out of its obligations. But of all the allegations attaining the very perfection of humbug that could be addressed to this or any other assembly, to say to any intelligent mind that the fact of the four momentum grades is any appreciable factor whatever in the determination of the question before the committee, or in the determination of the value of the Transcontinental or the essential soundness—

Mr. CAHILL: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like to finish my sentence, but perhaps the hon. gentleman would prefer not.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Government made any demand on the Grand Trunk in respect of the deficits which they have made in the operation of the Transcontinental, and if not, why not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because we have no agreement with the Grand Trunk. Unfortunately, in the original bargain there was no agreement with the Grand Trunk to take over the Transcontinental; the agreement was with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Undoubtedly we made demand on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and repeated demands, to take over the Transcontinental, and they resisted those demands and put up their plea, and put everything in their plea they could think of. They put in the four momentum grades—and smiled as they put them in. They told us frankly, as Mr. Chamberlin told the Drayton-Acworth Commission, that the reason they did not take the Transcontinental over was because they could not take it over. With respect to making them take it over, litigation was contemplated, I am not certain, but I think a writ was issued and a defence put in. We might have launched upon a lot of needless, purposeless, and aimless litigation, but where would we have been if we had won? We would have had a judgment against them ordering them to operate the Transcontinental, but what practical value would that judgment have been? How could they operate the Transcontinental?

Mr. CAHILL: Are the guarantees of the Grand Trunk no good?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The guarantee of the Grand Trunk is not there. It is too bad the hon. gentleman did not have something to do with framing the bargain, but the fact remains that it was not in the bargain. The Grand Trunk never guaranteed that the Grand Trunk Pacific would live up to all its obligations. We have the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific to take over that line and pay three per cent on the cost, but we have no guarantee of the Grand Trunk at all.

Mr. CAHILL: Not that the Grand Trunk would take it over?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, none whatever. Is this the first the hon. gentleman knew of that? We have just the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it cannot possibly perform its undertakings.

Mr. CAHILL: Did not the Grand Trunk guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, but the bonds are not an undertaking to take over the Transcontinental.

Mr. CAHILL: It is the same company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I will try once more. The Grand Trunk Pacific issues certain bonds which the Grand Trunk guarantee. They issue certain others which the Grand Trunk do not guarantee. The Grand Trunk Pacific makes a covenant to take over the Transcontinental upon completion of construction. That covenant the Grand Trunk never guaranteed. For the fulfilment of that obligation we have the Grand Trunk Pacific and nothing else. What condition did we face? We faced capitalization of approximately $200,000,000 and an annual charge approximating $6,000,000. We are faced with a road that showed no reasonable chance of paying

operating expenses, to say nothing at all of fixed charges. There was a deficit, as a result of operation, of $2,000,000 a year. How could the Grand Trunk Pacific undertake an obligation which entailed an expenditure for rental of $6,000,000, and a loss in operation of $2,000,000—$8,000,000 altogether—when to operate its own line it had to borrow $7,500,000 every year? What is the use of talking of four momentum grades? You might as well talk about the colour of the rails. The four momentum grades is a mere flea bite. I consulted the engineer to-night, and he tells me that these grades were put in the same as any other grades, that no objection was made by the Grand Trunk at all. The objection was an after-thought on their part. It was not the practice to have the signatures of each engineer to all these things, he says. The grades were put in by the consent of both, not in writing, but by consent, the same as any other grades. But what has that to do with the thing to-day? The fact is that no matter what kind of grades the road had, no matter whether the company had legal rights that enabled them to escape or not, it really makes no impression on the situation at all. The fact was, whether they had legal rights or not, they could not operate. They frankly admitted that before Sir Henry Drayton. Here is what Mr. Chamberlin said:

> Sir Henry Drayton: Doesn't it really come down to this, that the statements in your letter mean that in your view, in order to protect the finances of the Grand Trunk, and as a corollary to protect the finances of the country, the Government ought to relieve the Grand Trunk in regard to its investment?
>
> M. Chamberlin: That is the whole thing.
>
> Sir Henry Drayton: There is nothing else to it?
>
> Mr. Chamberlin: Nothing else.

Nor was there anything else to it. And that is the reason why we did not relieve the Grand Trunk Pacific. They are not relieved to-day. Their legal obligation stands to-day as good as ever it was. In practice we operate because they cannot operate. A receiver has been appointed because they cannot operate the Grand Trunk Pacific. How could they operate the Transcontinental if they cannot operate the Grand Trunk Pacific? Why not see the real big things that count?

Mr. CAHILL: Sure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly. I am glad the hon. gentleman does see them. I have not laboured in vain if he sees anything at all about it. We are in this position. We have gone in as receiver. The hon. gentleman says we could have gone in as receiver in another way. We could have had a receiver appointed under the Exchequer Court Act, also passed by this House. I do not want to get into an involved legal argument. Suffice it to say, that the legal advice tendered the Government in this regard was that that Act was not applicable to enable us to do as my hon. friend says. But whether or not, we would have been in the same position we are in to-day; we are simply operating under another Act. We would have had a receiver put in under the Exchequer Court Act, and we have a receiver now. We are in the same position one way or the other, and we are operating the road. It was the necessity of operation that compelled us to do it this way. It is quite true we could have waited for default, that is, in the sense of default on the bonds; and that default probably would have come. But what was to become of the road while we were waiting for default? Could we have done without the road? No; once you have built a road, and towns and industries have sprung up along it, it is a bounden necessity to operate that road. We could not afford to wait one or two or three months until the conditions stipulated in the trust deed matured. We had to see that not a day nor an hour was lost. And that is why we acted as we did. Our rights are safeguarded in every possible way.

I do not want to enter into a general discussion, which is not at all relevant to the immediate issue before the committee, as to what should be the conduct of our negotiations with the Grand Trunk from this. Suffice it to say that this Government has taken no step which in any way impairs or reduces the liability of the Grand Trunk Railway as originally entered into. The Grand Trunk say to us: Consider the Grand Trunk on one hand and the Grand Trunk Pacific on the other; take our earnings and pay us our average of what we have made for ten years and then consider the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we will talk to you about that. We say, however, that the two are one and inseparable. We say further: It is true you paid dividends for ten years averaging perhaps $3,600,000 a year, but while you did that we were taking care of your obligations; we were lending money to a company which you owned, in order to discharge obligations in respect of which you were liable; had you been taking care of all the obligations you would not have been paying $3,600,000 a year; indeed, were you to-day to take care of all your obligations it is doubtful whether

you would pay your shareholders anything at all. That is the language we used to the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. At the same time the people of Canada, and this Government as representing the people, are anxious that no impression shall be justifiably created among British people or others that we seek to confiscate or to take any step that favours of confiscation. We intend to see that the just rights of the shareholders are protected as much as the rights of anybody else. But we say to them: In estimating the value of your shares there must be taken into account all the obligations of that road, not merely the obligations you yourselves have recognized in days gone by. The question is asked us, if this Bill goes through, what will you do? The acting Prime Minister said a few nights ago that the negociations had reached such a stage that the principles upon which we were acting were quite clear, the next step being on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Apparently they are taking that step now. In fact, they have taken it, and have requested that negociations be resumed. Do hon. gentlemen suggest that before negotiations are again entered into we should announce exactly what we intend to say? If we did that there would be no negotiations to conduct. The first step is the passing of this Bill. Before anything is done, of course, it must be ratified by Parliament, and the Government has taken Parliament fully into its confidence as to the principles by which it desires to be guided. We say: we already have something in the nature of judicial determination of the value of the shares of the Grand Trunk railway, and that we cannot take the Grand Trunk Pacific. You may ask us to do it, conditions may compel us to do it, but conditions do not compel us to do it to the relief of the Grand Trunk railway and in such a manner that we cannot acquire the Grand Trunk railway under fair conditions. We claim that there has been something in the nature of a judicial determination and make you an offer based on the finding of that tribunal. We believe we make you as fair and generous an offer as we can, based and anchored upon that finding. If you refuse it we make you the same offer we make our own people in all cases of acquirement of private property, namely, settlement by arbitration, and we set down the terms of arbitration, that is to say, the principles by which the arbitrators should be appointed. It has never been alleged that these principles are unfair. We offer the same to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company as, through all time, we have offered to the holders of private property in this Dominion wherever that property has been taken by the Crown. We say to them; We offer you just the same; We do not impose restrictions as in the case of the Canadian Northern; otherwise just the same system of determining values is adopted. Nothing that we ever gave the Canadian Northern have we ever sought to refuse the shareholders or directors of the Grand Trunk; on the contrary, having regard perhaps in some degree to the fact that the shareholders of this road are widely scattered people in another land, and to the fact also that the road is an old historic Canadian institution that has played a great part in early days in the development of older Canada, we say we will not impose on you the special restraints we did in the case of owners of proprietary interests in the Canadian Northern, and offer you a fair open arbitration with no limit fixed as the maximum which the arbitrators may award. Now I submit to the House that it does not lie in the mouth of the President of the Grand Trunk railway, or of the directors, or of the editors of financial journals in England or anywhere else, to say that we have refused the Company anything that we have ever conceded the owners of private property in this Dominion. There is nothing we have given to others that has been refused them, and when we are threatened by the proprietors or others with a condition of unfriendly negotiation it will be well to realize—and the sooner the better—that we cannot by any threats of that sort be brought to take a stand inconsistent with sound principle, the principle that has guided us in other matters of a similar kind.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON: The leader of the Opposition, when I was speaking this afternoon, asked me if I was opposed to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I replied in the affirmative. Perhaps the bald statement without an explanation might be used to my prejudice. While I am opposed, and always was opposed, to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and while I still believe it was a colossal blunder, I would not want the House to understand that I take the position that the West does not need further railway accommodation. Settlement was extending in that country very rapidly and additional railway accomodation was required, but that in my opinion should have been

provided by arranging with the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern to build branch lines under certain conditions. One of the reasons why I have been and am opposed to the Grand Trunk Pacific is the fact that it parallels for hundreds of miles some of the existing lines in that part of the country, consequently doing damage to the lines that were there—the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific. If the leader of the Opposition has been through Yellowhead Pass—if he has not he probably will some day—he will have witnessed or will witness the melancholy spectacle of two railways running parallel within a few yards, or a few hundred yards as the case may be, for hundreds of miles, the rails on one of those roads having been torn up for hundreds of miles. This seems to be a piece of gigantic folly, building a railway parallel to others and destroying their value. That was my position on that point.

While on my feet this afternoon I neglected to express the opinion that the capitalization of the old Grand Trunk is away beyond reason. It has a mileage of something over 3,000 miles and is capitalized for $444,000,000, I think. If you divide the capitalization by the mileage you find that the Grand Trunk has cost over $127,000 a mile. It cannot possibly pay interest on that; no railway could. The Canadian Pacific, which was built under reasonable conditions, is capitalized at some $68,000 a mile, while the Canadian Northern, which we took over last year, is capitalized at $54,000 a mile.

One other point before I resume my seat. I think the Government owes it to itself and to the people of Canada to let the shareholders of the Grand Trunk, of whom, I suppose, there are some thousands in the old land, know exactly what the position is and what stand the Government and Parliament of Canada take in the matter. These shareholders are in the hands of a little clique of manipulating managers who are making a mighty good thing out of their job, and of course they are fighting for the continuance of the Grand Trunk Corporation.

Let the Grand Trunk pass into the hands of the Government, as it probably will, and the occupation of these financial manipulators and exploiters is gone, they will lose their job. They are working on the shareholders to give the idea that the Canadian Government is not acting fairly towards the Grand Trunk shareholders, that in fact this Government is discriminating against them because they are British. All sorts of insidious statements are being made in order to prejudice the Grand Trunk shareholders. I think the Government ought to make a point of issuing a statement which would be circulated among those shareholders letting them know exactly what position we take. Because the shareholders, if they accepted the offer which the Government has made, to pay the average rate of interest on the preferred and guaranteed capital that prevailed for a period of years prior to 1917, would be in as good a position as ever they were, and in a very much better position than they are ever likely to be if matters are left to these manipulators. If the latter position is taken the result will be that the shareholders will be left in the lurch. I am not certain whether I understood the Minister of the Interior to say that the Government had offered arbitration to the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, persistently ever since February last.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am rather sorry about that. I have no faith in arbitrations, particularly where too many lawyers are set to work on them. I want to state it here, because I like to take a public opportunity of doing so, that I have a great prejudice against too many lawyers handling our business. I believe a great deal of the losses of the country are due to the fact that we have had too many lawyers manipulating our affairs. I don't believe that we ought to arbitrate with the Grand Trunk. We arbitrated with the Canadian Northern, and we lost out, as I said this afternoon. The Government limited the amount it should give to $10,000,000, and these lawyers granted them about $11,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What was the amount?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was a clause in the agreement which provided that no matter what the value of these shares was found to be no greater amount should be paid than ten millions. The Commission found the value of the shares to be, I think, $10,800,000, but the whole ten millions has not been paid, because certain shares have not been able to be delivered. When all are delivered there will not be a dollar more than $10,000,000 paid.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is a matter for congratulation. We are about a million ahead of what I thought this afternoon, and I want to tender the Government my

sincerest congratulations that in one case at least the country has saved that large amount. This is the first case on record of the kind, and I think we ought to rejoice over it. Of course the Government has offered arbitration to the Grand Trunk railway corporation, that settles it, but I believe it is a mistake. We can deal with perfect justice to the Grand Trunk without offering arbitration and paying immense fees to lawyers in order to obscure the whole situation.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman might explain to the House his particular reason for not liking lawyers?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The lawyers are all right, and personally I have the sincerest friendship for them, but they have a way of tangling things up legally, and looking at everything through legal spectacles, which inclines me to the belief that the lawyers have been a greater curse to this country than any benefit they have ever conferred on it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the hon. member forgotten the statute of limitations?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I shall have to plead ignorance.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): From the information which has been vouchsafed this afternoon in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, it appears to be pretty well understood on both sides of the House that the Government must take this road over and operate it. Whether the Government adopted the wisest method in taking the road over under the War Measures Act, or whether they should have obtained an order from the Exchequer Court, or should have adopted some other means of appointing a receiver, may not perhaps be very material. Whether this action was necessitated by the violation of some contract on the part of the Government, or whether the Grand Trunk were unable to carry out its agreement, may not matter very much either. The situation would appear to be that the Government will have to take over and operate the Grand Trunk Pacific.

What would be interesting to know is, what is our position with respect to the Grand Trunk itself? I have always understood that the agreement entered into by the Government for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific was a specific one under which the Grand Trunk undertook to take over the road and operate it. Now, if I understood the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) correctly, and I think I did, he said that the Government had no contract with the Grand Trunk, the contract was with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In respect of the operation of the Transcontinental.

Mr. McCREA: What puzzles me is how the Grand Trunk proper would guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific if there was no obligation on the part of the former company to take over and operate the latter road. I also understood the Minister of the Interior to declare that we had no contract or agreement whereby we could hold the Grand Trunk Company proper to the obligation to operate the road, but we had a claim against the Grand Trunk because it had guaranteed the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, I cannot understand why the Grand Trunk would guarantee the bonds of a road in respect of which they had no contract or liability.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the Grand Trunk owns all the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific it presumably would interest itself in that road to the extent of guaranteeing certain of its bonds, but the Grand Trunk did not convenant with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to take over and operate the Transcontinental.

Mr. McMASTER: Although it owns all the shares?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It owns all the shares of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Transcontinental was built by the country.

Mr. McCREA: We are told that the Grand Trunk has guaranteed certain bonds, and we are also told that the Grand Trunk is responsible for the payment of these bonds, and that the Government has a good and valid claim against the company. On the other hand, the letter which was read a few minutes ago by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) would denote that as far back as 1912 the president, or general manager, indicated that the company was not going to be responsible for the carrying out of the contract referred to. The Government would have been well advised if, before this date,—and I suggest it is not yet too late if they have not done so,—it arranged a conference between solicitors representing the Grand Trunk and solicitors acting for the Government to see if an agreement could not be arrived at as to whether the Grand Trunk is responsible or not. Neither of the parties to this dispute has presented any legal opinion to the House stating definitely whether or not the Grand Trunk is liable. If the company is responsible, it has, by its officials, given us to understand from time to time, that it did

not consider itself responsible in any way for the payment of these guaranteed bonds. I think it would be a good thing for the Government to invite the Grand Trunk to have their solicitors meet the Government's solicitors and go over all the details in order to decide whether the Grand Trunk are responsible or not, and if they are—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad the hon. gentleman has more faith in lawyers than the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). There happens to be no need of them this time. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have never repudiated their legal responsibility in respect of the bonds guaranteed by them; so there is nothing to discuss.

Mr. McCREA: I do not always agree with the hon. member from Springfield, but I am pretty nearly in accord with him on the lawyer question. I am not a lawyer myself, and perhaps I may be all wrong, but the fact of the Government having stepped in and paid the interest on those bonds, as we have been told by the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon, would seem to indicate to some extent that we are acquiescing in the contention of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that they are not responsible for that interest, and I think if you proceed to the courts to enforce your claim the Grand Trunk Railway Company will raise that as one of the reasons why they should be relieved from payment. If it is true that the Government are responsible for the interest on those bonds, I think the Government should have proceeded to pay it. Is the fact that they have not done that the reason why the Grand Trunk think the Government should enter into negotiations for acquiring the Grand Trunk proper? And if the Cabinet are unanimous on the point that we should nationalize the Grand Trunk and all other roads—and I am not so sure that the Cabinet are unanimous in that respect yet; I think there are members of the Cabinet who do not believe in it—but if they are unanimous, would it not be better parliamentary procedure to get the authority of Parliament to enter into negotiations, rather than for the Cabinet to complete the whole transaction, and then come to this House and say: Now, take your choice: either support the Government in this measure, or vote yourselves out of office. I do not believe that is the proper way to proceed.

For my part, I have not any faith in Government ownership of railways. I do not believe that the Government of Canada, or any other Government, can operate a railway as well as a good, sound corporation which employs men for their ability, whereas the man who gets a Government position, whether on a Government railroad or in any other branch of the service, usually acquires that position through his political friends, and once he gets it he has always enough political friends to keep him there, whether he is qualified or not.

Mr. MORPHY: Has the hon. gentleman in view any private corporation that would take over the white elephant that the Government have had thrust upon them and operate it as a private concern?

Mr. McCREA: I do not know whether there is any private corporation that would take over the white elephant you have on hand. I am not finding fault with that; I said at the commencement of my remarks that I think we are in such a position that we have to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific. But, as far as I understand, the Grand Trunk proper are not asking anybody to take them over. On the contrary, they are claiming that the Government is attempting to ill-treat them and to take from them their property that they have operated for sixty years and that they built at a time when this country was in very great need of railway transportation and the railway business was not a paying proposition, but now that Canada has reached such a point in its development that their road will become a paying proposition, the Government steps in and wants to take it away from them. That is what I am finding fault with. If I were inclined to, I would find fault with the methods and means adopted for taking over the Canadian Northern. I think that this country paid a whole lot more money than it would have been called upon to pay had the Government adopted the proper means for acquiring that system.

Mr. CAHILL: How does the Minister of the Interior figure that he is going to get from the Grand Trunk the money that they are liable for to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and thereby to the Government? I presume he hopes to make the Grand Trunk responsible for their guarantees for the Grand Trunk Pacific; Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not have to make them responsible; they are responsible.

Mr. CAHILL: You hope to gather something from that responsibility?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: You expect to be able to realize on that responsibility?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To consider that responsibility in fixing the value of their shares.

Mr. CAHILL: What have their shares got to do with this transaction? If you hope to make them pay in respect of their responsibility, then, of course, your argument that the contract between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental holds good is a very poor one, for the reason that the Grand Trunk guaranteed the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Pacific in turn are being relieved of a portion of their responsibility to the people of the country, or whoever has got the money in that investment, by reason of the fact that you have allowed them to relinquish, or have relinquished for them, their contract with the Transcontinental.

In other words, if you made the Grand Trunk Pacific live up to their contract with the Transcontinental, instead of there being a deficit of $2,300,000 to $3,000,000 a year on the Transcontinental now, which the people of Canada are paying, you would be charging to the Grand Trunk Pacific $6,000,000 a year; and if, as the Acting Prime Minister stated, the Grand Trunk Pacific are losing $12,000,000 in operation, they would also be losing another $3,000,000 on the Transcontinental, which would make $15,000,000. It might be possible for them to take up these securities and get something for them, but if they are loaded with a $15,000,000 obligation, in all probability the securities will be worth nothing. So that the leader of the Opposition is quite right in saying that measures should be adopted to take out the unnecessary expenditures or the money it will be impossible to pay interest on. From the questions which the Minister of the Interior has put, I take it that the Government does not intend to make the Grand Trunk responsible for their obligations to the Grand Trunk Pacific. If they do, how do they propose to do it?

Mr. NICKLE: It is a contractual relationship.

Mr. CAHILL: I want to know how you propose to get the money from the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hardly know where to commence to disentangle the knot of absurdities which the hon. gentleman has made. We do not, in the first place, have to make the Grand Trunk responsible for anything. You cannot make the company

[Mr. Meighen.]

responsible; it made itself responsible; its bond is there. That is to say, it is responsible for the second mortgage bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific; if the Grand Trunk Pacific does not pay, it must. All we are anxious to do with respect to that responsibility is to make them realize it; to make them realize that it still exists and has to be taken into account in connection with the value of their shares. The difficulty is that some years ago they dropped the Grand Trunk Pacific in their tracks as they walked along and have forgotten about it. They have put it away; they do not like any too well to be reminded of it. So that all we have endeavoured to do in that respect is to bring home to them that that responsibility still exists and is an essential factor in the determination of the value of their share.

If I extracted anything else that had meaning from what the hon. gentleman said, it was this: If we had got an order of the court directing the Grand Trunk Pacific to take over the Transcontinental, and if the Grand Trunk Pacific, which was not able to do so, had done so and therefore had lost $2,000,000 a year more in operation and $5,000,000 more in rental—that is $7,000,000 a year more—then I think he tried to say that the Grand Trunk would more likely have to pay something on its bonds.

Mr. CAHILL: You would not say that the Grand Trunk bonds would be any more valuable would you?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would not be affected at all. The Grand Trunk bonds were the second mortgage bonds. It depends on the value of the road itself as an operating road whether these bonds are good or not and whether the Grand Trunk might be called upon to pay them. If the Grand Trunk Pacific as a commercial proposition is worth the amount of the first and second mortgage bonds up to the end of where the Grand Trunk guarantees, then the Grand Trunk will not be called upon on its guarantee.

Mr. CAHILL: The hon. gentleman has a curious process of reasoning.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might lose money on the operation of the Transcontinental, but the value of the Grand Trunk Pacific as a commercial proposition, as effecting the security of the second mortgage bonds, would be worth just the same whether they had to deal with the Transcontinental or not. These bondholders would sell the road aside altogether from its Transcontinental obligations. Now, that really has nothing to do with this question or with what the hon.

gentleman got up to speak about. It has nothing to do with their liability; they are liable, if they are called on to pay, now. The liability is great or small just in proportion to the value of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise itself as a distinct commercial entity. Whether great or small, all we say is that it exists. It is there, a fixed responsibility, binding on them, and we insist that it be taken into account in the determination of the value of their shares.

Mr. CAHILL: Well—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CAHILL: You will carry it in plenty of time, now; don't—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member is supposed to address the Chair.

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will kindly bear with me for a few moments. I hope that the Minister of the Interior will have patience; I regret that he got peeved a few minutes ago when I asked him a question, although he was quite ready to cross-question and examine the leader of the Opposition when he was speaking. The Minister of the Interior is very lucid in his explanation of everything except of the questions that are put to him. He jumps up and says: "This fellow does not say anything that we can understand;" he seems to think that the idea is to split hairs and work around in a circle. In one breath he says that the Grand Trunk have an equity in the stock of the Grand Trunk because the Grand Trunk liability does not amount to anything; in the next breath he says they have no equity in it. The Prime Minister says that the Grand Trunk directors have not said that they were responsible on their guarantee, and the Minister of the Interior says they are responsible on their guarantee. We have conflicting opinions from different hon. gentlemen opposite. We are only trying to get some information on this very interesting and apparently intricate Bill—information that we are clearly entitled to. Hon. gentlemen on the Government side have spent hours in discussing this matter, and when we on this side, who have not spent a quarter of that time in discussing it, ask a question or seek information it is not very becoming to hon. gentlemen opposite to say, "Carried," "Hear, hear," and so on, and run away with the idea that people are scared of them or that they are going to shoo us out of the Chamber. We are entitled to certain information, and I intend to ask for it and to continue asking for it until the Government either attempt to furnish it or say that they will not give it to me. I am not a bit particular whether they give it to me now, five minutes from now, or two hours from now. Apparently this question has evolved into a consideration of taking over not only the Grand Trunk Pacific but the Grand Trunk as well.

The question of taking over the Grand Trunk has been discussed here in the last hour or two, but that matter has not previously been considered by the House. There was a report that negotiations were taking place some time ago, and honourable members on the Government side of the House seem to take it for granted that some member on this side is trying to protect the interests of the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific. They are not taking that from anything any honourable member on this side may have said, but they seem to have that idea fixed in their minds. If the Grand Trunk have a responsibility to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if you can define that responsibility, it is just possible the Grand Trunk Railway Company have no equity whatever in the stock of the Grand Trunk or of the Grand Trunk Pacific; and if they have not, I am anxious to know the reason of the anxiety on the part of members of the Government to pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company some money. If the Grand Trunk are responsible for some seventy or eighty million dollars of guarantees of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, as they apparently are from statements that have been made, it seems as if they have no equity in the Grand Trunk, as if the equity guaranteed in the Grand Trunk Pacific might exhaust the equity in the Grand Trunk. If the deficits in the Grand Trunk, the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific are so great that they will show a deficit in the combined three roads of which the Grand Trunk is a guarantor, then it is possible that the equity in the Grand Trunk is nil; that it will not bear the carrying charges nor the operating expenses. If that be the case, I do not see why honourable members opposite are so keen about paying the Grand Trunk something, insisting that the company are under this guarantee and that they must live up to it. And yet when we ask the minister how he purposes making them live up to the guarantee, he refuses to answer, saying that he cannot because of negotiations which are under way, and he circles around

11 p.m.

again. The question is quite a fair one. This country is about to be involved in a liability of something like five or six hundred million dollars, possibly seven hundred million dollars, and apparently the Government have taken an unhappy way of reaching out for this undertaking. Instead of going in the ordinary way to the Exchequer Court, as in all probability they should have done, they have had recourse to the War Measures Act, which serves such excellent purposes for them. Apparently, however, the British people do not understand that procedure; they were led to believe by the Prime Minister of Canada some time in May of last year that negotiations would be continued in the Old Country during the summer. That excellent attorney, the Minister of Interior (Mr. Meighen), went over to London and sat down with the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and said: Now, what is your proposal? And the other fellow said: What is yours? The minister said: We have none; we stand exactly where we stood before. What kind of a continuation of negotiations could that be called? It is absolutely no continuation of negotiations. The minister might have said: Our offer is open; but he refused to negotiate further because he refused to step aside from the attitude the Government had taken. On the strength of that and of the Government not pressing the Grand Trunk Pacific and not holding the Grand Trunk to their obligations, the Grand Trunk were able in September last to sell another $14,000,000 worth of six per cent bonds at 99. Had the public believed that the Dominion Government were going to take action to close out the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific, I cannot conceive how it would be possible for the Grand Trunk people to sell £3,000,000 of bonds in the Old Country. We are told now that the negotiations are opened up again and that the Government have not taken any attitude or ground that would mislead the British investing public. Surely there must have been something or those people would never have bought the $14,000,000 worth of bonds. They must have had a different understanding from that which the members of the Cabinet had, because it is impossible to conceive of any person buying bonds of a road that is going into the hands of a receiver for the purpose of compelling the parent company to pay.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is, I think, under a misapprehension. The bonds to which he refers as being sold are the bonds of the Grand Trunk, not the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. CAHILL: I said the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company sold some $14,000,000 worth of bonds. If their obligation is binding to the Grand Trunk Pacific, if the Grand Trunk Pacific will hold them to their contract, then it would be impossible for them to sell the $14,000,000 worth of bonds, if the people understood the situation. When the Acting Prime Minister stated that the British people could not misunderstand the attitude of the Government in this matter, I think he was making some mistake because those bonds were sold after members of the Government had left London and had terminated for the time being their negotiations with the Grand Trunk people. What I want to find out from the Government is this: Why are they anxious to pay the Grand Trunk something for their stock if the Grand Trunk have no equity in that stock? And if they have an equity, why should the Government take this summary action? Suppose the amount of bonds the Grand Trunk have guaranteed is $70,00,000. Provided that the Grand Trunk Pacific is losing only $6,000,000 a year, with the expectation in one or two years of recovery and making up their operating expenses and the interest on their bonds, then the guarantee would not be so heavy on the Grand Trunk; but if the Grand Trunk Pacific is hopelessly in the hole, as it would be if it were held to its contract with the National Transcontinental, then the Grand Trunk Pacific securities guaranteed by the Grand Trunk would come back in their entirety on the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk would be responsible for the total guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds. I hope the Minister of the Interior can understand that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I am lost.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister is lost because he has been assuming all along that members of the Opposition are all opposed to this because they were opposed to taking over the Grand Trunk and to taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific without giving the Grand Trunk something. Let us put it in another way. If the Grand Trunk Pacific were not able

to pay, their securities would drop in the market, but if their obligation was so great that they could never pay, then their securities would be of no value whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What securities?

Mr. CAHILL: The Grand Trunk securities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not necessarily.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Grand Trunk Pacific were losing say $10,000,000 a year, how long would it take to wipe out the Grand Trunk securities in the Grand Trunk Pacific? Can the minister follow that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, easily.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would not like my hon. friend to think that the Government is intentionally denying him any information. Since we brought down the resolution, I have laid upon the Table the very fullest information that we had respecting the transaction, including the balance sheet of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and those of its subsidiary companies, and all the correspondence that has passed between ourselves and the Grand Trunk railway. I apprehend, I think quite clearly, the point my hon. friend has in mind. He says that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has heavy liabilities of a contractual character in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific; that is, they have guaranteed in the first place $20,000,000 of the bonds secured by a second mortgage, and some $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 of the debenture stock, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. He makes the point that the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are so heavy in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific that in his view the shares of the Grand Trunk Railway Company would be, in the strictly legal position, of comparatively small value, and he asks why the Government is anxious to pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company the money in respect of their shares or in respect of the system if taken over. I will read what I think has been read before from the Drayton-Acworth report. The commissioners are speaking of the value of the shares of the Grand Trunk which they have recommended the Government to take over and have vested in a holding company to be controlled and managed on account of the people of Canada. They first touch on the very heavy liabilities of the Grand Trunk in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which they assume at $5,000,000 per annum, and then speak of the capital expenditure of $30,000,000 required by the Grand Trunk to put its own lines in proper condition, and then go on to say, which is precisely in point:

> We regard the entire share capital of the company as being intrinsically of but small value at the present time. On the basis of present value of maintainable income the fair compensation would be very small. But we do not think that this is the only basis on which the people of Canada should proceed. We think this is a case for generosity rather than strict justice. Canada is under obligation to the Grand Trunk shareholders, who in the early days, with but small Government assistance, and in competition with the railways of the United States with their vastly greater resources, built up the first Canadian railway system.

Then they go on to recommend that the average net earnings of the Grand Trunk for a period of ten years preceding the war be adopted as the basis in negotiating for the acquisition of the shares.

There is just one other point to which my hon. friend has referred. He spoke of the obligations of the Grand Trunk Railway in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, I assume he was speaking of the legal obligations. Those legal liabilities—some $20,000,000—are in respect of bonds which the Grand Trunk guaranteed under the original agreement. Secondly, there is the sum of $35,000,000 or more—I think more—of debenture stock since issued, and which they also guaranteed. Then there are the guarantees which they gave the Government in respect of the loans made in 1909 and 1914. I think the total amount of the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway guaranteed by the Grand Trunk is in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000—about $98,000,000, to be more accurate. The system also owes the Grand Trunk Railway Company on open account some $20,000,000 or more. That is the situation.

My hon. friend has spoken of the Eastern Division of the National Transcontinental, the title of which has always been in the Government, because the Government built it, and it was to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now the Grand Trunk, while it is a guarantor of the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, did not guarantee to the Dominion Government that the Grand Trunk Pacific would carry out the lease of the Eastern Division of the National Transcontinental, which was in contemplation when the arrangement was originally entered upon and which was stipulated in the agreement, and in the legislation confirming it, between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company. I

think I have cleared up all the points to which my hon. friend drew attention. I do not intend for a moment to refer to the circumstances under which the system was built or as to the wisdom or otherwise of building it. As I stated to-day, we have got past that; that water has gone over the millwheel. We have been confronted with a situation of immediate urgency, requiring in the view of the Government certain action in the public interest, and the action that has been taken by the Government to protect the people of Canada by maintaining continuous operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific has, so far as I can see, been approved by all. It seems to me the matter has been very fully and amply debated, and I have to thank all hon. gentlemen for the contributions they have made to the debate.

Mr. CAHILL: There in one point that I think the minister did not quite understand. Apparently the object of this transaction is to take over the Grand Trunk. Suppose you do not make a deal with the Grand Trunk; what position shall we be in then with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific? Will the Government foreclose? How would they ever get the money from the Grand Trunk? Will they make the Grand Trunk responsible, under its guarantee, for the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We would not make the Grand Trunk responsible for the Grand Trunk Pacific except to the extent that it is now legally responsible. The point that was made by the Minister of the Interior, and which I made earlier in the day, is this: In estimating what the Government should pay by way of rental, if the Grand Trunk Railway system was taken over under lease (which was involved in the offer made by the Government to the Grand Trunk Railway Company last summer) there must be taken into account the legal liabilities which the Grand Trunk have in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. My honourable friend says: suppose you do not take over the Grand Trunk, what then? Well, the Dominion Government have a first mortgage charge upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it could proceed under that first mortgage to foreclose, offer for sale, and get the system at a much lower price than is now represented by all the securities which have been issued in respect of it. That is what the Government could do. That would involve the elimination of the second mortgage securities guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, upon which their liability would still continue.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. CAHILL: Suppose the second mortgagee were to take up the first mortgage; where would you stand then?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The purchaser would have to consider whether this road which is not only not earning its fixed charges, but is making a deficit this year of $4,000,000, would be able to repay him if he assumed the first mortgage. I do not think my hon. friend need worry about that. Hypothetically, the Government would have to estimate whether the third and subsequent charges would justify it in paying a higher price I do not think it would, but if my hon. friend asks what the business position is I have no hesitation in telling him.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that this Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company is an entirely different concern from the Grand Trunk Pacific. It has separate assets and creditors and is a hotel system. Why this property should be taken over with the other is something I would like to know.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company is owned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company and therefore is one of the subsidiaries of the system. It owns hotels, steamships and other properties and real estate throughout the West. Any great railway system, as my hon. friend knows, embraces not only railway lines proper but subsidiaries.

Mr. JACOBS: What provision will be made with regard to the payment of creditors and other claims against this company? While by a stretch of imagination we can understand that a railway system may be taken over by Order in Council, I cannot possibly see why it is necessary by Order in Council under the War Measures Act to take over these hotels, seeing that is an entirely separate and distinct company from the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is run in connection with it and the stock is owned by the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is part of the system. It was necessary to appoint a receiver not only for the railway company proper but also for the subsidiaries forming part of the system. My hon. friend asks what about the creditors? Well, he does not need advice from me as to the position of creditors. This system has been put into the hands of a receiver.

Mr. JACOBS: Why is this company referred to as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System? I understand that term has never been used in connection with the

railway. There is "The Grand Trunk System" but not "The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System", which it seems to me is a misnomer.

Mr. McMASTER: We have heard so much of late about the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System that I begin to fear they hardly convey an idea to our mind. I would suggest that our leader might propose to the leader of the Government that we adjourn.

Mr. JACOBS: I have no other questions to ask.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The "Grand Trunk Railway System" is a term used to designate all that is embraced within the ownership of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would own physical properties vested in it. It would own stock of express companies—although I do not think it does—telegraph companies, development companies, hotel companies, steamship companies, and the word "system" would properly apply to the company itself and all the subsidiaries.

Mr. VIEN: Has the Grand Trunk Railway Company been completely relieved of the interest which it failed to pay and which was paid by way of grant from the Government, approved by Parliament?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The votes by Parliament during the past few years have been by way of loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific, secured by blanket mortgage in each case.

Mr. VIEN: Does the Government not fear that its action will place it in a very awkward position before the courts in view of paragraph 6 of Chapter 24, 4 Edward VII, which reads:—

> Notwithstanding anything in the said contract contained the Government shall not exercise any rights in respect of possession, foreclosure or sale, by reason of non-payment of interest by the company under the 31st, 32nd, or 33rd paragraphs of the said contract, or under all or any of them, unless and until these shall be such default to the extent in the whole of a sum equal to five years of such interest, as the company is not relieved from payment of or permitted to defer or capitalize by the provisions of the said paragraphs.

According to this paragraph the Government appears to have no right to foreclose or to take possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway before five years of accrued interest is due. The Government by way of loan has surely, impliedly at least, authorized the company to defer its payments, to say the least, if, indeed, it has not been entirely relieved. If that is so, it seems to me that the Government had no right to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or to force a foreclosure, and that in so doing it assumes all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, or at least, is liable to the Grand Trunk Pacific for all damages which the company may incur as a result of the forcible taking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I dealt with this matter pretty fully this afternoon, and I hope that my hon. friend will not think me discourteous when I say that we have given the whole subject the most careful consideration and are satisfied that the appointment of the receiver has not exposed the Government to liabilities or in any way weakened our position.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am anxious that we should get through with this Bill to-night, and it will perhaps be the only opportunity we shall have of saying a word to the Government before it enters upon the negotiations which are in contemplation. There appears to be an attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to create the impression that we have a special retainer from the Grand Trunk and from the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that we are defending their case. It is scarcely necessary to say that such is not the fact. We are here to represent the people of Canada, and are actuated by the desire to get out of this mix-up in the very best way we can. I would impress upon the Acting Prime Minister, if such negotiations are to be proceeded with, that as I understand the situation the Grand Trunk is in debt to this country to a very large amount in obligations that have already accrued due or will accrue due. We on this side of the House would impress upon the Government in the most urgent and solemn manner that all those obligations should be properly marshalled, and the position of the Grand Trunk as to its liabilities to the people of Canada ascertained in the most businesslike manner. If the road in question is taken over, and if any money is to be paid, our position is that that money shall be paid less the amount the Grand Trunk owes to this country. I do not think that we can enter into sentiment in the matter at all, it will have to be a respectable business transaction. Whatever the shareholders of the company, or the company itself, are entitled to get from us, they should get—no more and no less. I trust the obligations in question will be fully considered in any negotiations

that may take place between the Government and the company.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.29 p.m.

Friday, April 4, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 45, to incorporate the National Wholesale Grocers' Association of Canada.—Mr. Sheard.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the official report of the Debates:

Friday, 4th April, 1919.

The Select Standing Committee to supervise the Official Report of the Debates beg leave to present the following as their First Report:—

Your committee have had referred to them for consideration a communication from the King's Printer submitting the present as well as the proposed scale of rates appended hereto to be charged for special editions of members' speeches.

Your committee realizing, in view of the large increase in wages and paper, the undesirability of the Printing Bureau continuing to charge for the above editions at the old rate recommend that, in future, the rates proposed to be charged be approved.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

R. L. Richardson,
Chairman.

PURCHASING OF DEPARTMENTAL AND OTHER SUPPLIES.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 46 respecting the purchasing of departmental and other supplies and materials for His Majesty.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Explain.

Mr. N. W. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, the members of the House will recall that by Order in Council of 8th May, 1915, a War Purchasing Commission was constituted, its duties being to supervise purchases for which payments were to be made out of the war appropriation. The commission carried on its duties from the date of its appointment, supervising all purchases made out of the war appropriation and dealing only with those branches of the public service until the month of February, 1918, when on the recommendation of the Prime Minister the duties of the commission were enlarged so as to embrace the other branches of the public service. The Prime Minister, in his report recommending the enlargement of the duties of the commission, pointed out that, pending consideration of permanent provision for that purpose after fuller study of the problems involved, the commission would continue to perform these larger duties. With the coming of peace, as the commission was appointed under the provisions of the War Measures Act, its duties would automatically come to an end unless other provisions were made. The work of the commission has been so satisfactory that the Government believe that it should be continued, and the present Bill provides for the appointment of a Purchasing Commission for Canada which shall do the purchasing of all supplies required by all departments of the Government. That does not include the Government railways, which now form part of a larger system and are being operated under the Railway Board. This, in brief, is the object of the Bill.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time.

THE EASTER RECESS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That this House adjourn Thursday the seventeenth instant at 6 p.m., and that when the House so adjourns it stand adjourned until Tuesday the twenty-second instant.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James): I would suggest to the Acting Prime Minister that the day for adjournment be fixed for Wednesday instead of Thursday. We do not sit on Wednesday night and I see no reason why we should stay here until the next day at three o'clock. I would remind the minister that Thursday is a feast day in the province of Quebec as is Good Friday. It seems to me that it would not make very much difference if we adjourned at six o'clock on Wednesday. Many friends have asked me to bring this matter to the attention of the Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): In former years we have generally adjourned on the Wednesday.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): I would strongly urge that we adjourn on Wednesday, if it were possible without too much inconvenience.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government is anxious, of course, that the business before the House shall be despatched as expeditiously as possible, but I am agreeable that for the convenience of hon. members the day should be changed from Thursday to Wednesday. I therefore beg to move:

That this House adjourn on Wednesday the 16th instant at six p.m. and that when the House so adjourns it stand adjourned until Tuesday the 22nd instant.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SOLDIERS SENTENCED TO PENAL SERVITUDE IN ENGLAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, referring to the question I addressed to the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) on Tuesday last regarding a Bill said to have been introduced into the British House of Commons under the provisions of which it is more than likely that criminals undergoing sentence to penal servitude would be sent to Canada, may I ask the hon. gentleman if the Government have received any information in regard to that proposed legislation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has no information respecting it. I think the statement of my hon. friend, or at least the impression conveyed by his question of the other day, no doubt based upon newspaper despatches, is entirely erroneous. I would not like to speak without the full facts before me, but I think that what was probably referred to was convictions for military offences, which are very different from criminal offences in the ordinary sense. However, I shall not speak on the subject now because I have not the facts. Some time, when the House is in Committee of Supply, I will be able to give my hon. friend further information. I understand that there are other members of the House who would like to speak on the subject.

Mr. MURPHY: Will that be within a short time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When we are in Supply. I understand that one or more members of the House may explain what they understand to be the situation. The Government have no information, and it is not in the slightest degree excited about it, because we are satisfied that no Bill introduced into the British House of Commons will work any injustice to Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the hon. gentleman do the House the courtesy to make inquiries so that we will know what the facts are?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall take that matter under consideration.

WAR MEASURES ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. BELAND: May I ask the Government whether it is their intention to provide for the repeal or abrogation of the War Measures Act as soon as the preliminary peace treaty is signed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend (Mr. Beland) will have observed in the speech from the Throne that provision is made for the enactment of a Franchise Act—

Mr. BELAND: I refer to the War Measures Act.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The War Measures Act will not be repealed until franchise legislation, with satisfactory provisions, is brought down.

Mr. BELAND: I do not refer to the War Time Elections Act; I refer to the War Measures Act.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The War Measures Act will expire, under its terms, upon the conclusion of peace as promulgated by Order in Council. The Government, upon the conclusion of peace, will consider when that promulgation should be made. I am unable to make any statement in regard to that at the present time.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BELAND: May I ask the Government further whether it is their intention to provide, during this session, for the repeal or abrogation of the Military Service Act as soon as demobilization is completed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand that the Military Service Act is to provide only for reinforcements to the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. Any announcement the Government has to make respecting the matter will be made in due course.

VACANT SEATS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. FREDERIC KAY: May I remind the Government that there are four vacancies in the membership of this House, namely, Assiniboia, Ontario North, Quebec

East and Glengarry and Stormont. I ask the leader of the Government when the Government will bring on the by-elections in these constituencies?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government will announce its policy in due course.

PATRIOTIC FUND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): May I ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if provision is to be made for the Patriotic Fund by the Government? An understanding was arrived at last year that after March of the present year private individuals would not be asked for contributions to the Patriotic Fund. Inquiries are coming to members of Parliament as to what the Government has done in this connection, and I would like some statement to be made to the public as to whether the collectors are supposed to cease collecting for the Patriotic Fund now and whether the Government will provide for whatever is necessary for the future.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has always stood ready to provide whatever amount was necessary in connection with the Patriotic Fund over and above what might be subscribed by the general public. I understand that the condition of the Fund is such that Government aid is not necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): moved the second reading of Bill No. 37, respecting the Department of Health.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this important Bill, it is fitting that a statement should be made to the House indicating the reasons why the Government has felt it necessary in the public interest to bring down this Bill. The proposal embodied in the Bill is one of the most important features of the Government's policy during the period of reconstruction. I may say that the war has impressed upon all citizens more than ever before the value of human life. There has certainly never been such a prodigal expenditure of human life in any war in history. On the other hand, never has human life been so valuable and never has the physical fitness of the men in the respective armies played so important a part in determining the final issues of the struggle. This war made an unexpected drain upon the energy and resources of the soldiers engaged in the conflict. During many periods of the war, the question was as to the ability of the men to stand the strain and not break down under it. The men who had the greatest physical strength, who were the most capable of bearing the burden of the struggle, were those who in the end rendered the greatest service.

Not only has the war emphasized the importance and value of human life, but the losses of the war have made a great drain upon the best life in this and every other nation engaged in the struggle.

I am sure we all realize, Mr. Speaker, that the men who went to the front were not the weaklings, the physically unfit, but the very best blood of the nation. The men who enlisted were of course the strongest and the most vigorous in the national life, and all the countries which were at war suffered most severely by reason of the number of their strong, vigorous, young men who laid down their lives in this struggle. Canada has lost approximately 60,000, the majority of these having fallen in battle or died of wounds, while a limited number died of disease. Canada is to-day the poorer to that extent. Not only has there been this drain upon our people, but a large number of the men who went overseas to fight for us have returned to Canada less physically fit; they have been maimed in the struggle and have suffered from disease, and to-day tens of thousands of them are less able to carry on their work and take their place in the life of the nation than they were before the war.

When one takes into account these war losses, one realizes what has been the drain of the war on the life of a young nation like Canada. We must also bear in mind the heavy financial burdens which this war has imposed upon Canada as upon every other nation engaged in the struggle, and that the only way we can carry these burdens is by developing our resources, by increasing the output of our forests, our farms and our factories. And as that development can only be obtained by increasing the productive power of the nation, we realize with additional force what a loss it is to Canada that these vigorous young men are no longer available to us. Just at the time when the burden upon us is the greatest and when we need the best blood of the nation to bear that burden, we are suffering from these war losses.

It has been the policy of Canada for many years, Mr. Speaker, to spend large sums of money to foster immigration in order to people our unoccupied lands and

to develop our natural resources; and yet while we have been spending these large sums of money for this purpose, we have not been nearly so active in spending even a moderate amount of money to conserve the lives, the health and well-being of the people here at home. We have not paid nearly so much attention to caring for the young children born in Canada who would make good Canadian citizens as we have in bringing in immigrants to settle here and become citizens.

At this time when we are suffering from the losses due to the war, and when the value of human life has become of greatest moment, it is fitting that the House and the country should turn attention to considering better measures for conserving the health of our people.

Now, do the conditions existing in Canada justify action at this time? What are the facts as disclosed by the medical examinations under the Military Service Act? I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the figures are not available of the rejections on the ground of physical unfitness while the voluntary system was in force. Of course, a record was kept of the men accepted, but not a corresponding record of the men who were rejected. But I have the figures of those who were accepted and rejected during the period the Military Service Act was in operation, and I am sure that these figures will surprise hon. members. Hon. gentlemen will recall the fact that the class called up for service under the Military Service Act were young married men and unmarried men from 20 to 34 years of age. Now 361,695 men were medically examined under the Military Service Act; of these 180,440 were accepted as physically fit; of the remainder 181,255 were found to be more or less physically unfit. In other words, of the adult male population of Canada of military age more than one-half were found physically unfit for active service. Those are startling figures, and they disclose to us the room there is for improvement in caring for the health and well-being of the people of this country. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no citizen would have believed that of the young men of this country between those ages 50 per cent would not have passed the test for entrance into active military service. It shows that there are thousands of young men in Canada who are not up to the physical standard, and that the majority of them are not up to that standard from quite preventable causes.

Not only do the facts in connection with enlistment disclose those conditions, but similar conditions are disclosed, so far as statistics are available, in connection with infant mortality in this country. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time we have no vital statistics covering the whole Dominion, and it is not possible therefore to make a comparison with any other country which has a good system of vital statistics; but it is possible to make comparisons between different countries in which they have adopted improved methods of caring for their children and the countries in which those methods have not been adopted. It is possible to make a comparison between some of these countries where the Governments have given special attention to the question of public health, and particularly child welfare, with the cities and towns of Canada where such great care has not been exercised. Let me give you some most interesting figures relating to this matter. These figures have been furnished to me by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I give them as furnished. The country in which the Government has taken the most active interest in child welfare, and in which its measures have touched practically the whole people, is New Zealand. The figures for New Zealand are for the year 1915, and I understand that they are the latest available, but that they are fairly representative of the situation there. The deaths of children under one year of age per 1,000 births in New Zealand are 50. How do other countries compare with New Zealand? Australia comes next with 68 deaths to 1,000 births; Sweden, 70 to 1,000; France 78 to 1,000; the Netherlands, 87 to 1,000; Switzerland, 91 to 1,000; Ireland, 92 to 1,000; England and Wales, 110 to 1,000; and then when you pass over to countries like Russia you get 248 deaths per 1,000 births, and Chili, which has the highest mortality, 286 deaths per 1,000 births.

Mr. MORPHY: What are the years to which these figures have reference?

Mr. ROWELL: New Zealand, 1915; Australia, 1915; England and Wales, 1915; France, 1912, Netherlands, 1915; Russia, 1903; Sweden, 1913; Switzerland, 1914; Chili, 1914. These are the latest figures that we have been able to get.

Mr. MORPHY: Are the figures not affected by the war in any way?

Mr. ROWELL: I should think that they are not appreciably affected by the war. I mention them only as indicating the general standard or scale which I understand the general figures support.

I now come to the situation in Canada as indicated by the statistics so far as they are available. It should be borne in mind, of course, that there is always the possibility of a percentage of error because of the fact that in some countries the statistics are not as accurately kept as in others; and the same may be true of the provinces. The figures, as given in the official records of each province, are as follows:

The lowest on the list is Saskatchewan, 91·2 per thousand for the year 1916. The rest follow in this order: Prince Edward Island, 93.6, 1917; Ontario 107·2, 1916; British Columbia 107·3, 1916; Manitoba, 113·5, 1914; Nova Scotia, 120.9, 1916; Quebec 153·4, 1916.

But it is when you come to the cities of Canada that you find the more startling results. First let me give you the rates of infant mortality under one year of age in certain cities in the Old Country for the year 1916; London, 89 per thousand; Bristol, 95; Edinburgh, 100; Glasgow, 111; Manchester, 111; Nottingham, 116; Liverpool, 118; Leeds, 129. In England they believe that the rate of infant mortality is unnecessarily high. They believe that attention must be paid to the question of public health as relating not only to children, but to older people as well. So serious do they consider the conditions that one of the most important proposals of the present British Government is the creation of a department of health. Last month a Bill designed to accomplish this end received its second reading in the British House of Commons.

Compare the figures which I have just given with those for our own Canadian cities. I have the figures for six cities, two in Quebec, two in Ontario and two in Western Canada. The lowest percentage of infant mortality per thousand is found in Sherbrooke, Quebec, 101. Then comes Toronto, 109; Winnipeg, 126; Vancouver, 144; Quebec, 203; Montreal, 207; Ottawa, 224. Compare these figures of infant mortality in Canada with those of cities in Great Britain. We are willing to spend money to bring immigrants to Canada, yet there are dying in some of the great cities of our country, during the first year of their lives, twenty-five per cent of the babies born. I mention these facts to point out the urgent reasons why we in Canada should give serious consideration to this most important matter.

Mr. NESBITT: To what years are the figures for the Canadian cities applicable?

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. ROWELL: Sherbrooke, 1917; Toronto, 1916; Winnipeg, 1917; Vancouver, 1916; Quebec, 1917; Montreal, 1917; Ottawa, 1916. In the light of these facts I am sure every one will realize that the question is one to which the House and the country should devote their most serious thought.

Mr. DUFF: May I inquire who compiled the figures which my hon. friend has just read?

Mr. ROWELL: They have been furnished to me by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, our own Government statistical bureau, and they are the latest figures available. I believe that they take them from the provincial government reports or the health reports of the different cities. At any rate, they are furnished to me as the official figures for those years, obtained from the best sources available—probably the Boards of Health in the cities.

There is another matter to which we should devote our attention. A disease which in the past has been mentioned with bated breath, but which people now frankly recognize must be discussed and the situation faced, is venereal disease. I mention it because its existence is one of the urgent reasons for the creation of a Federal Department of Health.

The government of Ontario appointed Mr. Justice Hodgins, of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario, to investigate this question and to make recommendations as to what action the Government should take in view of the prevalence of venereal disease throughout the country. I wish to refer to one or two statements occurring in the report of Mr. Justice Hodgins. On page 4 he reports

> Speaking generally the evil is so great and so widespread that nothing will be gained, but rather the reverse, by attempting all at once a too drastic course of action.

I refer to that statement to direct attention to Mr. Justice Hodgins' words "so great and so widespread."

In his report he quotes, on page 11, from the report, dated February 7, 1914, of a committee appointed by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, in which it is stated:

> In a recent inquiry concerning 8,000 male patients over eighteen years of age, admitted to a Boston hospital for all sorts of other medical and surgical diseases, the following result was obtained after careful questioning of all the patients: thirty-five per cent admitted the history of gonorrhoea and eleven per cent of syphilis at some period of their lives.

Then on page 12 of the report of Mr. Justice Hodgins it is stated—and most

people will admit that these figures are very surprising:—

In Ontario from a test applied in the Toronto General Hospital during the first three months of 1917 the following results were obtained. Twelve per cent of all public ward patients gave positive Wassermann reactions, i.e., found to be definitely syphilitic.

That is, 238 cases were detected in three months, or the equivalent of 952 per annum.

It is further established that twenty-five per cent of the male admissions to the Toronto General Hospital for the Insane were found to be suffering from general paresis and the further final results of gonorrhoea and syphilis which go so largely towards keeping up the population of our hospitals and asylums.

I just learned to-day that during the last two or three months of 1918 a test was made in connection with the Montreal General Hospital with the result that twenty-six per cent of the patients responded to the routine blood tests as suffering from venereal disease. These figures indicate how widespread and prevalent this disease is throughout the country, and what a menace it is to the future well-being of our nation.

It is an interesting and suggestive fact that the incidence of venereal disease is very much less amongst our soldiers than amongst our civilian population. One mode of applying the test was when the new recruits came in, and it was found that the incidence of venereal disease was very much higher amongst men called up under the Military Service Act than amongst men who had been in camp training for some time. These were examinations of men who had passed the medical examination, who had been accepted as soldiers, who had been passed by the battalion medical officers and who were considered as being suitable for going overseas, and yet there was a much greater amount of venereal disease than amongst the regular troops.

I mentioned that fifty per cent of the total number of men called up under the Military Service Act had been rejected The question arises—how many of those are suffering from a physical disability that was preventable. I have discussed the matter with the officers of the Army Medical Service, and while no actual statement has been compiled covering all the men called up, they have tested the matter out by securing figures in certain districts, and they state that undoubtedly fifty per cent of those who were physically unfit were physically unfit from preventable causes, and that if proper care had been taken those results would not have ensued. I might illustrate the importance of this question by referring to tuberculosis, but as there are a number of medical men in this House and some of them may wish to discuss that subject, I shall not take up the time of the House in dealing with it. I was startled at the number of deaths resulting from Spanish influenza. Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, recently stated that no less than six million people in India had died during last season from influenza, a terrible plague that spread throughout that country. In his statement he pointed out that undoubtedly the large mortality in India was in some respects attributable to the physical condition, the lack of nourishment in the underfed sections of the people.

I am aware there are some who entertain the view that medical science cannot render very great service under such conditions, but, while I respect their views, I cannot agree with them. Perhaps nothing has so vindicated the medical profession as this war. The marvellous result the medical profession has secured in the care of the soldiers in all of the armies at the front is one of the most striking tributes, not only to the advances of modern science, but to the skill of the medical profession. I remember when in England, in 1916, I had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Director General of the Army Medical Service of Great Britain, and he pointed out at that time that if the incidence of typhoid fever had been as great in the British forces on the Western front as it had been in all previous wars, they would have had 150,000 cases of typhoid fever from the opening of the war up to that date, viz., August, 1916. How many cases do hon. members think there were? Less than fifteen hundred, notwithstanding the conditions under which the men were compelled to live and fight on the Western front, and that result was largely due to improved methods of sanitation and the knowledge which medical science has brought to us, and the methods employed in utilizing that science.

There is an interesting fact in connection with our own troops that I should like to mention to the House. In the South African war, of the British forces, there died of disease 14,653; there were killed or died of wounds, 7,792. In other words, sixty-five per cent of the total deaths were due to disease and thirty-five per cent to casualties in action. In the Russo-Japanese war, in the Russian army, 20,890 died of disease, and 31,458 were killed or died of wounds. That is, forty per cent died of disease and sixty per cent died from wounds. In the Japanese army 27,000 died of disease,

and 59,000 were killed or died of wounds. That is, thirty-one per cent died of disease, and sixty-nine per cent died from wounds. During the present war, in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, 2,815 died of disease, and 51,853 were killed or died of wounds. That is, 5.14 per cent died of disease, and 94.85 per cent from wounds. That is a magnificent tribute to the efforts and skill of our Army Medical Service I submit that I have disclosed a state of affairs that calls for the most serious consideration not only of the Government and the members of this House but of the people of this country, to see what action we can take to improve conditions. I am sure we all agree that with our invigorating climate, our great open spaces, and the healthful conditions under which our people may be permitted to live, there should be no country in the world in which the death rate should be lower than in the Dominion of Canada, and no population more healthful and vigorous than ours.

These conditions have been attracting public attention, and the people of this country have been urging that action should be taken. I want to draw attention to how general and widespread is the demand that the Government should take action in this matter. In the month of March, 1918, there was convened in the city of Ottawa a women's conference composed of women from all the provinces of Canada and representing all the principal women's organizations in Canada. Many questions relating to the war were suggested for the consideration of that conference, but the women themselves insisted on taking up one question and making it the foremost question of the conference; and that was the question of public health, and the action which the Government should take upon it. This is the resolution they passed:

> That the conference of Canadian women in session at the request of the War Cabinet consider that one of the first and most essential things needed by the country at the present time is the establishment of a Federal Department of Public Health, and request that immediate steps be taken to have such a department established.

They further resolved:

> That in view of the terrible wastage of war, and of the excessively high death rate among infants in Canada, and of the ravages made by venereal diseases it is essential, in order to secure the maximum human efficiency in the country that immediate steps be taken by the Government to conserve infant life and to deal with the problem of venereal disease.

This action by the Women's Conference was only in line with the action that had already been taken, and has since been taken, by various women's organizations in Canada. The National Council of Women of Canada passed the following resolution and sent a deputation to the Government to present it:

> Resolved, that the National Council of Women of Canada do once more urge upon the Government the importance of establishing immediately a Federal Department of Public Health (including Bureaus of Child Welfare and of Venereal Diseases) under the direction of a minister chosen, not on account of political affiliation, but only upon the basis of competency.

There is no question that the women of Canada are very deeply and vitally interested in this whole question of public health. They know conditions, perhaps, better than the men do, and if there is any question that lies upon the heart of the great mass of the women of this country it is this question of federal assistance and greater care in the conservation of child life and the general health of the people of Canada. There is another resolution, practically to the same effect, which I may read later, passed by the Women's Section of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, representing the women of Western Canada. The women in the East and West combined are urging that this action be taken in the interests of the whole country.

And not only is it the demand of the women of this country, but the demand of organized labour as well. At the last meeting of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, held in the city of Quebec from the 16th to the 21st September, 1918, this resolution was adopted:—

> Whereas, the workers are the creative forces of all wealth of the nation, and whereas, it should be the supreme duty of all governments to maintain and uplift the physical, social and economic standards of its people, by the creation of laws governing health, housing sanitation, sick insurance, unemployment, etc., be it resolved, that this convention of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada places itself on record in favour of the creation of a Department of Health in the Dominion and provincial governments with a responsible minister attached; and be it further resolved, that the Executive Council and the various Provincial Executives of the Congress place this matter before their respective governments for adoption.

And when the delegation representing the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada waited upon the Government to present certain resolutions passed at that meeting, there was no question upon which they placed greater emphasis, from the standpoint of the working men of Canada, than on this question of a federal department of public health. Not only have the working

men recommended such action, but the employers have done so as well. A few months ago, and subsequent to the date upon which the representatives of the Trades and Labour Congress waited upon the Government, another deputation came to the Government composed of representatives of the Trades and Labour Congress and of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and I may say that was the first occasion on which representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and of organized labour ever came together to present a request to the Government. And what do you think was the first request they had to present? It was that the Government should create what they described as a Bureau of Public Welfare. Their request, presented in the month of November, 1918, was as follows:—

That the Government be requested to establish immediately a Bureau of Public Welfare to deal with such matters as health, sanitation, town planning, housing plans, accident prevention, and every other matter pertaining to the physical efficiency of the nation.

Owing to the present dearth of suitable homes for working men, this particular subject should receive the Bureau's first consideration. Much could be accomplished through the co-ordination of the many agencies, private, philanthropic and governmental dealing with these matters.

The representations to the Government have not been confined to these classes. Public health authorities all over the country have joined in pressing the matter very strongly upon the attention of the Government. In the month of January of this year a conference was held in the city of Ottawa of representatives of the departments of health of the different provinces of Canada, and in order that the House may know the character of the men who passed the resolution I shall read, may I say, who were present at the conference. It was presided over by Hon. J. A. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonization. There were also present: Major General J. T. Fotheringham, D.G.M.S.; Dr. P. H. Bryce, Chief Medical Officer, Department of Immigration, Ottawa; Dr. Gordon Bell, Provincial Health Officer, Manitoba; Dr. George G. Melvin, Chief Medical Officer of Health, New Brunswick; Captain Gordon Bates, Toronto; Hon. Wm. F. Roberts, Minister of Health, New Brunswick; J. W. S. McCullough, Lt.-Col., C.A.M.G., Chief Officer of Health, Ontario; Hon. W. D. McPherson, Provincial Secretary, Ontario; Major William Hutchinson, President, Canadian Public Health Association, Montreal; Dr. Elzear Pelletier, Secretary Superior Board of Health, Quebec; Dr. A. H. Desloges, General Medical Superintendent of the Insane, Quebec; Dr. Arthur Simard, President Superior Board of Health, Quebec; Dr. M. M. Seymour, Commissioner of Health, Saskatchewan, and Mr. Vincent Massey, who acted as secretary to the conference.

During the conference, which was called at the request of the military authorities to consider the question of protecting the public health in connection with venereal disease, the following resolution was passed:

Resolution: Moved by Dr. W. F. Roberts, New Brunswick. Seconded by Dr. Gordon Bell, of Winnipeg.

Whereas in the "Reconstruction of Canada" following the Great War, there are very many important problems that must be taken into consideration such as finance, soldiers' re-establishment, labour, etc. Among these the conservation of the lives and the health of the people is equally if not most important to be dealt with—as Life is the country's greatest asset.

Therefore resolved that this Conference whose personnel is made up of representatives from the various Provincial Governments of Canada together with their chief medical officers assembled at Ottawa, this third day of February, 1919, at the call of the Acting Premier the Honourable Sir Thomas White, for consideration of the Venereal Disease question, do memorialize the Government of Canada that it is in the interests of the future health and life of the citizenship of Canada that there should be immediately established a Federal Department of Health.

I mention this resolution particularly because some people seem to think that the proposed Federal Department of Health might be in some way an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of the provincial departments of health. No such idea is in view, nor is it contemplated by the Bill, which is supported and expressly requested by the health authorities of the different provinces. The Canadian Public Health Association have passed a strong resolution which they have forwarded to the Government, and the medical authorities at their conferences year after year have urged this matter. The Canadian Army Medical Service, acting through its chief, General Fotheringham, have requested, having regard to the grave menace of venereal disease, that there should be a Federal Department of Health with which the military authorities might co-operate in dealing with this question. The military authorities can deal with it from their standpoint, but the subject must be considered from the civilian standpoint as well, and it is the general desire that there should be a Federal department to deal with it.

It is said that the press is not unanimously in favour of a Department of Health. Well, I shall not dispute that but I could quote, if it would not be taking

up too much time, editorials from the leading journals of Canada very strongly supporting the proposal, in fact, demanding that the Government should establish a Department of Health. Now under the terms of its constitution the department will deal not only with matters relating to public health, but also with the social welfare of the people of Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: I presume that the minister has studied the constitutional aspect of the Bill and is satisfied that it does not invade the civil rights in the provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, that matter has been carefully considered. I do not think any question of civil rights arises under the terms of the Bill as drawn. As a matter of fact the public health—

Mr. BELAND: Can the minister say whether this question was brought up before the last Interprovincial Conference?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not remember, but I think it was not. However, there was this special conference called later, at which representatives of the province were present, when this proposal was made.

Mr. DEVLIN: I asked the question I put to the minister because he stated that this is done at the request of the medical representatives of the different provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: They have requested it, but I do not mean to say that the Government is taking action because they did so. I mentioned the fact only as indicating that they support the proposal and that it is their desire that this Bill should be passed. The British North America Act does not specifically deal with health, the only reference to health is the matter of quarantine which is expressly placed under federal authority. As a matter of fact, in the Act creating the Department of Agriculture passed in 1868 provision was made for public health and quarantine as being a matters over which the Parliament of Canada had jurisdiction. A number of sections of that Act dealt with public health and others with quarantine.

Mr. DEVLIN: Which Act does the minister refer to?

Mr. ROWELL: The Act creating the Department of Agriculture passed in 1868. Ever since Confederation the Federal Parliament has dealt with public health in various aspects under many Acts. I shall come to that in a moment. We have probably no fewer than fifteen Acts dealing with various phases of public health.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. DEVLIN: I observe in subsection B of section 4 a reference to the conservation of child life. I do not wish to anticipate the discussion, but is not that a matter which falls entirely within civil rights?

Mr. ROWELL: Every province is deeply and vitally concerned in that question, and it is its duty to do everything in its power to conserve child life. But I should think that it is equally important to the Dominion, which is spending thousands of dollars to bring immigrants here, to see that its native born do not unnecessarily die and the nation suffer.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand that, but I asked a direct question, and would like a direct answer. Has the minister studied the Bill sufficiently to be able to tell the House whether that section, for instance, does not fall within civil rights of the provinces?

Mr. ROWELL: I think the provinces clearly have jurisdiction, but the Federal Government also has jurisdiction. It seems to be a case of both having jurisdiction, but so far as the Federal Government is concerned its action might very properly be limited to collecting information and furnishing it to all who may desire to take advantage of it, there is no question that there is a very important field of activity open in that respect. In the United States the same situation exists as here. The States primarily deal with public health, and it was only in recent years that the Federal Government took up the question as a matter of self defence, originally in connection with quarantine and immigration, because people entering the country were bringing diseases and the Federal Government had to protect its citizens. It gradually extended its work until it now includes many phases on which I shall give the House information shortly. Section 4 of the Bill provides limitations so that we are clearly not invading any provincial rights.

Mr. McKENZIE: As regards the words "over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction," it might be well to give a definition of the term "jurisdiction."

Mr. ROWELL: It covers all matters specifically enumerated in the Bill, and possibly a few others. I shall be glad to go into that in a few minutes when we come to discuss the general sections of the Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has a copy of the Bill been submitted to the provincial authorities?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I think not. I think no Government authority has asked for it. Several requests have come in for copies and they have been sent out but I do not recall that any have come from provincial governments. The Bill deals with the question not only of public health but of social welfare and I am sure that the members of the House will agree that after all the most important thing is not to cure disease but to prevent it. The most important thing is to endeavour to create conditions favourable to good health rather than to treat disease after it has developed. In connection with the health of the people, no question is more important than good sanitary housing and the avoidance of slum conditions. I think it would be a natural development that the administration of the Federal Government's housing policy would be entrusted to a department like this. At present it is being administered by a committee of the Cabinet. I would expect that it would be entrusted to a department such as this because it is so intimately associated with the social welfare of our people.

Mr. McMASTER: Does the minister suggest that such a question as housing should come under federal jurisdiction?

Mr. ROWELL: I would suggest to my hon. friend that the policy which the Federal Government has adopted of assisting the provinces in housing would fall under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. DEVLIN: The policy of increased subsidies.

Mr. ROWELL: A full discussion of that question can take place when the Estimates are submitted, but I think that what the Government has done is unquestionably within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament and it has been accepted in that spirit by every province, many of them having passed Acts in order to take advantage of the federal housing policy. There are many other matters that one might mention in the same light. I referred a moment ago to the United States situation being very similar to ours as far as the Federal jurisdiction is concerned. In the United States their Public Health Department which has grown from very small beginnings, has developed into a very strong and efficient department. They have now eight divisions as follows:

1. Division of scientific research.

That is clearly within the competency of the Federal Government there. It is as clearly within the competency of the Federal Government here and it may be one of the important features of the work of a department such as this. That, of course, would depend on whether an appropriation were proposed in order to carry it out.

2. Foreign and insular quarantine and immigration.
3. Domestic and inter-state quarantine.
4. Sanitary reports and statistics.
5. Division of marine hospitals and relief.
6. Division of personnel and accounts.
7. Miscellaneous division, various activities in the matter of the publication of public health reports and bulletins.
8. Division of venereal diseases (which was added last year).

They have developed a very strong department of health and they are now making large appropriations for it, many millions of dollars being appropriated in the United States for the promotion of public health.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the establishment of a department of scientific research?

Mr. ROWELL: That question has not been considered as yet. It is a question for future consideration, but I should think that one of the natural and inevitable developments of a Federal department of health would be that we should develop a bureau of scientific research in connection with it. I have been asked why that was not specifically mentioned in the Bill. The reason is that it is not necessary. Clause 4 gives power and it is a question of a vote to establish it. It comes up on the vote for an appropriation and so soon as the Government is prepared to recommend to the House a vote for such a bureau that question would come up for consideration.

Mr. BUTTS: The minister has dwelt at considerable length during the course of his remarks with the infantile death rate. Could not that be very easily handled by making the Criminal Code a little more drastic in the passages that refer to murder?

Mr. ROWELL: My answer would be that I do not think the instances of infantile mortality in connection with what my hon. friend refers to would be any more numerous in Canada than in the other countries.

Mr. BUTTS: You would not like to answer that, perhaps. The second question is in connection with those unmentionable diseases; is it worth this Government's

while to spend time legislating to cure those diseases, or would it not be better to clear those people out altogether?

Mr. ROWELL: The policy of the Bill is to prevent rather than cure.

Mr. BUTTS: You cannot prevent it by Act of Parliament.

Mr. ROWELL: One can prevent the spreading of many diseases. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) asked in reference to the Federal Government's jurisdiction. I should like to draw his attention to certain Acts already passed by Parliament dealing with various health matters. In the Department of Agriculture, we deal with the health of animals. We have undertaken in this House to care for the health of animals and to prevent the spread of contagious diseases. I should think that we had just as much right to preserve the lives of human beings as animals.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would be a good principle of law to say that if we had jurisdiction over agriculture it would follow, as incidental to that, that we should deal with the health of animals.

Mr. ROWELL: In connection with agriculture both the provinces and the Dominion have concurrent jurisdiction. They are legislating in connection with agriculture and it is the same situation in connection with public health.

Mr. VIEN: Does the minister not think this is an unnecessary duplication?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I do not think so at all. I think the figures I have given show the necessity of the action. Public opinion in the country demands action. The Government would be recreant to its duty, with its knowledge of these facts, and in view of the public demand, if it did not take action.

We maintain in the Department of Agriculture in connection with animal diseases a laboratory for investigation and the supply of sera, and we maintain inspectors to investigate outbreaks of disease. In the Department of Inland Revenue we exercise certain jurisdiction in the inspection of foods and beverages in regard to adulteration. That is one of the important matters that comes under the Federal Bureau of Health in the United States, but we have dealt with it here by the Department of Inland Revenue. The Department of the Interior deals with the medical and sanitary side of Indian Affairs. The Department of Immigration deals with the inspection of immigrants' detention hospitals, investigation of immigrants' subsequent condition as regards mental and physical health, quarantine arrangements at sea ports and on the frontier, leper lazarettos, administration of Public Works Health Act, inspection of vessels in ocean ports, and supervision of public health in the Yukon territory; the Department of Marine deals with marine hospitals and sick seamen; the Department of Trade and Commerce deals with vital statistics; the Department of Militia and Overseas Military forces deals with the army medical corps and army military hospitals service, sanitation of camps, and food supplies for the army; the Department of Public Works deals with sanitary inspections of public buildings; the Department of Finance deals with infectious diseases transmitted through handling of money; the Department of Justice deals with the sanitation of prisons and the disease of criminals; the Department of the Naval Service deals with the sanitation of ships and food supplies for the naval service, and also with the diseases of fish and health in fish hatcheries; the Department of Customs investigates the quality of dutiable foods and drinks in relation to public health; the Post Office Department deals with infectious disease as transmitted through mails, and the sanitation of post offices. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment deals with the physical and mental restoration of invalided soldiers; and the Commission of Conservation investigates into general questions of public health. There is also the subject of patent medicines, which is under the Department of Inland Revenue, too, I think. Not only have we dealt with the question of health, but we have voted hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to various branches of the Government dealing with different aspects of the health problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will deal briefly with the scope of the Act. It will be noticed that section 4 defines the duties and powers of the minister administering the Department of Health, and covers all matters relating to the promotion or preservation of the health and social welfare of the people of Canada over which Parliament has jurisdiction, and particularly the following matters and subjects. The first is:

(a) Co-operation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the co-ordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health;

At the present time there is no co-ordination; each province takes its own course, as

it does in any other matter. A Federal Department might be a clearing house in which information of the results of work in one province would be gathered up and made available to every other province, and the largest measure of co-operation worked out. It has been done in other branches of the Government in connection with other phases of work carried on by the provinces and the Dominion.

Mr. DEVLIN: What does the hon. minister mean by "co-operation" and "co-ordination"? Does he mean that all literature to be distributed will be sent to the provincial boards of health to be distributed by them, or will it be distributed independently of the provincial boards?

Mr. ROWELL: I can give my hon. friend illustrations covering many matters, but I will take only one, the case of contagious disease. It is a matter of the greatest importance to the welfare of the whole nation that there should be to some extent at least corresponding provisions in all the provinces for the protection of public health against contagious diseases. If a contagious disease breaks out in any one province it is a menace to all the provinces, for we know how rapidly it spreads. In such a case co-operation should secure the enactment of legislation in the different provinces for the suppression of such a disease. I am quite sure that it would be feasible, and that the health authorities in the different provinces would be very glad to co-operate in order to secure such a result.

You will see that provision is made in section 6 for a Dominion Council of Health consisting of the Deputy Minister of Health, who shall be chairman, the chief executive officer of the provincial Department or Board of Health of each province, and such other persons, not to exceed three in number, as may be appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall hold office for three years. That would be the medium for co-operation and co-ordination, for you would have the health representatives of all the provincial Governments on that Council conferring together and working out plans to secure the best results for the whole Dominion.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would their advice be accepted by the Minister of Public Health?

Mr. ROWELL: The Minister of Public Health must of course be responsible to this House as a member of the Government. He would not be bound to accept their advice; it would be in his discretion to accept or reject it.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then what is the use of having both?

Mr. ROWELL: I should say there would be great advantage in having both. I should think it would be a good thing for the minister to be in constant touch with the provincial health authorities, and also for the public health service in the different provinces, and I am quite sure that they could render very excellent and helpful advice to the minister. He, of course, must take upon himself the responsibility of finally acting on it or not. Referring again to section 4, we have the conservation of child life and child welfare, on which I have already spoken.

The next subject dealt with is the inspection and medical care of immigrants and seamen, and the administration of marine hospitals;—

Mr. DEVLIN: That is within federal jurisdiction undoubtedly.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes; and it is a matter of very great importance. The next subject is the supervision, as regards the public health, of railways, boats, ships and all methods of transportation;—

Mr. DEVLIN: That is within federal jurisdiction.

Mr. ROWELL: Unquestionably, and again a matter of great importance, having regard to the facility with which a contagious disease may be communicated in transportation.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the hon. minister apply that to provincial lines as well?

Mr. ROWELL: That is a matter I have not considered.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is very important.

Mr. ROWELL: Of course, if it had to be worked out in a way that would keep well within federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MORPHY: Reverting to clause (c) the inspection and medical care of immigrants and seamen, and the administration of marine hospitals, would the Act give power to have your inspection made at the ports of embarkation of immigrants from other countries, so that prevention might be undertaken at the right place?

Mr. ROWELL: The inspection would be under the Department of Health, but whether here or over there or at both places would be a question to be settled by the Immigration Department.

Then clause (e), the supervision of federal public buildings and offices with re-

gard to the health of the civil servants and other Government employees therein. Obviously there is no question that that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Dominion.

Clause (f) reads:

(g) The administration of the statutes mentions made by the International Joint Commission, promulgated pursuant to the treaty between the United States of America and His Majesty relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States of America and Canada, so far as the same relate to public health;

Clearly that is also a matter of federal jurisdiction. I shall not go into it at the present time, but probably during the discussion my hon. friend the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) who has given special study to it, will have something to say upon it.

Then clause (g) reads:

(g) The administration of the statutes mentioned in the Schedule to this Act, and of Acts amending the same, and also of all orders and regulations passed or made under any of the said Acts; and all the duties and powers of any minister of the Crown under either of the said Acts or any of the said orders or regulations, are hereby transferred to and conferred upon the Minister of Health;

—and clause (h):

(h) The collection, publication and distribution of information to promote good health, and improved sanitation;

Assuredly those are matters of federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): The establishment of a Department of Scientific Research, it seems to me, is more important than any one single—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to remind hon. members—and I do not refer specially to the hon. member who is just now speaking—that the House is not in committee. The hon. President of the Privy Council has been very courteous in allowing and answering questions of all kinds, but hon. members cannot interrupt the hon. minister for the purpose of expressing their respective opinions without violating the rules of the House. I would remind hon. members that all of these questions may be properly asked when the Bill is considered in committee.

Mr. ROWELL: Before passing from the subject of the distribution of literature, I may add that the following rather interesting circular letter came to my attention recently. It was addressed by a Medical Health Officer in Saskatchewan, in view of the influenza epidemic, to the principal of a school:

You will find enclosed copies of literature on influenza sent out for free distribution by the United States Public Health Service. Not only should the information contained in these leaflets help to suppress influenza, but other infectious diseases as well.

Kindly have the teachers carefully explain this literature to each class.

Until such time as Canada has a Dominion Health Department municipalities must continue to beg and use American health literature.

Perhaps he is not correct in his statement; at any rate that circular was issued. I have a sample of the literature that was sent out to the schools of that particular western city. First, there is a bulletin of the United States Public Health Service for circulation among all families, on Spanish influenza and how to treat it. Then, diagrams and charts were issued by the United States Department of Health on the subject of influenza and were widely distributed. The United States Department of Health carries on a very active propaganda in the interest of public health, spreading the information all over the country.

The Bill does not contemplate adding another minister to the Cabinet; it provides that the Department of Health shall be presided over by such minister as the Governor in Council may determine. While I have no authority to say so, I should think, now that the war is over, that the tendency would be to decrease rather than increase the number of Cabinet Ministers. A Bill was passed last session which permits of the transfer of one branch of the service from one department to another, and I have no doubt that such a rearrangement of the public service can be worked out as will make it possible for a member of the Government to give the necessary time to the work of this important department. I think it deserves the best thought and attention of a member of the Government in order that the public interests may be promoted, as I believe they will be promoted by this Bill.

As I view the matter, and as the Government views it, the Bill is of very great importance. It is not a new departure in the sense of the Federal Parliament legislating on public health; ever since Confederation we have legislated on various aspects of the question. But it is a new departure in the emphasis which it places upon the conservation of the health of the people and upon their social welfare. It

means that in the new day in which we are now living, when the welfare of the masses of the people must become more and more the concern of the whole people, the Government of the country must devote its best thought and attention to the questions which I have suggested, so that here in Canada, with all our natural advantages, with our great opportunities of developing a truly great nation, we shall have a strong, vigorous and healthy people of whom Canada may be proud and who will retain for Canada the magnificent place which her soldiers won for her in the field. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. DEVLIN: Bowing to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the minister? The minister has had in his hands a great deal of literature which was distributed in the United States. Of course he has read these things; I have not had opportunity to read them. Do they recommend, as a good many doctors in Canada recommend, whisky and quinine for the treatment of influenza?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The question of a specific remedy or treatment is certainly not one which can be discussed when we are considering the principle of the creation of a Department of Public Health, and I rule the question out of order.

Mr. DEVLIN: Even with the minister's permission?

The CHAIRMAN: Even with the minister's permission.

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (Toronto South): Mr. Speaker, I have given some little attention to this Bill and some study to the preliminary conditions which led up to its introduction into this House. While I am free to admit that a Federal Public Health Department would afford great opportunities for good in Canada and that there are great avenues of work through which it can exercise those opportunities for good and attain a great many objects, I am far from being satisfied with the Bill as it has been brought down by the President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell).

If a Federal Department of Public Health is to be of real value to Canada, it must be ancillary to the Provincial Health Departments now operating in the Dominion. It must assist, and not conflict with, the operation of municipal and provincial health boards; and we must be absolutely sure that its jurisdiction is constitutional and well-defined.

We need not go very far to prove what are and what will become the limitations of a Federal Health Department; we may simply refer to the British North America Act. True, the British North America Act makes but a slight reference to health matters per se, but it does make very specific reference to the machinery by which health matters are administered. If we are going into child welfare, if we are going into work to administer the machinery connected with hospitals and dispensaries, we are certainly trading upon the rights of the provinces and the municipalities. Section 92 of the British North America Act defines the exclusive powers of the Provincial Legislatures and subsections 6, 7 and 8 clearly state that the establishment, maintenance and management of public reformatories, prisons in and for the province, and the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions are within provincial jurisdiction. Therefore, outside of hospitals maintained as marine hospitals and quarantine hospital stations at the ports of entry, all the hospital machinery of the country is reserved for adminstration under provincial law.

I shall probably have a number of amendments to move to this Bill when it gets into committee, so that I shall not do more now than utter a word of warning. In my judgment the Bill has been framed not altogether with the idea, I fear, of co-operating with the provincial and municipal health departments, but rather with the idea of establishing a Federal department which may exercise such authority as will be gubernatorial so far as the administration of health matters in Canada are concerned.

But, Sir, I am going to support the Bill, —although not in its present shape,—because I believe it affords an opportunity to legislate at the present time on a matter which concerns the best interests of our country.

My first suggestion is one which has already been referred to in the question put by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon), who asked if a bureau of scientific research was to be established for the administration and co-ordination of this work. I understood the President of the Council to say that it all depended upon the amount of money which this Parliament placed at the disposal of the department. I hope the bureau will be supplied with a substantial sum for this purpose, because every department of public health in a country which has in any way created it as a national feature, has pivoted around its laboratory work. Nay,

more, I will say that laboratory work is the very foundation of health considerations, and you can no more move in a health organization without laboratory equipment, without research work, without devotion to laboratory effort, than you can move a train without its motive power. All I have to do is to refer to the great start made in health work in 1872 by the studies of one of the most illustrious of all distinguished scientific Frenchmen, who in his discussions and researches and experiments in reference to fermentation, electrified the scientific world, and to-day we have amongst the saints of sanitation, that patron saint in medical discovery, the revered and illustrious Pasteur. What had Pasteur been doing? He had been combatting in his laboratory, quietly and alone, the theory of Liebig. Liebig advanced the theory that the processes of fermentation were essentially dependent upon temperature, and that you could have no fermentative processes apart from regulation of temperature and cell development. But Pasteur took a distinct line to analyse that theory, and he showed that there were other organisms which when introduced into the animal kingdom combatted the organisms which produced disease, and he astonished in particular the British Isles by taking a hundred sheep and inoculating them with a specially prepared serum, which prevented the virulent form of anthrax which was ravaging the sheep flocks in the form of foot-and-mouth disease in the Southern counties of England. That single experiment of Pasteur, the result of his laboratory work, practically abolished the foot-and-mouth disease in Europe and, to a large extent, in this country. That was immediately prior to 1872, and from that date bacteriology and its allied sciences took a new development based upon laboratory work exclusively. Sanitation became a science and had infused into it a new life, vigour and application, through scientific laboratory research work by specialists.

The United States has made considerable advancement as regards sanitary matters. It has it Bureau of Animal Industries, and its Bureau of Scientific Research. It has not only its statistical department, but its advanced experimental stations, and we find, when we investigate the administration of these matters at Washington, that they have a Federal Health Department which is almost wholly and entirely scientific and laboratorial in its efforts. There are four great departments of active workers in sanitary science—there are the great department of bacteriology, the great department of pathology, the great department of chemistry, with separate laboratory equipment and departments for each, and the separate department of pharmacology. That is how the Washington Federal Health Department is arranged at the present time. That, however, may be so much Greek to those who do not know the technique and the bearings of those various departments of a Federal Health Department. Take, for instance, the great study of pollution of water supplies. In this Bill there is a special proviso, and a very proper one, which this Government must take cognizance of to regulate the international waterways:—

(b) The enforcement of any rules or regulations made by the International Joint Commission, promulgated pursuant to the treaty between the United States of America and His Majesty relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States of America and Canada, so far as the same relate to public health.

In other words, that refers to the degree of sewage contamination which may be produced, for instance, at Buffalo in Lake Erie, and the Niagara river, and which may contaminate Lake Ontario and thus breed typhoid and other water-borne diseases along the shores of Lake Ontario. That bacteriological department is one which to a very large extent will be occupied in determining the degree of water contamination. It will also study the actual diseases, the causes of communicable diseases, and what serums can be developed in order to counteract them. And this information can be spread broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion with great benefit, not only to the local and provincial health departments of the country, but to the agriculturists, yes, and to the manufacturers everywhere. And it can do the same as was done in the United States when they made their great investigations into and studies of hookworm and Pelagra, and practically removed that scourge from the transmontane states of California and Oregon. They discovered not only the cause of the disease—and it was one which affected cattle and men—but the remedy by which it could be cured. May I mention that, as an illustration of how a department of bacteriology could be operated as a federal health department, which would in no respect conflict with either the spirit or the application of provincial laws and provincial rights as they relate to health matters, but which would be enormously beneficial in yielding results which would

save the lives of men and the herds and stocks of the agricultural community?

Let me take the next department, the department of pathology. Hon. members may say: What in the world is pathology? Pathology, technically speaking, is a discourse on disease, but it has also to do with the careful investigations ot the diseases of man and animals, diseases which are communicable from animals to man.

For instance, such diseases as hog cholera and hog measles originate in animals, and when the flesh of one of these diseased animals is eaten by man, the disease may be communicated. In that way the disease is spread, and sometimes causes death. It is the business of the Pathological Department to examine in a pathological way these diseased tissues. You could not find a better example of the work that department is doing than at the laboratory of the stock yards in eastern Buffalo. This laboratory is maintained by the Department of Federal Health at Washington, and it is the duty of a body of trained examiners to examine microscopically samples of every slaughtered animal. If a sample is affected with trichinosis, tuberculosis or anthrax the disease will be detected at once. The examiners have no interest in the stockyards or in the property of the animals, but they have every interest in seeing that the meat is wholesome and entirely fit to eat.

Next we come to the great department of chemistry, which is operated under the Federal Health Department at Washington. This is a department we should certainly have in this country. It attends to all forms of adulteration of food, the glazing of tea, and a hundred other things in respect of which it is necessary to see there is no adulteration or that the proper percentage of nutritive value is contained. This provides an excellent check on fraud and deficiency in the trade and commerce of the country.

As to the Department of Pharmacology, which is a separate department in Washington. It is a department which we should have here, but no mention is made of it in the Bill, unless in the schedule, where it would come, I suppose, in connection with the Proprietary and Patent Medicines' Act. The Pharmaceutical Department at Washington requires, first of all, to know the contents of every patent medicine. Patent medicines are being sold in this country which are supposed to cure every variety and form of ill. They may be frauds; you cannot tell what they contain; there is no department of the Government, so far as I am aware, that is responsible for stating that they have any efficacy at all. Any one can make up a little colored water, put it in a bottle, advertise it well as a cure for delirium tremens or something else, and make millions on an article that may be nothing but a hollow fraud. We have no one in Canada to investigate and report that these patent medicines are what they profess to be, and whether they have any virtue at all.

Then we come to the proprietary medicines. The difference between a proprietary and a patent medicine is that the formula of a proprietary medicine is published, while the formula of a patent medicine is supposed to be a secret, and as no reputable physician has any secrets, he does not care to endorse the so-called patent medicines. He does, however, use proprietary medicines to show his breadth of mind, and for the good they will do his patients, perhaps. It is the business of the Pharmaceutical Department to see that the proprietary medicines are made up precisely as represented in the formula.

These are simply suggestions as to what, in my judgment, a Federal Health Department should primarily aim at. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) was a splendid one, and I should like to see it embodied in the Bill, and made effective. That is the first suggestion I have to offer. My hon. friend says it is not necessary to embody it in the Bill; that all we have to do is to bring down the necessary estimate. If the deputy minister thinks it is all right—and I can clearly see that the Minister of the Department of Health will have no knowledge of the matter at all—if the deputy minister has ambition enough to initiate a new development along these lines, and thinks it feasible and not too much work, he may agree to it, but there is no statutory obligation on him to do this particular kind of work. I should like to see a clause inserted—and I shall move, accordingly, when the Bill is in committee—that will set forth the metes and bounds of this new department.

We come next to the conservation of child life and the matter of child welfare. I would strongly urge upon the House to strike that out, as there is no possibility of doing any work along that line without encroaching upon the authority and rights and operations of the provincial health departments, except it be in the matter of preparing statistics and giving information of the work that is being done in other countries. In my judgment, the federal work

along this line should be confined purely to statistics, and I have reason for saying so. Wherever the benefits of child welfare work have been observed, the benefits have always been achieved through hospital effort. I should like to quote some statistics from a report of the medical officer of the Local Government Board of England, for the year 1917-18. A special chapter of that report deals with child welfare. The death rate of infants is dwelt upon, and it is pointed out that one-third of all the deaths in infancy occur in the first month, and one-fifth in the first week after birth. The decreasing death rate after that period shows how much saving in life is possible. A table is given which shows that in a thousand births, 20.2 deaths occur among the children of medical practitioners, while 47.1 occur in the families and houses of general labourers. In a women's hospital in New York where there were 8,318 infants born, .15 died on the first day, .10 within the next six days, and .6 in the second week. Amongst the causes of death in children, the English statistics show that 6 per cent were due to acute infectious diseases, 3 per cent to tuberculosis, 18 per cent to diarrhoeal affections, and 7 per cent to pneumonia and lung affections. Genital disabilities carry off a certain percentage. I quote these figures to show that in cases where the women are housed in hospitals and the children have the benefit of hospital care for the first two or three weeks of their lives, infantile mortality is materially reduced. This would seem to indicate that the greatest field for beneficial work in this particular respect is in the maternity and similar hospitals in the country, which institutions are, under the British North America Act, entirely within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

This Bill has been urged chiefly by reason of the achievements of Dr. Anderson in England. But conditions here are entirely different than were those under which he worked. We can have no opportunity of doing what he did, because we are altogether differently constituted. Dr. Anderson's work embraced the incorporation of all the local government boards operative in England. These local government boards were practically separate boards of research. They were not endowed by the country, but were largely connected with the scientific institutions which officially did work for them. The Public Health Bill in England abolished all these and placed them under a central board of administration, a bureau of scientific research, such as that for which I am arguing to-day as a necessity in Canada.

[Mr. Sheard.]

But they also embraced the administration of the Poor Law system, a system inaugurated since the days of Elizabeth. The Poor Law administration, the administration of old age pensions, and charities, were all included under the Health Act; and there were many other features which had to be remodeled,—features that do not exist in this country. The provincial boards of health have done the greatest amount of work, and in health matters we are to-day far in advance of the British Isles, notwithstanding the statistics that have been submitted concerning child welfare. Ontario, I think, is abreast, and probably ahead, of any other place in the world in matters of health,—certainly better off than any state in the Union. Some of the Western Provinces have an equally good record, and in view of the splendid way in which the provinces have administered public health in the past we should be very careful not to encroach in the slightest degree upon their particular work. However, I can perceive much good in the Public Health Department if it will provide a certain amount of money to take care of patients that are transferred from one province to another. Take a case of contagious disease that passes a port of entry unobserved, and goes, say, from Montreal to Toronto, where it is discovered. Who is to take care of that case, and who pays the bill? Clearly it does not come under the responsibility of the province of Ontario, and the Federal Health Department should make some financial arrangement for the maintenance, care, and treatment in the public interests of all migratory cases that occur. In the case of venereal disease, I think a thorough and rigid inspection at the port of entry should be made. There are many cases of syphilitic infection which ordinary medical men can detect without a very careful scrutiny. These cases have in the past been frequently admitted without restraint and have gone on for a year or two, communicating that condition to others besides a long progeny of mentally defective, and, in some cases, epileptic persons, with the necessary entailment of cost. In my opinion, therefore, the greatest work in connection with the Public Health Department is a rigid system of quarantine and inspection in connection with the Immigration Department, 200 per cent better than it has been in the past, to preclude the possibility of these cases escaping detection. A certain number of infectious diseases may be brought to this country by returning troops. The care of them is clearly not the legacy of any particular province, and the Federal

Department of Health should make arrangements to look after them. If there is space to accommodate them in marine hospitals, well and good; if not, there should be an arrangement by which the provinces might take care of them and isolate them as long as necessary, and be paid through the order of the Federal Department of Health. Over and above all that, there should be provision for the careful study of epidemics as they appear in various foreign countries. We know how this country has suffered in the past from imported epidemics, very little attention having been given them, even by scientific men, until they began to develop in this country, when they were studied more closely because they then came under the immediate notice of the proper authorities.

If we had a paid department maintained by the Federal Government for the specific purpose of studying these epidemics, distributing literature, studying modes of infection, getting into touch with those who had charge of cases before they landed on our shores, a very considerable benefit would accrue and the work would prove profitable.

As I shall probably have a good deal to say by way of amendment when the Bill comes into committee, I shall now conclude; but before taking my seat I would say that if the energies of the Bill are properly and well directed, if the influences behind it are those of pure scientific minds emulating the highest ideals which have distinguished and characterized the medical profession throughout the whole civilized world, then I can see no greater force developed in this great Canada of ours for the betterment of humanity and for the relief of the sufferings to which Canadians may be exposed, and I can see no better investment than a well equipped, well endowed well supported Federal Health Department.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I shall not take up very much time in speaking on this question. First, I should like to congratulate the President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) on the honour which he has had of introducing this Bill, and also on the exceedingly able manner in which he has put forward the reasons for it. His explanation of the causes that led to the introduction of the Bill was so exhaustive as to leave little for the ordinary medical man to say on the matter.

In dealing with a question like this we should bear in mind that health is the greatest and most vital national problem with which any country has to deal. Some Bills affect only some of the people, but this affects all the people for in it is vitally bound up the welfare of every citizen. Before I discuss briefly the objects of the Bill and give my opinion of those objects, I desire to refer to the criticism that has been levelled at medical men in some portions of the press of this country in connection with this Bill. The medical men have been described in some of the newspapers as political doctors who are looking for a portfolio or something to that effect. I do not believe that criticism is fair because if you look over the history of the medical profession, if you look over the history of health matters throughout the world, you will find that there has been no advance in sanitation or public health that medical men were not foremost in helping forward. One point in this connection that is worth making is that the effect of this very Bill will be to take away a part of the occupation of the medical men themselves. It would be to the interest of the medical men to oppose the bringing in of a Bill such as this. I consider that the medical men are taking the same high minded stand on this matter that they usually take on public questions. If you will look over the history of the different branches of medicine you will find that practically all the great advances we have had in scientific medicine have been made by medical men. You will remember that it was the German, Koch, who discovered the tubercle bacillus which was one of the greatest discoveries in medical science. You will also remember that it was the great French scientist, Pasteur, who discovered the methods for preventing hydrophobia. That discovery has been dealt with much more oratorically and fluently than I could possibly deal with it by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sheard). I have the happy recollection, one day a number of years ago now, and some time before the outbreak of war, of standing in the Pasteur Institute in Paris and seeing a mother and father come hurrying into the institute with a little child which had been bitten by a mad dog in order to take advantage of the blessing that Pasteur had given to the world. His discovery was another of the great advances in medical science for which we are indebted to a medical man. Then, we have the discovery of chloroform and ether. Ether was discovered, if I remember correctly, some time in 1846 by Dr. Morton of Boston and chloroform was discovered by Sir James Simpson of that fine old Scotch University of Edinburgh in 1847.

It is strange and significant, in view of the real importance of this measure, that during the discussion of this most important question the House should be almost empty. When chloroform and ether were discovered many clergymen in Europe wrote to the press protesting against the use of such things as anaesthetics, and it was said by these critics that the pain of child-birth was given to the mothers as a God-given blessing to them and in order to purify them. Such ludicrous stuff as that was put forward in opposition to the use of chloroform and ether. Yet they were employed and proved great blessings. Surgical asepsis was discovered by Lord Lister, also of Edinburgh, about 1867, and as a result the world has received the greatest possible benefit, notwithstanding the fact that this discovery met with opposition. The opposition to vaccination still continues. It was the discovery of Dr. Jenner, a physician practising in a backwoods town. These are just a few of the examples showing how the medical profession has contributed to the advancement of knowledge in regard to matters relating to medicine and sanitation, and if the medical men of the country have supported this Bill it is because of the high-minded view which they are taking of it.

One of the many points brought up by the hon. the President of the Privy Council was that relating to tetanus and typhoid. He mentioned typhoid, but I do not think he mentioned tetanus. He stated that in the South African war typhoid had caused nearly as many deaths as wounds, whereas in this war typhoid had caused almost no deaths. At the beginning of the war tetanus was one of the most potent causes of death. Because of the highly fertilized soil of France wounded people coming in contact with it became infected. Through the anti-typhoid and anti-tetanic serums these diseases were practically eliminated. In my whole experience at the front I only saw one case of tetanus.

I was glad to notice that the minister mentioned that the labour organizations were among the first to bring forward a proposal that a medical health department be established under Dominion jurisdiction. I believe the labour organizations had much to do with advancing the proposal. Very often labour organizations in this country bring forward proposals that are very worthy of consideration. Recently in England a health Bill was introduced, but it was not made applicable to Ireland and Wales. I have forgotten whether it was made applicable to Scotland or not. But we had the picture in the British House of Commons of the Irish and Welsh members standing up and fighting to have the Bill made applicable to the parts of the country from which they came. We had Sir Edward Carson, one of the old anti-home rulers, and Captain Redmond, one of the prominent Nationalists, and son of that fine old Irishman, John Redmond, who had for years been political foes, standing side by side and fighting to have the medical health Bill made applicable to Ireland as well as to England, and perhaps to Scotland. There is a motto issued by the New York Board of Health which it seems worth while to remember. It is this:

> Public Health is purchasable and within limits the community can determine its own death rate.

This Bill is peculiarly applicable at the present time because of the fact that the war has caused the death of 60,000 of our best and bravest men. Influenza has caused many thousands of deaths and infantile mortality has always headed the death rate in this country. It is a fact that the city of London has a lower death rate than Montreal or Ottawa but in this connection it is only fair to mention the fact that London does not get the extremes of heat and cold that Canadian cities do. I mention that as some sort of a defence of the death rate in Canadian cities although so many cases of infantile mortality in Canadian cities are not defensible. I do not think we should have anything like the mortality that we have amongst infants.

In regard to the opposition to the establishment of this Federal Board of Health, the same objections apply to the establishment of provincial boards of health. If you carry the opposition to a Dominion board of health to its logical conclusion you must oppose the provincial board of health and you must oppose anything but a municipal board of health. I do not think that position is really tenable. Of course, I am glad to hear the minister say that this is not for the purpose of interfering with provincial or municipal legislation, or that it will act to the exclusion of any such legislation. The purpose is to co-operate with the provincial and municipal authorities. If, for example, the province of Quebec had better health rules than the province of Ontario this board of health would point that out in the province of Ontario and try to induce that province to adopt similar measures. It might be the other way round; I am just mentioning that as an example.

The war showed a heavy line of defectives when the men were being examined. As the minister mentioned, over fifty per cent of the men were refused admission to the army of Canada through deafness, blindness, bad teeth and such diseases as that. Most of these diseases are preventable by the proper handling of the children in the schools and by proper inspection of school children. It seems strange that Canada, where the natural conditions are so conducive to good health, should have such a large number of defectives amongst those who applied to enlist in the army.

It is worth noting that life insurance companies estimate the value of a human life at $2,500 to $4,000, and when you take into account the thousands of these little infants who die every year and the deaths from preventable diseases, you realize the importance of preserving the health of our people. After all, we have no natural resource which is comparable to our little children. We are losing a vast amount yearly by reason of the heavy infantile death rate which now prevails, and this Bill is for the purpose of preserving our greatest natural asset—our little children. Hitherto we have been very careless of the health and welfare of our people, and the interesting fact was mentioned by an hon. member that we protect the cattle of our country much more than we protect our people.

A point worth remembering is that France, with her glorious record in this war, which has caused her so much loss in both life and property, recently passed a Bill for the appropriation of $20,000,000 for the prevention of tuberculosis. It indicates what the more highly developed countries are doing in the line of public health conservation.

I am going to refer to some other matters which I think are pertinent to this discussion, but which have not been touched upon during the debate. Are you aware, Mr. Speaker, that in our fairly large centres to-day insane people are kept in jail pending their removal to an asylum? Those people are just as much sick as people suffering from typhoid or pneumonia. Is such a condition not a disgrace to a professedly civilized country. Tuberculosis has been mentioned; it is a plague that is taking the lives of thousands of our young boys and girls, and yet it is entirely preventable by proper treatment and education. Illegitimacy and venereal diseases have been mentioned by the hon. minister, and I would like to draw his attention to this fact, that illegitimacy and venereal diseases are directly in proportion to the number of mental defectives in any country, so that the admittance of mental defectives at the ports of entry increases illegitimacy and venereal diseases; our rescue homes are filled with mental defectives. Typhoid, diphtheria, smallpox and other diseases are also preventable. Another matter I wish to mention, and I hope some day to see measures taken to render impossible such an exhibition as I am about to describe. Years ago as a young medical student I paid admission to see a supposedly wild woman from, I think, the southern Pacific Islands—

An hon. MEMBER: Perhaps Borneo.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps so. When I got inside I found to my horror a woman with a head about as large as my fist, a woman who was just an ordinary congenital idiot—idiocy is congenital—and she was being exhibited there for ten or fifteen cents. I consider that that was a disgraceful condition of affairs. That woman was no more to blame for having been born with such a small head than you or I, Mr. Speaker, are to be credited for inheriting heads of nearly normal size. In any properly civilized country such an exhibition would not be tolerated; the poor woman would have been put in a proper institution and carefully looked after. Those are some of the subjects which came to my mind while I was considering this Bill, and the Bill itself has suggested to me the following further points:

First: This Bill will bring about united co-operation, and we all know what united co-operation did for us in the war that has just closed. Second: It will bring about a general supervision of the health of our people. The purpose of the Department of Health will be to gather statistics and information of all kinds. The insurance companies of this country are loaded up with the very finest statistics bearing on the public health, but they have no central information bureau such as would be established under this Bill. Third: I think generally it will educate the country. Fourth: It will also take cognizance of the immigration policy of the country, covering such subjects as mental defectives, trachoma,—which is a very easily contracted disease and very difficult of eradication,—and other diseases. Fifth: International waters—the hon. minister dealt with that, and I need not enlarge on it. Sixth: It should do a great deal preparing young women for

motherhood. I do not think this Bill should interfere in our private life, but I do not believe it will. Its purpose is to educate. Education is a thing you can take or leave, but you cannot take it unless it is offered to you, and this organization should go a long way towards educating young women at a time when they require that education. Seventh: Also it can take up the question of mothers' pensions, which I believe is a very live question and one very worthy of consideration. I should like to emphasize what the hon. members from Muskoka and Toronto mentioned in regard to establishing a research branch. I sincerely hope that a research branch will be instituted in this Department of Public Health. The questions of better housing conditions and child welfare, and better labouring conditions for the workers of this country, also should be considered.

I should like to make a couple of suggestions. In the first place, it should be the object of this department to get the very best man as the deputy minister. I do not think politics should have any interfering power whatever in this matter. There are a number of very able men in Canada to-day who have made a special study of public health, for this is a special department of knowledge and one with which the ordinary medical practitioner has not full acquaintance, his purpose being to cure, while the purpose of public health is to prevent sickness. There are several eminent specialists, among them Dr. Starkey of McGill University, Dr. Amyot of Toronto, and Dr. Hill, who is now, I believe, in the state of Minnesota, but who is a Canadian by birth —formerly medical officer of health of London—and stands among the highest of medical health specialists on the North American continent. I do not know any of these men personally; I have no interest in them, but I think we should endeavour to secure the services of a man of their high standing in the science of public health. In the second place, if this department is ultimately given to a minister to handle alone —which the hon. minister (Mr. Rowell) states is not going to be done—I do not think that minister need be a medical man. I believe in the old saying, that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and the ordinary medical man has limited knowledge of public health matters. Of course, that remark does not apply to the member for Toronto (Dr. Sheard), because he has made it a specialty for years. But the ordinary medical man has little knowledge of this branch of preventive medicine.

[Mr. Manion.]

For these various reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall very strongly support this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 2—Department:

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Is it necessary to have another minister?

Mr. ROWELL: So far as I am aware, no. Under existing legislation the work of departments may be re-arranged; a minister may be head of more than one department.

Mr. BELAND: What minister of the Crown will be in charge of this department?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not able to give any information as to that. I assume that will have to await the return of the Prime Minister.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—deputy minister, etc.

Mr. SHEARD: How will the Civil Service Act affect scientific men, bachelors of science, say, of the university of Toronto, or graduates in medicine, some of whom, I assume will be engaged in this department? Will it be necessary for the Civil Service Commission to re-examine gentlemen who have attained scholastic distinction and who hold degrees from recognized universities?

Mr. ROWELL: There is a special provision in the Act for appointing men possessing special professional or technical qualifications without requiring the ordinary Civil Service examination.

Mr. SHEARD: Will the deputy minister make those appointments?

Mr. ROWELL: No. All appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SHEARD: To what extent would the Civil Service Commission investigate in such cases? Where would their recommendation come in?

Mr. ROWELL: I assume that they would follow their usual procedure in cases where persons having special qualifications are required for a particular position; they would ascertain the best man qualified for the office.

Mr. SHEARD: How would they do that?

Mr. ROWELL: I have never discussed the matter with them; therefore I am not

in a position to tell my hon. friend just how they go about it.

Mr. SHEARD: That is the point where the Civil Service Commission is carried beyond all reason. I cannot conceive of any health department doing any work that is worth while unless in the hub and centre of the organization are a number of trained, expert, and eminent scientific men.

Mr. ROWELL: I agree.

Mr. SHEARD: To ask them to go before a Civil Service Commission is a very questionable proceeding to my mind, but to expect that commission, who do not know the character, the standing or the qualifications necessary, to make a recommendation of fitness for a particular scientific position where the work must be of the highest order—well, I cannot think that that is reasonable or practicable.

Mr. ROWELL: The point my hon. friend raises refers more particularly to the Civil Service Act than to this Bill. The Bill refers to the Civil Service Commission only in so far as regards the transfer of men from some existing departments the work of which is taken over by this Department of Health. The general Civil Service Act applies to all new appointments; the reference here is to transfers.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Will all new appointments be made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: All new appointments are made at present by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): The point of the member for Toronto South (Mr. Sheard) is well taken. It is absolutely impossible for three Civil Service commissioners to select a scientific man for a position of such responsibility as this. If it is left to them, the chances are that in nine cases out of ten they will not get the best man, because they have no way of judging. It is a very questionable proceeding to ask trained scientific men to accept an appointment by examination from three Civil Service commissioners.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Section 21 of the Civil Service Act, which provides for just such cases as this, has often been discussed in this House, but for a different reason: it was too much used by the present Government for questionable purposes. The section provides that when a scientific man is required for the Civil Service he shall not be subjected to a special examination, but shall be taken on his merits and on his record; the Governor in Council may override the Civil Service Act and make the appointment direct. The present Government, however, utilized that provision for the purpose of getting their friends appointed who should not be appointed at all. For instance, when a man who was over age wanted to get into the service, the game was to call him some kind of an expert. In that way he was put into the position under section 21. A couple of years ago, I took occasion to look into this matter, and in answer to a question that I asked in the House it was discovered that no less than seventy-five experts had been appointed by the present Government, although not half a dozen real experts had been appointed during that period.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend will look at the Act passed at the last session of Parliament, he will find that section 21 is repealed and that the principle of section 21 is no longer to be found in the Act.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Then every appointment has to be made after examination by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. CARVELL: Absolutely.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Then I think the point is very well taken that the Act ought to be amended, because if that be the case, it will be impossible to get an eminent man to submit himself to examination by the commission.

Mr. ROWELL: I think the section to which my hon. friend referred is not in the Civil Service Act in the form he mentions, but my recollection is that the present Act provides for the appointment of experts, highly qualified professional men, by the Civil Service Commission, without the necessity of the regular examination which the ordinary civil servant must take, and they would ascertain the qualifications of a highly qualified technical expert the same as, under the old system, any minister of the Crown would ascertain them and select from the sources which would be available, the best man who could be secured for a position requiring such high qualifications.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I just want to enter my protest against this method of procedure, because in my opinion it will fail. I do not think three Civil Service commissioners are qualified to pass judgment on men of that class, and it should be left to the administrative head of that

department to choose his own assistants. If that privilege is not given to him the whole thing will be a failure.

Mr. PROULX: The practice of the Civil Service Commission has been to appoint committees to look into the qualifications of experts. In this case the commission could appoint a committee of medical men to choose the officers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The question that has just been raised is a very important one. I at first thought that possibly there was no necessity for creating a health department of the Government to deal with this matter, but I have realized, after hearing the arguments that have been advanced, that I may have been mistaken in my views. Section 2 of the Act provides that the department shall be presided over by a minister of the Crown. The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) says that it may be necessary to appoint the most eminent men that can be found in order to make a success of the work, and that the Civil Service Commission will ascertain the qualifications of these men as would any minister of the Crown under the old system. The minister who will preside over this department will be responsible for its success or failure, and I would not like to see it possible for him to escape from some of the responsibility for the administration of that department by unloading that responsibility upon the Civil Service Commission. I do not believe that to be in keeping with responsible government. The minister, the head of the department, must be held responsible, and should be free to exercise his judgment in making selections of officers to administer the work.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—duties and powers of minister:

Mr. SHEARD: I have several amendments to move to this section as it contains the crux of the whole situation, and I hope the committee will be able to take it up clause by clause.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was going to suggest to the hon. member to call it six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The House in committee on Private Bills, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill No. 22, respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company—Mr. Cronyn.

On section 1—agreement confirmed:

Mr. McKENZIE: Did this Bill get through the Railway Committee without any difficulty?

Mr. CRONYN: The Bill was reported by the Railway Committee without amendment, and with very little, if any, comment.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not dangerous to allow it to pass?

Mr. CRONYN: Not in the least, I think I can assure my hon. friend.

Bill reported.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—Mr. Morphy.

On section 2—interpretation:

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the leader of the Government will tell us something about this Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: So far as the Government is concerned, there is no objection to this Bill. It provides for the creation and issue of perpetual consolidated debenture stock. While negotiations are proceeding with the company, as I intimated yesterday, there does not appear to be any good reason why the company should not be permitted to issue debenture stock for its purposes. If the company should be taken over later by the Dominion Government, the power would remain in the company and might be exercised for the benefit of the system, just as the power to issue securities by the Canadian Northern Railway Company is exercised to-day. In other words, a corporation taken over by the Dominion Government, either through the acquisition of its stock or by rental of its system, is still a corporation, and it is desirable that it should have the proper powers to enable it to issue securities from time to time, if thought desirable by its proprietors. In connection with the financing of the Canadian Northern Railway Company to-day, all the stock of which is owned by the Dominion Government, instead of the Dominion Government making direct loans to the company, the company is encouraged to issue its own securities in London and New York, and thus finance itself. In

other words, it is still a corporation, although the sole shareholder is the Government of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is this difference, however, that if this stock should be sold it will become an obligation or liability, so to speak, of the company. The stock is not likely to sell now for the price it would bring if the railway was really owned by the Government. For instance, if the company sells this stock it might have to sell it below par, whereas if the credit of Canada was behind it, it would be a very much better security and would sell at a higher price. If negotiations are under way with the company, and there is strong probability of the road becoming the property of the Canadian people, some provision should be made so that this stock will not sell at a price that would not be so much to the advantage of the Canadian people as if sold after the transfer of the road had taken place.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think there is some merit in what my hon. friend has put forward. On the other hand, I think, it would be unwise for the Dominion Government to refuse the power to issue securities which may enable the company to carry on pending negotiations. These securities might be temporarily borrowed against, instead of being sold in the market. I think we can control the situation in the Dominion interest, but I do not like to take the position that, pending negotiations with a company like the Grand Trunk, we should refuse them the power to issue securities which are required at the present time to enable them to borrow money to meet certain pressing obligations.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no objection to the legislation, so long as the Prime Minister appreciates my point.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I fully appreciate my hon. friend's point.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—ranking of debenture stock:

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This section provides that the stock shall rank equally with the consolidated debenture stock. I should like to know if this will affect the security we hold in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, where the Grand Trunk has guaranteed the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We allow this stock to rank equally with the consolidated debenture stock of the Grand Trunk. That will be a claim, I presume against the assets of the Grand Trunk ranking prior to any claim with respect of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed by the Grand Trunk.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not understand that the debenture stock of the Grand Trunk is secured upon its assets. From time to time they have financed by the issue of debenture stock, to amounts authorized by Parliament. This legislation is to enable the Company to issue a further amount of debenture stock, which will rank for the purposes mentioned with the debenture stock hitherto issued. I do not think it has any bearing on the Grand Trunk's guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific debenture stock, for this reason, among others: The proceeds of this debenture stock will, of course, be used for the purposes of the Railway Company, either for reducing obligations already existing or providing for betterments or otherwise as the directors may desire. So that there would come in to the company the proceeds of debenture stock to be used for the purposes I have mentioned, and in that way the position of the company would be strengthened. I think I stated to the leader of the Opposition that we should not withhold our consent to this legislation going through.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—REPORTED.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 35, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway.—Mr. Clements.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 27, respecting the Department of Health. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 4—duties and powers of minister:

Mr. SHEARD: I would move that section 4 be taken up clause by clause, as this is a very important part of the measure.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What is meant by "social welfare"?

Mr. SHEARD: The first part of this section seems to me to be somewhat ambiguous and might permit of more or less conflict in these departments of public health. I therefore beg to move, in order to make it absolutely clear, that all the words after

the word "jurisdiction" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

Provided that nothing in this Act shall authorize any officer or authority created by or appointed under the authority of this Act or under any regulation made hereunder to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial Health Officer or any Provincial or Municipal Board of Health or other authority operating under the laws of any province.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) altogether misapprehends the object of the Bill if he thinks there is any intention of exercising jurisdiction or authority over provincial or municipal health officers. That is not part of the plan or policy of the Bill, and to insert such a provision as he proposes would imply that it was. The majority of the subjects enumerated in the portion of the section which the hon. gentleman's amendment would strike out are matters of great importance which are now covered by some other statute, and the object of this section is to consolidate them under this one department. It would be not only unnecessary but undesirable to insert such a provision as is proposed.

Mr. SHEARD: I might ask the minister what is meant by inserting in this clause the following words: "and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects." These are the words I intended my amendment to affect, not the subsection that follows. I seek to make it absolutely clear that what the new department is to do in these matters shall be ancillary to the work of the provincial and municipal health authorities. Would the minister explain what is meant by these words: "and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects."

Mr. ROWELL: While the general clause is larger and embraces more than these particular matters specified below, these particular matters specified below are to be taken charge of by this department. It particularly emphasizes them, so to speak. The Bill would be sufficient, so far as the enumeration of powers is concerned, if we stopped at the word "jurisdiction." Everything that is enumerated could be done under the broad, general paragraph quoted. It is in order that attention may be focussed on these particular matters which are of importance, and some of which are under other departments, that they are enumerated as being subjects which should come under this department. Clause 4 is broad enough to cover the establishment of a research laboratory if the Government is in a position to make an appropriation for it and decides that it would be in the public interest to establish it. It is desirable, if the department is to have the largest scope within federal jurisdiction to conserve public health and social welfare, that we should not cut its powers down unnecessarily.

Mr. McKENZIE: The fact of the President of the Privy Council stating what his intention is will not be a sufficient guarantee as to the construction to be put upon the Act. I have no doubt the President of the Council understands it in the way he has stated, but he will not be an exhibit of this Bill when it comes into operation. The question is one of the construction that the ordinary legal, or judicial, mind would put upon it. There can be no very great objection to the amendment of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard), but I would suggest to him that he is not putting his amendment in the best place. In my judgment section 4 is pretty good, and inserting his amendment where he suggests would rather disarrange it. The purpose would be better served by getting his amendment in at the end of section 5, where it says:—

The Governor in Council shall have power to make such regulations as may be necessary to give effect to and carry out the objects of this Act, and to impose penalties for any violation of such regulations.

Mr. SHEARD: I would be perfectly willing to accept that suggestion.

Mr. McKENZIE: This would be the natural place for it.

Mr. ROWELL: Let it stand until we come to section 5 and I will consider it.

Mr. TRAHAN: I see by the fourth line of section 4 that the department will have to deal with questions relating not only to health but also to social welfare. I would like to know what subjects will come under this general term "social welfare."

Mr. ROWELL: I suppose that "social welfare" means just what the name suggests—the welfare of society as contrasted with the individual, the welfare of the mass of the people. Health is at the foundation of social welfare but "social welfare" has perhaps a little broader meaning than simply the word "health." The labour organizations were very strongly in favour of having a little broader term than the one "health" used. We felt that "social welfare" would have a broader signification. They suggested that instead of calling it a

Health Department it should be called the Department of Public Welfare. Their view was that housing, in so far as it was a matter of federal jurisdiction, would be a proper matter to come under this department as as it was very intimately connected with the social welfare of the people. I think that when this department is created it will very properly call for the administration of the housing plans of the Government which are now being carried out by a committee of the Cabinet and which should be transferred to this department for administration. Matters of that class relating to the welfare of the community and which the department might take up in the public interest would be covered by such a clause as this.

Mr. TRAHAN: The illustration given by the minister suggests that perhaps the Government might encroach upon civil rights and provincial autonomy. The housing problem is a very large and interesting one. It relates to social welfare in general, but the proposition made by the Government has only reference to granting subsidies to provincial governments or municipalities to help housing in the various provinces and municipalities. The term "social welfare" is very general, and this measure might lead to abuses if that term is not well defined. Generally in connection with legislation, when general terms are used, there is a definition to limit the interpretation to be given to the Act, but here we have a general term which may be applied to many large questions and it is not limited at all. Believing as I do that these words should be struck out of the Bill, I propose to amend this paragraph by moving that the words "social welfare" in the fourth line of the section 4 be struck out.

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan), because I think it would strike out of the Bill a very important feature, which the working men of this country are deeply interested in. Let me take the illustration that I gave to the House. My hon. friend said that all the Government did was to loan money to the provinces in order that the provinces might loan it to the municipalities. But the Government is doing more than that, it is laying down certain conditions which control the expenditure of that money in order to accomplish the object it had in view. That object was to improve the housing conditions throughout Canada, to insure that the working men should be able to get houses at a moderate price, at cost, and it was particularly to assist workingmen who had been at the front; and it is important that those houses should be constructed upon the most improved sanitary principles in order to promote the health and welfare of their occupants. It was further desired that such houses should be constructed in localities and under conditions where, if a new area was being opened up, it could be laid out on the most improved town-planning lines, so that you would set a standard for workingmen's houses which would be a stimulus to the erection of a similar class of houses in all the important centres of Canada. Let me point out the conditions upon which the loan has been proposed and upon which the provinces are accepting it:

> Each province shall prepare and submit to the Federal Government for approval, a general housing scheme; setting out the standards and conditions to be complied with in connection with local housing schemes. The general scheme of each province shall include a schedule of minimum standards in regard to grouping of houses, provision of open spaces, sizes and heights of houses, sizes and heights of rooms, provision of light and ventilation, heating, lighting, character of materials, etc., which it is proposed should be enforced as the minimum requirements for health, comfort and convenience.

Then it provides for the maximum cost of dwellings:

> The object of the Federal Government being to facilitate the erection of dwellings at a moderate cost suitable for working men, particularly returned soldiers, it is necessary to place a maximum on the amount which may be loaned per dwelling, and the following maximum—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): What is my honourable friend reading from now?

Mr. ROWELL: The regulations governing the Government's housing policy, approved by Order in Council and published.

> —the following maximum has been fixed having regard to the conditions existing in the different provinces:—

Then it sets out what is the maximum which may be loaned on any house having regard to its size and character. The next clause deals with the ownership of the land:

> Public money may be advanced for building houses on sites owned by:—
>
> (a) The Provincial Government or Municipality.
>
> (b) Housing societies or companies comprising groups of citizens associated to promote good housing, supplied with proper improvements; such societies or companies to have not more than a statutory limitation of dividends payable on stock of 6 per cent.
>
> (c) Owners of lots for the purpose of erecting houses for their own occupancy.

I have merely read those provisions, Mr. Chairman, to show that the Federal Government has a definite object in view in its housing programme. These regulations have been submitted to all the provinces, and Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia have already passed the necessary legislation, and I think New Brunswick has it under consideration. Those are the matters which would come within the heading "Social welfare," and the administration of that policy might properly be entrusted to a Department such as this. That is what is meant by "social welfare."

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The phrase "social welfare" is very general. It may mean the moral as well as the physical welfare of the people. It may mean the shaping of a moral standard for the people in all kinds of subjects—for instance, prohibition. If my hon. friend does not care to amend the section, why not define the phrase "social welfare" so there will be no misconception about it. I think that would meet the idea of my hon. friend (Mr. Trahan).

Mr. SHEARD: As the hon. Minister has announced the policy of the Government and the interpretation it puts upon the term "social welfare", with all due respect I submit that it proposes to occupy ground absolutely covered by municipal and provincial rights. If the Federal Government intends to exercise supervision and direction over the construction of dwelling houses, it must necessarily conform to the by-laws operative in the municipalities in which those houses and buildings are being constructed. I cannot conceive of any process of carrying out the law as suggested by the hon. minister, unless some degree of supervision is going to be exercised in connection with the powers authorized by this Act, and if a Federal officer, for instance, is to come to the city of Toronto to supervise, or to direct, or to make suggestions regarding the construction of such houses, under the terms of the interpretation of social welfare as given in this Act, as far as I understand the hon. minister's explanation, I really think that there is at the start a considerable danger of conflicting authority between him and the municipal and even the provincial officers.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Chairman, I evidently have not made myself quite clear to my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). What I pointed out was that these clauses require provincial Governments to submit a general housing scheme to be approved by the Federal Government. It does not follow that the Federal Government is going to send in a man to supervise the housing policy of any province. For example, the Government of the province of Ontario have already submitted their housing scheme to the Federal Government under the provisions of that clause, and that housing scheme has been approved. In that housing scheme the provincial Government specify the standard and type of house they propose to build; that is perfectly satisfactory to the Federal Government; we approve it, and that ends it. Then the provincial Government enact their own laws in accordance with the scheme which has already been approved by us.

Mr. SHEARD: How is the Federal Government to know that the plans submitted have been adhered to and the buildings constructed in accordance with them unless they exercise their right of inspection and supervision?

Mr. ROWELL: We assume, Mr. Chairman, good faith on the part of the provinces, and if they submit a scheme to us which they say they are going to follow out, I think we have the right to assume that they will spend the federal money in pursuance of the provisions of that scheme. That is the line upon which we are proceeding, and I think it is a safe one. All we wish is to secure improved housing conditions, and so far no province has offered any objection to the regulations.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I do not understand what the hon. minister is doing. Does he wish to convey to the committee that the local government of some province has already submitted a housing scheme to the Federal Government?

Mr. ROWELL: It has.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Under what Act of the Federal Government?

Mr. ROWELL: Under the Order in Council which set aside the $25,000,000. That money was set aside on condition that the provincial governments should submit a housing scheme before they were granted a loan.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): But is the advancing of that money not contingent upon legislation which this House still has to consider?

Mr. ROWELL: The spending of the money is contingent upon the legislation.

The vote is in the estimates and the House will have to pass it before the money is expended.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Will not the Housing Bill also have to pass the House first?

Mr. ROWELL: So far as the advancing of the money is concerned the matter is in the hands of the Minister of Finance, but my impression is that it does not require any legislative Act. The item in the estimates sets apart the sum of $25,000,000 to be expended pursuant to the provisions of a certain Order in Council which defines the general policy.

Mr. PROULX: Will the money be distributed among the provinces?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, it goes to the provinces. I introduced the subject of housing only to illustrate what might be included in social welfare.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Government is simply becoming a badly managed loan society.

Mr. STEELE: I fear that we are departing from the discussion of the Bill relating to the Department of Health and entering upon a discussion of the housing scheme. If we get back to the amendment to strike out the words "social welfare", perhaps we shall make greater progress. I am sure that the Department of Health will not exercise any jurisdiction in the matter of the housing scheme unless Dominion legislation gives them authority to do so.

Social welfare is, in most parts of the country, a well understood term in these days and is becoming more popular and of much greater interest to the people generally. Probably Lloyd George gave to social welfare the important place it occupies to-day. He brought social questions to the front; he emphasized to the people of the world the fact that social questions and the social welfare of the people of every land must receive more attention than they have received in the past. I do not suppose that the elimination or the inclusion of the term "social welfare" would modify the operation of the Department of Health. But its inclusion in the Bill does give to proposed legislation a wider significance and, I understand, meets the views of the labour element. No section of Canada to-day is more interested in social questions than the labour people. When we consider that sickness is probably the greatest cause of poverty, particularly in the ranks of the labouring people, we see very clearly how closely allied health and social welfare are. Mr. Stapleford, General Secretary of the Neighbourhood Workers' Association in Toronto, made the statement recently that the most important cause of poverty in Toronto, as in other cities, is undoubtedly sickness. It is therefore very necessary that we should give attention to social welfare work as well as health work, in order that what this department will accomplish will at least relieve our labouring classes from the greatest cause of poverty, sickness.

I gave some statistics on a previous occasion in this House, which I should like to repeat to-night, to show what an immense loss comes to the labouring people through sickness. We have in Canada a million and a quarter labouring men. It is estimated by the United States authorities—and perhaps the same will apply in Canada—that every working man loses an average of nine days every year on account of sickness. In Canada that would mean a loss of 11,250,000 days to the working people, which, at a very moderate wage, would come to at least $35,000,000 a year. Any Federal department which directs its efforts towards relieving our working classes of that tremendous burden is doing something which, I am sure, will have the hearty support and co-operation of the labouring people, as of others.

It should be the object of this department to establish what, after all, is the best democracy we can have—that is, a democracy that gives all men an equal opportunity. A child that is born in a tubercular condition, or of syphilitic parents, or in unsanitary surroundings, in a home full of filth, has not the same opportunity in the world as a child born in sanitary surroundings of healthy parents. If, therefore, you want to establish a true democracy in this country, give every child a chance to be born of healthy parents and amid healthful surroundings. It will be the aim of this department, I know, to produce these surroundings and to put our people in such a condition that they will be healthy parents.

With these healthful conditions established—which they can be, not in one year, but through time—we shall bring about in Canada an industrial efficiency such as we have never known. Some years ago industrial efficiency was supposed to depend on the individual corporation and every effort was made to organize corporations in such a way as to produce efficiency Then it was found that even improved methods of organization

were not producing the desired officiency, and the era of amalgamation of corporations arrived. We saw some years ago a great epidemic, so to speak, of corporation amalgamations. Many thought that these amalgamations had an improper purpose in view. Perhaps some of them had, but they brought about greater efficiency in industrial life. Now that era is passing and an era of the conservation of the health and strength of employees has arrived. It is known to-day that efficiency in the truest sense must begin with the conservation of the health and strength of the individual. We are placing a higher estimate on the individual working man and on the value of the human machine, realizing that a man is greater than a mill and the producer more important than the product, and that that which reduces the value of the man lessens also the value of the machinery. Anything, therefore, that this department can do to improve the conditions of the labouring man may properly be considered as participation in social welfare work.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I must say that the member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) has cut a tolerable swath, considering that he rose to charge some of us with getting away from the subject under discussion. Mr. Lloyd George's social reforms are well known to those who have carefully followed politics in the Old Country, but I do not think Mr. Lloyd George legislated under the phrase "social welfare." When he brought in an insurance scheme, he brought in an insurance scheme. His object was social welfare but his scheme was embodied in a concrete manner in an Act of Parliament.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Lloyd George did not have to contend with the difficulties we have of a dual legislative authority. There is in Great Britain only the one authority.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend has plenty of time to speak when he wants to make his jokes. I am well aware of my limitations, but I should like to make my own speeches, lame though they may be.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was trying to help my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Lloyd George introduced old age pensions for the purpose of doing something for social welfare, but he embodied the scheme in an Act of Parliament. We are dealing with a concrete matter, namely, to establish a department of health, that is, a department which, in all countries in which they have such a thing, has certain well defined limitations which are proper to an Act of Parliament. The phrase "social welfare" has no such limitations. We have had a splendid illustration of that in the speech of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). It was a beautiful speech, full of splendid sentiments, and everybody in the committee agreed with him, but it cannot be put into an Act of Parliament just as it was spoken, and I accept my hon. friend's rebuke in wanting to draw the committee's attention to the fact that we are engaged in considering a Bill for the establishment of a health department. I do not think the minister has been successful in meeting the objection hinted at by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and put into shape by an amendment of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan). If that amendment is pushed to a division, I shall vote for it, unless further explanations of the minister are more successful in clarifying my understanding of the matter than his previous ones have been. Either the minister is very much mixed, or I am, and if it be true that he is very much mixed, I may be as mixed before he is finished with me.

I do not see that what he said about housing establishes a need for these words in the Public Health Bill. What he said about housing was a very great surprise to me. I understood that the policy of the Government in regard to housing was still to be discussed in the shape of a Bill which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, but it appears that the policy has been not only settled but put into operation by an Order in Council. I have been pretty patient with Orders in Council,—my hon. friends opposite perhaps think too much so,—but this is a method of procedure which, if I understand it correctly, I should advise the minister to look into very carefully. I am amazed,—I am the subject of consternation,—if I have correctly learned that the Government, by an Order in Council, is actually consulting about a policy which is yet to be debated and decided upon in this House. I leave that matter at that point for the moment, but I cannot see what purpose the words "social welfare" have in this Bill. We are all in favour of social welfare, and every Act of Parliament is meant to promote social welfare. Social welfare is the welfare of society; society includes all the

9 p.m. people in the country, and, of course, however little Parliament

may have succeeded, Parliament is always trying to move, even though stumbling, in the direction of doing something for social welfare. So these words might be put into any Act that is brought before the House. But I think, to say the least, they will be out of place in every Act on a different subject that comes before the House; and unless some specific meaning is given to them I do not see what they are doing in this Bill.

With regard to housing. If I understood the minister's explanations correctly, he wanted us to understand that the Public Health Department will consult with the local governments upon the question of housing and social welfare as it is advanced by this scheme of housing.

Mr. ROWELL: The Government has already consulted with the local governments in reference to housing and certain regulations have been agreed upon, and what I suggested was that this department would be an appropriate one to administer them. Perhaps I might answer what my hon. friend said, if he wishes me to, with reference to the Orders in Council to which he refers. The situation is this. Under the Order in Council passed on 3rd December, 1918, following the Inter-Provincial Conference held here, the Government set aside $25,000,000 for housing purposes. That Order in Council provides that advances be made as soon as a general scheme of housing shall have been agreed upon between the Government of Canada and the Government of the province applying for the loan. That Order in Council was passed pursuant to the provisions of the War Measures Act, and there was power to make the proposed advance to each province so soon as a housing scheme was agreed upon. Following that Order in Council there was a consultation with the provinces by means of communications sent to each one of them outlining what the Government thought should be contained in any housing scheme of the provinces. Suggestions were asked, and some of the provinces made suggestions, all of which we considered and then finally certain lines of policy were adopted, the ones I have already read to the House. Pursuant to that policy, the province of Ontario submitted its housing scheme which was approved by an Order in Council passed subsequent to that date, and I think two or three of the provinces have passed legislation dealing with the matter.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I should just like to say in reply that what the minister says astonishes me very much, and as one member of the House, I am bound to add an opinion for what it is worth that it would have been very much better for the Government if they had called Parliament together in December, 1918, and submitted housing legislation to this House before they took a course which practically amounted to legislating as a Government by Order in Council for the Dominion of Canada upon a purely domestic affair in consultation with the provincial Governments. That is practically what, we are told by a minister, was done last December. And then a housing scheme is brought down to this House in the month of February and the House of Commons is expected to sanction it and to set up a Health Department in so far as it relates to this scheme, or to carry out legislation practically settled by previous consultation between the Federal Government and the local governments. That is a most extraordinary method of conducting the federal business of this country, and where we shall land, if there is more of that sort of thing, I do not think one can really imagine. I can scarcely believe my own ears as these statements are made to this committee. I do not want to say more on that subject at the present time, but if the Government have made a mistake—and I am sure they have in setting about their housing scheme in that way—then it would be a bad thing for us to follow up that mistake by even appearing to sanction it by letting this phrase "social welfare" remain in the Bill. I, for one, if the amendment is pressed, shall vote for it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My objection to the expression is that it is altogether too general. It may mean anything. We have undertaken to regulate so many things of late in the life of the people that there is a certain uneasiness throughout the country over these encroachments. I am in favour of a Department of Health. I am also in favour of housing accommodation being provided. Although, if the minister will allow me to say so I do not think that the Government's housing scheme amounts to very much. It is simply a scheme of lending money to the provincial governments at five per cent interest. Now the provincial governments can borrow money pretty nearly as favourably as the Dominion Government, and personally, if I were lending my money, I would just as soon lend it on the bonds of the province

of Nova Scotia as on the bonds of the Federal Government, because I think the security just as good, and the interest is five per cent. The provincial governments would have to pay that rate if they went into the open market to borrow money. The scheme therefore, is of very little advantage to the provincial governments, and it should not be made an excuse for encroaching upon their rights. We all admit that housing is a matter altogether within the juridiction of the provincial governments, and I think it would be far better to leave the provincial governments alone and let them work out their own housing schemes, borrowing money in the open market, rather than tie them up to the Government housing scheme, and then follow that up by encroaching on their rights. This legislation is a further encroachment on provincial rights. Why should the Federal Government undertake to control the houses after they are built?

Mr. ROWELL: We do not do that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not yet understand what the minister seeks to attain by this Bill. The word "health" covers all the things the minister should want to deal with in connection with these houses, even if this Government does lend the money to build them. Surely he does not want to look after the plumbing of the houses or supervise in detail the matters which the municipalities look after. What then does he want? If he is concerned only about housing, why not substitute the word "housing" for "social welfare"? The working man has been mentioned. I do not think the working man wants too much of these regulations. He wants personal freedom. But by this legislation, if the Department of Public Health undertook so to construe the Act. he would not be allowed to smoke a pipe or have a tea party,—for is not that "social"? He would not be allowed to have even a bean supper,—is not that "social"? When you say you are going to deal with the "social welfare" of the people of Canada, the expression is so broad that it would give the minister power to control the people in all kinds of ways. I object very strongly to the expression and I shall vote for the amendment, unless the minister suggests a better expression.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I do not think we have yet had from the Government an explanation of exactly what was intended to be included in the phrase "social welfare." The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) suggests that it means matters pertaining to the health of the working man. Now, the preceding words of the section give the Government that power. It might also be inferred from what my hon. friend said that "social welfare" related to the conditions under which the working men of Canada carry on their work; for instance, the sanitary conditions of a building in which workmen are employed, the hours of labour, the age at which minors can begin to work, the minimum wage, etc. All these are matters which deal directly with the social welfare of the workmen of the Dominion of Canada at the present time. There are other factors which might be included. For instance, we have social welfare leagues throughout the Dominion, and they are carrying on a campaign now against cigarette smoking and the use of tobacco of all kinds. Then there are prohibition leagues. It has been decided that this Government has jurisdiction over the question of prohibition. If the phrase "social welfare" is allowed to stand, it will enlarge the power of this Government in a manner which has been severely criticised during the last two or three years. It will enable them to legislate for the country at large by means of order-in-council embodying the regulations enacted under this section. I further submit that if the Government are going to deal with questions of labour under this legislation, they may come into conflict with the various statutes which have been passed in at least one province of the Dominion. In the province of Alberta we have what is known as the Factory Act, which deals directly with questions of social welfare, in the strictest sense of the word, and more particularly with the social welfare of the workers. It empowers the Government to regulate the hours of employment, the age at which minors may begin work, the minimum wage, and the sanitary condition of the buildings in which workmen are employed. I think that the less we interfere or appear to interfere with the jurisdiction of the provinces the less trouble we shall have in the operation of the Act.

Then again, in regard to matters of health, I think that the constitution itself is not very clear on the question of jurisdiction, and when this legislation passes, great care should be exercised by the minister or the officers who will be responsible for the administration of the Act. The province of Alberta, under the Hon. A. G. Mackay, who is at present Minister of Municipalities,

is inaugurating what I believe to be the most progressive health legislation which exists in any province of the Dominion.

Mr. CALDER: Except Saskatchewan.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I will not even except Saskatchewan. We should be careful not to arrogate to ourselves here any authority which will in any way hinder the provinces from carrying out the legislation which they have placed on the statute books this year or in preceding years. It may be said that some of the provinces are backward in their health legislation. If that is so, it is the duty of the people who reside in those provinces to furnish themselves through their own legislatures with up-to-date health legislation. I think the application of this Act should be confined as closely as possible to those matters over which the Dominion Government has exclusive jurisdiction. The Government might, for instance, supplement the work of the provinces by establishing laboratories. If any conflict arose between Dominion and provincial jurisdiction, I do not think the Dominion Government should for one minute undertake to interfere with the legislation enacted by the provinces.

Mr. McKENZIE: When I was speaking on the Address some weeks ago and referring to this legislation which was forecast, I anticipated then the very difficulties which the minister finds himself compelled to deal with to-night. Many of the members treated my observations rather lightly at that time and evidently thought that there was not much in them, but it is some satisfaction to me to see that they now find that there was some good reason for what I said on that occasion, that it was difficult and dangerous to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the provinces. To-night, when the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) was speaking he made allusion to legislation introduced in the English Parliament, or to something that Mr. Lloyd George may have said about legislation, and I observed that Mr. Lloyd George is never confronted with the difficulty that we have to contend with. In the Parliament of Great Britain they have one sweeping jurisdiction, and have not to exercise any care to see that one piece of legislation does not encroach upon another. The hon. member for Red Deer thought I was joking; I was doing nothing of the kind; on the contrary, I was talking very seriously on a constitutional question that we have to deal with nearly every day, but which they are never called upon to consider in the Mother Parliament. I think one of two things should happen in relation to this Bill. The words at the end of the main part of section 4 should come out, or "social welfare" should be deleted. If the operations of section 4 are confined exclusively to the matters enumerated I have no particular quarrel with the words "social welfare," but if the following words are retained, "and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters and subjects," then I think "social welfare" should be struck out. If the minister adopts my suggestion the section will read:—

> The duties and powers of the minister administering the Department of Health shall extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health and social welfare of the people of Canada over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction; that is, (a) co-operation with the provincial, territorial and other health authorities—

and so on. If that would be satisfactory to the committee I think it would confine the scope of this enactment entirely to the matters enumerated.

Mr. ROWELL: I am very glad to have the suggestions which have been made. Needless to say, the words "social welfare" do not contemplate any interference with the social life of the people, and, as I think I intimated before, they were inserted merely in deference to representations made in the interests of labour, that there might perhaps be a broader meaning to the word "health" that some people were disposed to put upon it, although I agree with my friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that the word is broad enough to cover what is in view in the particular use of "social welfare" in this section. I would make a suggestion, which has been made to me and which possibly may be preferable to the one made by the leader of the Opposition, that we insert the words in the preamble. We might strike out the words "social welfare" used in Clause 4 and insert a preamble in this form:

> Whereas, it is advisable for the promotion of the social welfare of the people of Canada that a Department of Public Health be established in the Dominion—

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Before the next clause is taken up I would move an amendment. It seems to me that the very heart and life of this Bill has been left out. I do not know of a department of public health in the world that has not a bureau of scientific research and I cannot see what permanent results will ensue for the benefit of the people without such an institution. I would therefore move, that

section 4 be amended by inserting before subsection (a) the following words:

The establishment of a bureau of scientific research with hygienic laboratories including special departments of bacteriology, pathology, chemistry and pharmacology which shall investigate matters relating to public health.

If we incorporate such a provision in the Bill we shall have a source of great good to this country. I should regret to see a Bill of this kind go through the Parliament of Canada without such a clause, for in the eyes of every scientific man it would appear ridiculous.

Mr. ROWELL: The subject matter of establishing a laboratory for scientific research, as mentioned this afternoon, is a matter which I am satisfied is already fully covered by section 4. In fact, it was considered, but the parliamentary counsel advised that it was unnecessary to put in any further provision as clause 4 already fully covered it and the only thing that would be necessary would be that the Government should bring down an appropriation to provide for the building of such a laboratory. I have no objection to the insertion of suitable words that would indicate that this department is the department to have charge of such a matter although I think it is already covered. I am not sure that the way the matter is suggested here is the best way to put it, but I shall be glad to take the matter into consideration. If we can go on and dispose of the other clauses the Bill need not go out of committee and we can consider what is the best form in which to put this. I suggest that the amendment stand.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boivin): Amendment stands.

On paragraph (a) of section 4—co-operation with the provincial, territorial and other health authorities with a view to the co-ordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health:

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps it would be difficult for the minister to give some general idea of what is meant by co-operation with the provincial authorities. What would that include?

Mr. ROWELL: As I mentioned this afternoon, my hon. friend will see under section 6 we provide for

a Dominion Council of Health consisting of the Deputy Minister of Health, who shall be chairman, the chief executive officer of the provincial department or board of health of each province, and such other persons—

The idea is that the health authorities of all the provinces shall be brought together periodically, with the chief officers of the department at Ottawa, in order that they may confer together over matters of common interest, such matters as were mentioned this afternoon. Take the question of the war against tuberculosis and venereal diseases. In all these contagious and very virulent forms of disease, it is exceedingly desirable that there should be as much co-operation as possible between the different provinces in order that the good that is done in one province should not be lost by failure of action in another. It is in order to secure general co-operation throughout the whole country that this provision is made. This meets the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has made with regard to a divided jurisdiction. It is to get the whole country moving together in combating these forms of disease and in promoting the public health.

Mr. McKENZIE: Supposing an epidemic of smallpox broke out in Toronto to-day, that would be entirely a matter for the provincial authorities to deal with?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Mr. McKENZIE: Supposing the same thing happened after this Act went into operation, would the conditions be changed in any way or would the authorities under this Act interfere with that condition?

Mr. ROWELL: I should say not; it would make no difference.

Mr. SHEARD: I think this clause is one of the best in the whole Bill and I strongly support it because it embodies the idea of co-operation. If the Federal Health Department is going to be of any service at all it can only be of service to the Dominion generally by co-operating with the local authorities. I do not think that we can too strongly emphasize and urge that such methods be adopted. Certain provincial and municipal officers would be brought together by the provincial health authorities for the purpose of consultation and discussion of various methods operative in the various provinces so that there might be concerted action throughout the Dominion, and so that they might discuss advanced methods which have been found to be successful in various provinces. The unanimity of operation and progress necessary to make this Health Act effective could be secured. I would strongly support the clause and I think no objection should be offered to it.

Mr. WIGMORE: Mr. Chairman, I am very much impressed with the clause in

reference to the co-operation of the Federal, provincial and municipal departments. I know that in the past there has been no attention paid to the water supply of the different cities and towns of the Dominion. Some may say this is entirely a matter for the local board of health. But we know that during past years there have been epidemics of typhoid in the city of Ottawa and in different cities throughout the Dominion. The local boards of health have not been impressed with the necessity of looking after the watersheds in connection with the water supply of towns and cities. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the health board to take a general oversight of the water supplies of the different cities. My suggestion would be that when these laboratories have been established in the city of Ottawa under the jurisdiction of this board, the different cities and towns throughout the Dominion be compelled at certain times in the year, monthly or quarterly as the case may be, to submit samples of the water they are using to this board for analysis and report, in order that precautions may be taken to see that the water is pure and proper for human use. The epidemics which have swept over certain parts of Canada have certainly taught us a lesson. In the city of Ottawa, instead of using the water that comes from the lakes or rivers, or wherever it comes from, we are supplied with water from different springs around the city. If proper precautions were taken by the Federal Health department, or by this board, that would not happen because the water would be treated in a proper way and we would be absolutely sure of the water we were using. In addition to this, the sewage system of the different cities and towns should be inspected and proper precautions taken with respect to them. I realise that this would put a very large amount of work upon the department, but there is no reason under the sun why, with the co-operation of the provincial governments and municipal authorities, we should not reduce the death rate in the Dominion to a very large extent. In the different cities over which these epidemics have swept a great many deaths have been caused entirely by the laxness of the several health departments, both municipal and provincial.

In the province of New Brunswick we have organized a Health Department with a very efficient man in charge and I think with the co-operation of the Federal department there will be a great improvement throughout the province. Is it the intention of the Government to take up the matter of water supply and sewage pollution with the different provincial and municipal authorities?

Mr. KEEFER: The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Wigmore) has brought up a subject that has been under consideration by the Governments of this country and the United States. In 1912 an inquiry was started in Washington in regard to the pollution of the Great Lakes, the sources of the water supply of a large number of our cities and towns. That inquiry took in the river St. Clair, lake St. Clair, the lower end of lake Erie, the river Detroit, the Niagara river, a portion of lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence river, and it developed that those waters had been polluted by the cities and towns bordering thereon. As a result of that inquiry the Governments of Canada and the United States made an appropriation of $50,000 to investigate the whole matter scientifically, and the International Joint Commission has been conducting that investigation for a couple of years. What I am saying now is probably a little out of order, but it is relevant to an explanation of the clause in question. By paragraph 4 of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, it will be observed that:

> It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and water flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

Therefore we have pledged our word with the United States, and they with us, that that pollution shall cease. The two Governments, through the International Joint Commission, have been investigating what should be done, and the Governments of the United States and Canada have referred to the commission two questions, which are rather interesting, and which are quoted in the report:

> To what extent, by what causes, and in what localities have the boundary waters been polluted?
>
> What is the best method of remedying it?

The facts disclosed, for instance, that in the water-borne traffic of the Great Lakes something like 2,600 vessels pass through the Detroit river every year, and that three times more tonnage goes through the Soo canal annually than through the Suez canal. It is estimated that 15,000,000 people travel upon the Great Lakes annually, irrespective of the pollution from the cities and towns bordering on the Great Lakes. These facts were so startling that the commission

investigated how best to remedy the consequent pollution, and they have made a progress report, and a further report is coming in; for that reason it was deemed necessary to empower the Federal Government to carry out any recommendations that the International Joint Commission may make to prevent the turning of the Great Lakes into cesspools.

Mr. SHEARD: I think the hon. gentleman is discussing conditions under subsection (f), dealing with the International Joint Commission regulations.

Mr. KEEFER: Yes. I asked permission to do so. I admit it is out of order, but, as following the remarks of the previous speaker, it may not be necessary to explain this section again. The co-operation dealt with in clause (a) that we are now discussing will therefore be most essential in the carrying out of those recommendations. Supposing, for instance, the International Joint Commission should compel cities and towns to treat their sewage, it will throw a very serious expenditure upon such cities as Buffalo and Toronto. It is therefore very desirable to have co-operation and co-ordination in the views of the different authorities on the subject, yet it is wholly and solely a Federal matter. That is the reason why I dealt with it. If any objection is made to the question of child life and child welfare, I would like to be heard thereon but perhaps I had better not touch on it now, as I should be out of order again.

Mr. WIGMORE: I think I am absolutely in order on co-operation. It seems to me that the Joint Commission is to be congratulated on the amount of work they have done and the conclusions they have come to. I would like to see some legislation enacted by this new board to protect the water supplies of our cities and towns where they are getting it from a distance, for we all know that along the route of such water supplies there are farm houses and other sources of possible pollution, and there should be some protective legislation enacted by this board.

Mr. MANION: In Ontario the towns and cities can send samples of their water, and they do send them, to the provincial Board of Health at Toronto to be examined.

Mr. WIGMORE: That is only optional.

Mr. MANION: Yes; but I imagine that if you made it compulsory it might be thought to be interfering with the powers of the province.

[Mr. Keefer.]

Mr. ROWELL: Any matter within the province would have to be dealt with by the provincial health authorities. Under the new Minister of Health in New Brunswick I should think these matters would be taken up in the ordinary course by the provincial authorities.

Subsection agreed to.

On sub-section (b)—the conservation of child life and child welfare.

Mr. SHEARD: I wish to move, Mr. Chairman, that this be struck out, but in doing so I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the work of child welfare. It is probably, of all the departments of health, one of the most important. The reason why I think it is out of place here is because I cannot see that under our Constitution it can do any effective service at all, as all the machinery for carrying out the strict work of child welfare is in the hands of the provinces under the British North America Act. Let me preface my statement by reading to you a section of a report made by the chief medical officer of the Local Government Board of England and Wales of 1917-18, in order that we may clearly see what child welfare proposes. He sets this forth in speaking of child welfare:

> It can only be secured by improving the welfare of every mother. What is being done to this end in England is: first, it is being made possible that medical attention be given to every mother by the state supplying for the wife and for every insured person 60 shillings, it is being made possible to obtain priority for milk supply.
>
> But further than this the Government is supplying money for home nursing and "home helps." As maternity hospitals are not generally available, the Government is encouraging in a practical way by financial aid their establishment in the various municipalities. In London where such institutions are numerous the death rate is proportionately low.
>
> But as might be expected from what has already been said with regard to vital processes the aid to maternity cases ought to be applied during the ante-natal period. Child welfare stations are gradually being organized for this purpose. Statistics of work done in such cities as Edinburgh show that though it is not always possible to save the infants of sick mothers, yet almost no death of the mother occurs where such have been under previous observation and treatment. Where maternity homes are not provided, the extension of nursing oversight from Child Welfare Centres is being constantly extended, even to the point of having several beds in such centres where sick mothers and children from unsanitary homes can be taken in emergencies.

Child welfare, therefore, embraces the establishment, the operation, and the management of eleemosynary institutions. Under the British North America Act the

specific and exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures in this connection are set forth. Section 92, subsection 6, provides that the provinces shall have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter of the establishment, maintenance and management of public and reformatory prisons in and for the province and (section 7) the establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals. So that it is ultra vires of the Dominion Parliament to deal with these matters which are specifically reserved for the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities. Moreover, if we take this matter up there will be no great tendency on the part of the provinces to act. This is a very large and a growing question; it is yet in its infancy in this country. Many municipalities and provinces would be only too glad to offer as an excuse for not making any further progress in the matter the fact that the Federal Government by their recent enactment have undertaken to carry on the work. I venture the opinion that the Dominion, under the conditions which prevail, would not be able to do it. The provinces and the municipalities are doing it now and they are doing it well in some cases. I hope that they will do it still better and that this great work of child welfare will expand and advance systematically and scientifically. While I cannot speak too highly of the object which is aimed at in introducing child welfare into this legislation, I think that to include it here is simply to do something which is entirely in contravention of the provisions of the British North America Act, and for that reason I think it is out of place.

Mr. COWAN: I differ as sharply as it is possible for me to differ from the member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). It is said that when a great man goes wrong he goes very badly wrong; my hon. friend is so very far wrong that I think he must be a very great man. As a matter of fact, he has given all the evidence needed to prove that it is absolutely necessary for us to do this. He says that in some of the provinces this work is already being done very well; the inference is that in some of the other provinces it is not being done at all, or certainly not so well. The whole purpose of this Bill, so far as child welfare is concerned, is to educate the parents so that they will, through their provincial legislatures or otherwise, give such attention to the child as is absolutely necessary for its welfare. The ignorance of the people with regard to their own health is simply appalling; some of them do not give it the slightest attention. Many people who have pigs or cows on their premises study carefully methods of conserving the health of these animals, but give little attention to that of themselves and their children. Children are kept in much better physical condition by educated parents than by ignorant parents. I am surprised at the lack of interests in some sections of the country in the matter of health and of social and child welfare. In the section of the country in which I live this subject has during the past few years become one of the most important with which we deal. For several years past an annual babies' welfare week has been held in our city. The first one I saw on the fifth floor of a department store, which had been cleared out because it was not in use owing to a slacking up of business at the beginning of the war. Here were hundreds of mothers—their children were taken care of in another part of the store—and here were medical men giving free lectures, telling these mothers what they should do to give their children better health, how to bring them up, how to feed them, how to clothe them, how to give them proper environment. Environment has just as much to do with the health of a child as clean water and good food, as good housing and proper sanitation. If there is one thing in Canada that I am ashamed of, it is the lack of proper ventilation in our homes. Even this building is unfit to work in. But there we had these mothers meeting together and getting this instruction and education. The next year I saw them in the city hall, which was given up for a whole week to that purpose. The same thing is going on all over Saskatchewan. Does the provincial government do this? Well, the provincial government assits, I understand, by making a certain financial grant; the rest is supplied voluntarily. Several times I went to our provincial government when the public mind was not so well educated as it is at present and solicited their interest in this work, but found it exceedingly difficult to get any money to carry the work on. However, when the public had been so educated that they realized the work to be necessary and advisable, the government came over very quickly.

The hon. gentleman says that some provinces have not a very good organization. If this Health Department will do the

necessary publicity work it will create such a sentiment throughout the country that every provincial government and every municipality will be compelled to give the necessary grants to carry on this work properly. Educating the public in this way is not interfering with provincial education. I agree that the education of the child in the school is a provincial matter, but does education stop with the school, the high school or the collegiate institute? No; education continues long after a young man or a young woman leaves school. This is the kind of education they want; it is to their advantage to receive it, and we should give it to them. If we are going to limit the education to the schools, then we must deny our newspapers, for instance, the right to circulate beyond their provincial boundaries. Such a thing is so absurd that it is hardly worth mentioning. Therefore, this Government has a distinct field in that class of education, and it is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary that this work should be done. The results in my part of the country have been simply amazing. I have not the figures here, but I know that infant mortality, by reason of this campaign of education which has been conducted, has been reduced very considerably in the past few years. And if we go to other parts of the world, for instance, New Zealand, we find that as a result of the educational campaign which is being carried on, the death rate amongst children has dropped very considerably. Let me quote:

> Taking the seven years from 1900 to 1907 the average death rate among children under one year in Dunedin and suburbs was eight per cent. For the last five years the average has been 6.5 per cent; for the last three years 6 per cent; for the last two years, 5 per cent; and for the last year (1911), 4 per cent.

How did that come about? Doctor Truby King says it was because of education. He says that a—

> —generally diffused knowledge and recognition of infant requirements and maternal duties would save the community one life per diem, and would correspondingly increase the strength and vitality of the rising generation.

If that be the result of education in child welfare, then, for goodness sake, let us proceed with the necessary education to produce that result in Canada. That result is being achieved in my section of the country, and those provinces which are so backward in this respect should come to the Federal Government for a little direction and assistance which are all that is contemplated in this Bill. I, for one, would not think of interfering with the provinces or their duties, but can you have interference with provincial rights and co-operation at the same time? This Bill distinctly says to co-operate in all of these matters, and it seems to me as if the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard), producing as he has, the British North America Act to prove that this is an interference with provincial rights, has at the same time given denial to the Bill that he himself has so strongly supported in its vital points. I cannot see why we cannot have co-operation in the matter of child welfare just as we can have co-operation in the matter of adult welfare. What is the difference? Surely the provinces or the Dominion can agree over a child just as they can over anything else. Therefore, I think, because of the tremendous benefit that this will be, it is one of the most important clauses, and I certainly ask that it be left as it is.

Mr. ANDERSON: I intend to confine my remarks to the clause under discussion, and will leave the legal aspect to the lawyers in the committee. I believe that the legal adviser of the Government would not put this clause in the Bill if the Government did not have jurisdiction. While I am quite in accord with the clause, I think it does not go forward enough, and I would, therefore, move that it be amended by adding the words "and the welfare of needy mothers." If you wish to look after the child, it is essential that you should look after the mother, particularly in the early years of the child, as it is well known that infant mortality is greatest in the early days of its life and is in direct proportion to the poverty of the parents. Consequently we should look after the mother and see that she is provided with the necessaries of life; that if she is in financial difficulties, she be assisted in such a way that she can rear her children so that they will come up to adult life in good condition. I think, therefore, my amendment would be quite in order and would improve the clause under discussion.

10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that there is already before the committee an amendment moved by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) to strike out entirely paragraph (b) of section 4. This amendment must, of course, be disposed of before the hon. gentleman's amendment can be introduced. But as soon as we dispose of that I shall be pleased to put the amendment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) says that the paragraph as it reads is unconstitutional. I agree with him in that, but there is a way of wording it so that it will become quite constitutional. If, instead of leaving the paragraph as it is:—

The conservation of child life and child welfare.

he used the words:—

The promotion of child life and child welfare by furnishing financial aid to maternity hospitals and other institutions established for that purpose.

It would be quite constitutional, because he is furnishing financial aid for institutions established for that purpose.

Mr. SHEARD: I shall be quite satisfied with that modification if that, in the opinion of the minister, meets what was intended in this verbiage. All I wish is not to oppose child welfare, but to be constitutional.

Mr. CALDER: Would it meet the views of the hon. member for South Toronto if, instead of having the subject referred to in paragraph (b) as a distinct paragraph by itself, it was simply added to paragraph (a)? Paragraph (a) would then read:—

Co-operation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the co-ordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health and the conservation of child life and child welfare.

That would mean simply that the department would endeavour to secure the co-operation of the various provinces in promoting public health and child welfare. I understand the difficulty of the committee is simply this, that there is a fear that the Federal Government will enter upon what is purely provincial work, and I quite agree with the committee in that respect. It is not the intention of the Bill that the Federal Department should become an administrative department, as regards these matters of public health and child welfare, but that rather the department should be in a position to gather information from authoritative sources, to distribute that information, to educate the people, as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) has said, and to co-operate with the various provincial authorities with a view to securing those ends. I am inclined to take the view that the point raised by the hon. member for South Toronto is a very important one, and that if the section is left as it is there is a danger that the provincial authorities will take it for granted that the Federal Government is going to undertake this work, which, after all, is largely, if not entirely, provincial work,—I am referring to the administrative side of it. If paragraph (b) is added to paragraph (a) the point raised by the hon. member for South Toronto will be settled.

Mr. SHEARD: I am quite willing to concur in that suggestion if that is acceptable, and request leave to withdraw my amendment to strike out paragraph (b).

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. SHEARD: I move to amend paragraphs (a) and (b) by striking out paragraph (b) and combining paragraph (b) with paragraph (a) so that it will now read:

Co-operation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities with a view to the co-ordination of the efforts proposed or made for preserving and improving the public health and the conservation of child life and child welfare.

Mr. CANNON: In view of the suggestion of the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) that the sub-clause as it now reads might mean an encroachment on provincial rights, I would remind the committee that the first paragraph of this section removes any danger of that. Its terms are very general. It declares that this Department of Health can deal only with matters over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction. Our powers are defined by the British North America Act. Sub-paragraph (b) must be read in conjunction with the opening paragraph of section 4, which says that we must keep within our own jurisdiction.

Mr. CALDER: There is this point: I would presume that the Parliament of Canada, if it wished to do so, might establish and operate a hospital somewhere in Canada. I do not think that would be unconstitutional. We already have hospitals for our soldiers, and marine hospitals, and I dare say we might have hospitals of various kinds if we wished to do so. It seems to me this Bill should be so drafted that there will be no doubt on the part of the provinces as to its intention. I am strongly inclined to the view that the actual work itself is provincial work, and that drafting of the Bill should clearly indicate that to the provinces, so as to give them no excuse for asking us to undertake work which is purely of a local character. It is in order that there shall be no misunderstanding of the intention of the Bill that the amendment has been suggested.

Mr. TRAHAN: I respectfully submit that the conservation of child life and child welfare is included in "matters relating to the promotion or preservation of public health," and therefore I think sub-paragraph (b) should be struck out as it is only a repetition of the opening paragraph. The objection I have is to the phrase "child welfare." I have the same objection to that as I have to the phrase "social welfare". "Child welfare" is a very broad expression. As a child's welfare cannot be looked after properly without giving him an education, some good lawyer might argue that this legislation confers powers on this Government to interfere with the education of a child. It was for these reasons I was prepared to support the first amendment proposed by my hon. friend from South Toronto, which to my mind was expressed in the most suitable terms. The phrase "child welfare" is ambiguous, and might lead to abuses in its interpretation. If the committee want to be logical, having accepted the amendment regarding "social welfare," it must accept an amendment removing the words "child welfare." I think the Government would do well to strike out subparagraph (b).

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is quite in error in his view that the use of these words would authorize any interference in the matter of education. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) has clearly pointed out that all these subclauses are governed by the opening paragraph of section 4, which says that the powers of the minister shall extend to matters over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction. Now the Parliament of Canada has no jurisdiction in matters of education, except under the peculiar conditions mentioned in the British North America Act which would have no application here.

Mr. TRAHAN: I think that the words "over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction" refer to "the people of Canada" and not to the word "matters."

Mr. BELAND: I think the suggestion made by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization is a good one and should be accepted by the committee. I would have felt inclined at first to believe also that subparagraph (b) relating to the conservation of child life and child welfare, if it had been adopted as it stood at first, might have clashed somewhat with the interpretation my hon. friend rightly put upon the British North America Act. But by adding subparagraph (b) to subparagraph (a) it affects somewhat the meaning and the purpose of it all. We must not forget, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Dorchester, that the only matters that are to be dealt with under this legislation are those over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction; that is provided in the opening paragraph of section 4. Now the Parliament of Canada has no jurisdiction over education so we can leave that to one side. What is then the object this Bill has in view? It is, mainly, co-operation with the provinces. Reverting to section 3 of the Bill for a moment, that section gives the Governor in Council power to appoint such other officers as are necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the department. Let us suppose for one moment that the Government left aside all idea of exercising patronage—which is possible even for this Government—and appoint a most competent person, man or woman.

Section 6 provides that a Dominion Council of Health consisting of the Deputy Minister of Health and the Chief Executive officers of all provincial boards will meet—in Ottawa, I suppose—under the chairmanship of the Deputy Minister of Health, together with three members appointed by the Governor in Council. Let us suppose that this Dominion Council has the benefit of the wide knowledge of the person appointed by virtue of section 3 to which I have just referred. What a benefit could result therefrom. The provincial boards are not in a position—certainly not in Quebec—to afford the advice of a really competent authority on this question. I do not say that such persons are not available, but, being a member of the provincial board, I know we have no such adviser on child life and child welfare. The Dominion Council will meet in Ottawa and all the heads of the provincial boards of health will be benefited by consultation with this competent party from whom they will no doubt receive valuable suggestions and advice, which they can put into effective operation at home. Under these circumstances I think we should adopt the suggestion that has been made by the Minister of Immigration, supported by our eminent friend from South Toronto, and the legality of which we can surely rely on when it is warranted by such a brilliant lawyer as my hon. friend from Dorchester.

Mr. CALDER: What the hon. member has said indicates the main purpose of the entire Bill. I may mention a concrete illustration we had in the city not many weeks ago. As has been pointed out by the Presi-

dent of the Privy Council we had a conference on the question of venereal diseases. The chief health officers of most of the provinces were present. Two ministers, one from Ontario and the other from New Brunswick, were also present. The conference lasted the best part of a day and there were in attendance at least three professional men who were experts on the question. I was present during most of the day, and I am sure that there was not a medical man from the outside provinces who did not benefit most materially by the discussions, one of the main objects of which was to consider the steps that should be taken towards passing in the various provinces the necessary legislation to meet the problem, and in addition the provincial—not the federal —machinery that would be required. What is true in regard to public health is also true so far as child welfare is concerned. I have attended a number of conferences held here in the course of the past year when this problem has come up for discussion, and what the social workers throughout Canada feel that we need most of all is a central body that can secure the most reliable information from every source on this question of child welfare, which information could be given to the body that eventually must pass legislation and put it into effect.

Mr. TRAHAN: I want to draw the attention of the committee to the reason of my interpretation. I have before me the French and English versions of the Bill, my interpretation of which is based on the French version. The clause reads:

4. Les devoirs et pouvoirs du ministre dans l'administration du ministère de la santé publique, s'étendent à, et comprennent tous les sujets et questions ayant trait à la protection ou à la conservation de la santé et du bien-être social de la population du Canada, sur laquelle—

Referring to the population of Canada.

—le Parlement du Canada exerce jurisdiction, et sans restreindre la généralité de ce qui précède, en particulier les questions et sujets suivants:

When we are discussing a Bill which is printed in both languages we refer to both versions to ascertain the right intention.

Mr. ROWELL: It is merely a mistake in translation.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it be correct in the French version to replace the word "laquelle" by "lesquels"?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. I think it would improve the phraseology of clause (b) which is now (a) by inserting after the word "and" and before the words "child welfare," the words "the promotion of," so that the line will now read:

(a) The conservation of child life and the promotion of child welfare.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the question of marine hospitals.

I think the person who drafted the Bill could not have read the existing law in relation to this matter. We have an elaborate law relating to the care of sick seamen. A section of the Shipping Act, Cap. 113, Revised Statutes of Canada, consisting of 28 separate clauses deals with this question. We are now asked to adopt a clause which places marine hospitals and sick seamen under the management of the Minister of Health. We will have two statutes then conflicting with one another in regard to sick seamen. These clauses provide for the way in which sick seamen are to be attended to. Ships when they enter a port pay what is known as the sick mariners' dues. This money is placed in the hands of the receiver general to pay for the cost of managing these hospitals and attending to the seamen when they are sick. This provision is under the control of the Marine Department, and there is no reference at all in the schedule to this Act to the Marine Department. The law is not repealed, and we will have two statutes about the same matter and two ministers in control if we pass this section.

Mr. ROWELL: I think the matter will be found to have been dealt with when we come to the schedule. I will look at the Act. I think the parliamentary counsel had all these Acts before him when he drew up the Bill. One should guard against two ministers being charged with the same responsibility.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If the minister will look at section 406, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes of Canada he will find the following language:

Subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, the minister shall have the management of all marine and seamen's hospitals and pest houses for the use of sick mariners, and may renew leases of lands on which any such hospitals or pest houses are erected, and may make all necessary contracts for repairing and maintaining the same, and for the cure, care, attendance and support of the patients therein, and may also make such regulations as he

deems advisable for the government of the same, for regulating the visiting of seamen ill of any infectious diseases, and for their removal to any pest house or other building.

Clearly the intention of this law is to place the direction of these hospitals and the care of sick seamen under the care of the Minister of Marine.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so. Clause (c) might stand in the meantime, and we will look into it.

On paragraph (d)—the supervision, as regards the public health, of railways, boats, ships and all methods of transportation:

Mr. PAPINEAU: What is the meaning of the words " all methods of transportation?"

Mr. ROWELL: Railways, boats, ships. When the air service is established there may be another. The draftsman was evidently desirous of covering all methods of transportation.

Mr. SHEARD: I would suggest that the word "interprovincial" be put in there in reference to "boats." The subsection might read:

The supervision, as regards the public health of railways, boats, ships, and all methods of interprovincial transportation.

Otherwise we might interpret this Act as having jurisdiction over a boat travelling from Montreal to Quebec. It does not go out of the province at all and is a purely provincial matter.

Mr. BELAND: Might I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that seagoing ships which come as far as Montreal do not touch any other province than that of Quebec.

Mr. SHEARD: I am speaking of boats that do not go to sea but are simply river boats running within the province.

Mr. BELAND: How would you have the subsection read:

Mr. SHEARD: I would put in the word "interprovincial" before the word "transportation." If a boat, train or trolley car did not go from one province into another it would then be understood that it would be a matter purely for the provincial authorities to deal with.

Mr. KEEFER: The introduction of the word "interprovincial" might take away the benefit of the Act. If a boat plying between Prescott and Brockville in the province of Ontario was without proper equipment as regards its closets, and so on, there should be provision for dealing with it.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) raises a point that is well worthy of consideration. A boat coming from England and arriving at Montreal would not be an interprovincial boat and yet this board would, or should, have supervision over it entirely. If smallpox or some other disease should be found on board the Department of Public Health should take charge of it.

Mr. ROWELL: The question of navigation is a matter of federal control. The ships are all registered and I do not think we need fear anything on that score.

Mr. CANNON: I have in my constituency a railway known as the Quebec Central. It is operating under a provincial charter. Under this paragraph would the Government have any jurisdiction over a railway of that kind?

Mr. ROWELL: Provincial roads under certain conditions prescribed in the law become subject to federal jurisdiction, and in that case I should think it would come under this law.

Mr. McKENZIE: If we read this paragraph with the words contained in section 4, we have the safeguard that these powers shall apply only to the subjects over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction. That provision is to be read with the subclause.

Mr. SHEARD: Before we pass to paragraph (e) I have another subsection to introduce, and I think it would come in here. I want to introduce a section to provide for the control of the spread of venereal diseases, and I want to have it specifically set forth. I would suggest that the section to be here introduced be as follows :

To control as far as practical the spread of venereal diseases and to quarantine infected cases thereof so as to prevent interprovincial communication and the importation into the Dominion of Canada of those infected with constitutional syphilis.

The reason why I ask for the mention of veneral disease, with particular reference to syphilis is that it is probably the most chronic of all infectious diseases and that not only does it not limit its infection to those who may come into contact but it spreads to those who may descend from the parents of those infected. We have had many instances of congenital syphilis which showed little or no

manifestations until a later period in life. These cases could be admitted into the country, and have been undoubtedly, in very large numbers through what I am afraid amounts to more or less neglect in the medical inspection of immigrants. I well remember one case in the city of Toronto which came under my notice where the father and mother were both subjects of the disease in a very chronic form. They had a girl of eighteen years of age who suffered from keratitis, or inflammation of the eyes, from which she became almost blind afterwards, although the disease did not show itself until very near puberty; and there were two other children, a baby that had congenital syphilis, and a child of five or six years of age which also showed evidence of this disease. The chronicity of the malady makes it imperative that some special responsibility shall attach to those responsible, to avoid the admission of such cases into the Dominion of Canada; and it must be the particular duty of the Federal Government to take the necessary precautions because of the insidious character of the infection. It is often carried from one large centre to another. For instance, a diseased person may be in Montreal; he may take train to Toronto and travel through to the coast, sowing his infection as he goes, and it is a case where it does not belong altogether to the authority of any one province. What I have in mind is to exercise two efforts for its control. Of course, no wholesale inspection can be attempted by a series of examinations for such cases, but as they become known to the proper health authorities they should come under the control of a central authority; or they can be recognized by a thorough and regular inspection at the port of entry. I think some specific reference ought to be made to that matter before we take up Federal buildings, international commissions, and so on, and I think this is the proper place to introduce it if we are to have any regard at all for the symmetry of the Act.

An hon. MEMBER: I quite agree with my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) to the effect that such inspection might be practical at the port of entry from overseas, but I cannot quite follow him when he states that in moving from one province to another an inspection would be possible, because these cases would be known or that there would be some system of inspection at the port of entry. I cannot conceive of the possibility of stopping a train, say, on the border between Quebec and Ontario, and having an inspection of the passengers.

Mr. SHEARD: No.

An hon. MEMBER: Nor can I conceive of the police of Montreal wiring to an agent at the border and saying that such and such a passenger has an infectious disease.

Mr. SHEARD: I wish to assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I had no such thought in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment reads as follows:

> Mr. Sheard moves to amend clause 4 by inserting as subclause (d) the following words "to control as far as practicable the spread of venereal diseases and to quarantine infected cases thereof so as to prevent inter-provincial communication and the importation into the Dominion of Canada of those infected with constitutional syphilis."

Mr. PROULX: Mr. Chairman, with regard to immigrants, it seems to me the matter is covered by subsection (c), the inspection and medical care of immigrants and seamen. Under the Immigration Act the immigration authorities have power to refuse admission of any person infected with venereal or infectious diseases.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) has anticipated me. If at the port of entry some man or woman should be found suffering with syphilis, there is no reason why this country should admit and take care of such a case. The main objection I have to the motion of the member for South Toronto is that when you get away from the port of entry and attempt to deal with syphilis in the provinces you are encroaching on provincial jurisdiction, just as much as if you attempt to deal with scarlet fever or any similar disease. As the hon. member appears to be very anxious to protect the rights of the provinces, I think he is overstepping his own mark.

Mr. SHEARD: I might point out to the hon. members and to my hon. professional colleague from Fort William (Mr. Manion) that constitutional syphilis is an incurable disease and absolutely in a category by itself. It is a disease which I have seen active for ten years, and a disease where I have seen the progeny affected constitutionally down through two generations. It is a disease which can stay in an infectious stage without giving the slightest inconvenience very often, and without even being noticed by the community and without being treated by a medical man. Many of these cases are in their worst form

treated by druggists or others who dispense quack nostrums. For those reasons I think it is incumbent upon the Federal Health Department to use the very best medical knowledge and science in endeavouring to control this peculiar and infectious disease which is distinguished by its chronicity and insidiousness and by the destructive work which it does in those who are in no way exposed to the disease except by their nativity, and which is not communicated as is scarlet fever, smallpox, diphtheria, measles and the ordinary infectious diseases. It is a travelling and ambulatory disease par excellence, and I think some particular mention ought to be made of it in this Act so as to give the central Federal authority jurisdiction over it.

In reference to the point which has been mentioned, and which the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) says I am contradicting myself upon, I do not agree with him. I am referring to ambulatory cases that wander about from one province to another, that travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific, sowing infection and coming back again, a condition which probably does not apply to any other infectious disease known to medical science except tuberculosis, and this disease is more easily transmitted and communicated than tuberculosis because of its chronicity and the insidious manner in which it works upon the human system. It is for that reason that I think a special clause ought to be embodied in this Bill. If the hon. minister wants to consider the advisability of introducing such a clause, I am not prepared to press the matter very strongly, but I certainly think that the public at this particular juncture expect the question to be dealt with and taken up by the provinces.

Mr. ROWELL: There can be no difference of opinion, I should judge, among members of the committee as to the importance and seriousness of the disease to which my hon. friend has referred, but I think ample provision has been made for dealing with it in the Bill as now drafted. As a matter of fact, in the first draft of this Bill it was specifically mentioned, as were three or four of these worst diseases, including tuberculosis, but they were struck out of the Bill for the reason that the provinces might think, if they were specified, that we were undertaking to relieve them of further responsibility, although our jurisdiction was expressly limited by section 4. It was thought better, on the whole, not to enumerate these diseases, because we have full power under section 4, subsection (a), in co-operation with the provinces, to deal with them. But if it is the view of the committee that these diseases should be more specifically referred to in the Bill, I have no objection.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I agree with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) that these diseases are the greatest curse of Canada to-day. There is no denying the fact that with the troops returning we shall have a great increase of these diseases, and that increase will no doubt be spread over every province in the Dominion. So that the Government, through this department, should take practical steps at once to deal with this matter. It is no use shutting our eyes to it, or, as the minister said this afternoon, talking of it with bated breath. We have to meet it by open discussion, by dissemination of knowledge, and above all, by training the people to look after themselves. After all, it is not always a question of knowledge. In treating tuberculous cases we tried to educate the people, so to speak; but we found that it was necessary also to train them to look after their own health. Conditions twelve months hence will no doubt be much worse than they are to-day; therefore, this question should be dealt with at once in a scientific manner.

Mr. BRIEN: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGibbon, Muskoka), that with the home coming of the soldiers venereal diseases will increase. As a result of the work that the medical officers have been doing in the army, the percentage of venereal disease in the army has been very considerably reduced. You will find a greater percentage in the civilian population than you will find in the army. We have heard a great deal about trying to make this world fit for democracy; I believe we have a great duty to perform in making democracy fit for the world. This venereal disease problem is veiled in mystery, as is illustrated by the cripples and defectives which follow in the wake of the disease. If we refer to it specifically in the Bill, I suggest that it be mentioned in subsection (i). I suggest that the feeble-minded as well as those afflicted with venereal disease, gonorrhea and syphilis, be referred to there, and, if it be in order, Mr. Chairman, that the matter be left over until we come to that subsection.

The CHAIRMAN: The proper way of holding it over would be to withdraw the amendment which is before the committee, and then any suggested amendment of subsec-

tion (i) could be proposed when that subsection is reached. The amendment now under consideration, however, would have to be withdrawn by the hon. gentleman who proposed it, and as he has left the chamber the only way to dispose of it now would be to have it negatived by the committee. Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. BLAKE: Does that mean that we are still discussing the matter of venereal disease under the suggested clause (d)?

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection (d), introduced as an amendment by the member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) has now been struck out, but there is nothing to prevent any hon. gentleman from suggesting a similar amendment to any other subsection when it is reached.

On subsection (e):

Mr. MORPHY: I move that this subsection be amended by striking out the words "regard to" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the words "a view to conserving and promoting," so that the subsection will read:—

The supervision of Federal public buildings and offices with a view to conserving and promoting the health of the civil servants and other Government employees therein.

Mr. ROWELL: I see no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to, and subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection (h)—Collection, publication and distribution of information to promote good health, and improved sanitation.

Mr. ROWELL: I move that this subsection be amended by striking out the word "and" in the second line thereof and adding at the end of the said subsection the words "and social welfare."

Mr. CANNON: There are already quite a number of Government publications from nearly all departments, and large sums of money are expended on those publications every year. Of late there has been a special publication which has been attacked and criticised. Are we to have some more publications of the same kind as the Official Record? If I were sure that this new publication would be more useful and interesting than the Official Record, I would have no objection, and the moment the President of the Privy Council will give me that assurance, I shall withdraw any objection I may have.

Mr. ROWELL: Whether a publication is interesting or not depends upon one's viewpoint. One person might find this publication more interesting than the Official Record, while another might find the Official Record more interesting than this.

Mr. TRAHAN: By the insertion of the phrase "social welfare" at the end of this paragraph, as proposed by the amendment, it looks as if the minister still wanted to have the right to legislate upon all things pertaining to social welfare.

Mr. PAPINEAU: As my hon. friend has just said, we struck out the phrase "social welfare" before, and now the minister wants the collection, publication and distribution of information in regard to it. As the phrase "social welfare" was struck out of the first part of the section, it is struck out of the duties and powers of this department of health, so that what is the use in publishing information in regard to it when the department is not empowered to deal with the question?

Mr. SHEARD: I would like to see paragraph (h) modified somewhat. We know that the public generally are very sensitive on matters of public health, and pamphlets, publications and interviews with newspaper reporters can often be given out to the great discomfort of other health officers and to the excitation of the public. I had in mind, if I had been in my place, to suggest that the paragraph read:

The collection, publication and distribution through provincial and municipal health officers and local boards of health, of information to promote good health and improved sanitation.

So that the information would come through official channels. I can understand an over-zealous and over-officious officer connected with this Federal Health Department giving an interview to some newspaper reporters, setting forth the details of certain epidemics and their ravages in certain parts of Canada, to the direct injury of the health officers operating in that particular part. In order to avoid that I would suggest that all this distribution shall be done through official channels, and then the local officers of the province and the provincial officers shall undertake the distribution through their particular section. In that way the information always travels through legitimate provincial channels, and that is better on matters of public health than the indiscriminate distribution of statements, publications, criticisms and the like which might be made public through the ordinary channels of the daily press.

Mr. POWER: My objection to the inclusion of the phrase "social welfare" is that it is so difficult in a country like ours to establish a standard of social welfare. It is all very well to collect, publish and distribute information with regard to social welfare, but the information distributed to people whose ideas are of one kind will not be suitable for those whose ideas are of another. Shall we have propaganda tending to help the socialistic ideas of social welfare; or, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) would be willing to say, the Bolshevik ideas of social welfare; or shall we have the Methodist, Presbyterian or Catholic ideas of social welfare? That would depend entirely upon the deputy minister or the minister who administers the department. In a question of such great importance as this we cannot leave the determination of this in the hands of any one man. Under the circumstances, since we have already declared in principle that the words "social welfare" cover too many things, they ought to be dropped even from this paragraph. While I have been a member of this House I have had more than enough pamphlets on the various questions of the day put into my post office box. Every day since this session started I have received "uplift" literature of all kinds, with a great deal of which I do not agree, although I am in favour of a certain amount of "uplift" in the right direction. If we are to be bombarded from day to day with propaganda with which we do not agree the lives of members of Parliament will be made burdensome.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I hope the minister will not press the amendment.

Mr. ROWELL: If there is any particular objection to it, I shall not press it. I think everything that is necessary can be done under the section as it stands. My hon. friend has an entirely different idea of social welfare from what was in view in its introduction in the Bill and its use here. It related particularly to such questions as were of interest to the workingman, such as the question of good housing, the question of social insurance, the facts in connection with unemployment where it exists.

Mr. POWER: Does not that all appear in the Labour Gazette?

Mr. ROWELL: Not in relation to public health. It is intended to have statistics and information as to social insurance and how that operates, in order that the public might become fully seized as to the results of these measures in other countries.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think we can pass this section to-night. A paragraph was left standing at the top of the list of paragraphs, and there are several amendments to be introduced to paragraph (i) and several main sections of the Bill have still to be discussed. We are getting tired now, and I am afraid we would not, if we were to follow this matter up to-night, give as complete a finish to it as if we went at it in a little fresher frame of mind at another time.

Mr. ROWELL: Could we not deal with sections 5 and 6 and let section 4 stand?

Mr. POWER: Section 5 is very contentious.

Mr. ROWELL: I thought my hon. friends would accept that without any question. I was going to suggest that when we come to section 6 we change the word "three" to "five" so that the section will read, "not to exceed five in number."

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like the minister to understand that in every other house and institution of this city it is now five minutes after twelve.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friends think it is time to adjourn, I have no objection.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. McKENZIE: Monday will be private members' day, I suppose. Will any particular business be taken?

Mr. ROWELL: After private business, I think Supply will be taken up, probably Trade and Commerce estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.09 p.m.

Monday, April 7, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

On motion of Mr. Richardson the first report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House was concurred in.

REPORT.

Tenth Annual Report and Regulations of the Civil Service Commission—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

THE IMMIGRATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved for

leave to introduce Bill No. 52 to amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Mr. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, as the title of the Bill indicates, its purpose is to amend the law governing immigration. The Bill is a fairly lengthy one. A good many of the amendments are of a minor character and I think can be best explained and considered when we reach the committee stage. There are, however, a number of amendments of considerable importance to which I might make a brief reference at the present time. I will mention them in the order in which they appear in the Bill.

In the first place, the Bill provides for the extension of time during which persons who enter Canada as immigrants may be deported. Under the law as it now stands, the period is three years—we are proposing to exend that to five years. In other words if any person enters Canada whom we find to come within the prohibited classes under the law, such person may be deported at any time within a period of five years. There is a provision in the law as it now stands casting upon transportation companies certain duties and responsibilities in reference to the carrying of immigrants to Canada. It is proposed to extend the term "transportation company" so as to make it applicable to the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments which have transportation systems. Officials in charge of the Canadian National railways or officials who may be in charge of Government boats or vessels, will be responsible for carrying out the law in the same way as officials of an ordinary transportation company. Under the law as it now stands there are certain prohibited classes; certain people are prevented from entering Canada on account of their being mentally or physically unfit or for some other reason. It is proposed to extend the provision of the law in so far as these prohibited classes are concerned and at this stage I shall merely mention what the proposed new provisions of the law are: (1) It is proposed to include within the prohibited classes persons who are suffering from chronic alcoholism; (2) Those coming within the class of what is called constitutional psychopathic inferiority—probably the doctors in the House will explain a little more clearly than I can just what the effect of these words are. Then, it is suggested that we should carry into our law a provision to the effect that all persons who are either mentally or physically in such a condition as that they are not likely to be able to earn a living should be excluded. It is also suggested that we should set up a literary test and that persons should be included in the prohibited classes who are not able to read. That provision has not been in our law as yet. The Bill also provides that we should include in the prohibited classes persons who believe in, or advocate, the overthrow of constituted Government by force or violence or who advocate the unlawful destruction of property; also persons guilty of conspiracy against His Majesty; enemy aliens who have been interned and also enemy aliens who have been deported from Canada, or from British countries, for any cause. The Bill itself will explain just what is meant there a little more fully.

The Bill also provides that we should take authority to provide for the medical examination of immigrants in the country of their origin or on board ship. There are several sections of the Bill dealing with the duties and responsibilities of transportation companies. In the law as it now stands there is a provision of this kind but we propose to add to and extend this provision so as to throw greater responsibility upon transportation companies that bring immigrants to Canada. We are also imposing upon them more severe penalties for failure to carry out the law. The Bill also contains provision for the examination of seamen when such seamen land in Canada for any cause. Then, there is one other section, probably the most important section in the Bill. It is in the law now as section 38 (c) and under that section the Government has power by Order in Council to prohibit persons from entering Canada for either a stated period or permanently for any reason which may be deemed advisable. It is proposed to extend the provision of that section so as to give the Government greater powers in so far as that feature of our work is concerned. These are the chief provisions of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 47, for the relief of Annie Proderick.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 48, for the relief of Samuel David McElroy.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 49, for the relief of Mary Jane McCulloch.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 50, for the relief of Mary Garland Lewis.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 51, for the relief of William Canham.—Mr. Fripp.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Might I ask the Acting Prime Minister if any decision has been arrived at as regards daylight saving? I am informed that the Railway Commission, having heard the pros and cons on this question, is now awaiting the action of the Senate, and that if the Upper Chamber on Wednesday should decide in favour of daylight saving, so will the Railway Commission. Is there any truth in the statement?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not aware that there is any truth in the statement, and I should doubt very much if the Board of Railway Commissioners, after the hearing which it has given the matter, is awaiting the action of the Senate. I informed the House last week that we would await the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and after that decision had been given we should take such action with regard to the matter of the time in this Chamber as might be proper, having regard to the convenience of members.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT ENFORCEMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): I rise to ask the Minister of Militia a question. It is announced in the press that in the parish of Ste. Marie, in the county of Kent, New Brunswick, a defaulter has been shot at and wounded by a military policeman, the bullet passing through the injured man's leg. I would like to know if a military policeman has the right to discharge a firearm at a defaulter. According to the newspaper report which I hold in my hand, it would appear that there are a number of military policemen still on duty in the county of Kent.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): As far as I am aware there are no military police now engaged in arresting defaulters. There may be some of the Dominion police employed in that duty, but if so I have no information in regard to it. The military police have made no arrests of defaulters since the date of the signing of the armistice, but a number of Dominion police have been engaged in apprehending certain individuals. However, I have no knowledge of any such occurrence as that to which the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House.

[Mr. Calder.]

EDMONTON, DUNVEGAN AND BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): I would like to ask the Acting Prime Minister if the attention of the Government has been drawn to a report of the proceedings of the Alberta legislature contained in the Edmonton Journal of Wednesday, April 2. I quote the following extract from the report in question:

> During the general discussion of these estimates, Doctor G. D. Stanley, High River, again asked the Premier concerning his previous statement in the House that the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway (what is known as the Peace River Railway), might be taken over by the Federal Government; that negotiations were pending between Mr. McArthur, the railway promoter, and the Federal Government, for such a consummation, and that the completion of the deal awaited only the signature of the minister, presumably Sir Robert Borden. The Premier replied that the extent of his knowledge was that negotiations of this nature were pending; he could give no information as to their progress. In answering another question relative to the Government having paid the interest on the bonds of this railway to prevent default, the Premier stated that the procedure had been to give the company authority to make the payments; there was, however, no difference in the cheques.

I might say that there have been remarks about the House to the effect that the Federal Government might take this railway over, and it has been reported that very strong pressure was being brought to bear upon the Government to do so. I would like very much to know if the Government has any information that it cares to impart to the House, because it is very important to know what has been done with regard to the railroad in question?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): With respect to the subject to which the hon. member has drawn notice, I might say that while the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway has been brought to the attention of the Government for some three or four years past in connection with matters relating to subsidy, no arrangement such as is suggested with regard to the taking over of the road has been completed, nor are there any negotiations at the present time looking to that end. It is, of course, open to those connected with this railroad to bring to the attention of the Government from time to time anything that would be of public interest relating to its affairs.

RECIPROCITY IN COASTING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Might I ask the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce if he has any information to impart to the House with regard to reciprocal coasting.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have to inform the hon. member for Kingston that the department has not yet received any word from Washington which would indicate that the authorities there have abrogated the license extended to our coast shipping.

THE LATE MR. JOSEPH READ, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Since the last sitting of the House death has again touched our circle, and has removed one of its members. I confess that when I read in the press this morning of the sudden and unexpected death of Captain Read, the late member for Prince, Prince Edward Island, I experienced a feeling of very deep emotion. Nothing could more forcibly bring home to us the truth of the saying: In the midst of life we are in death. It is inexpressibly sad to me, as I am sure it is to all members on both sides of the House, to reflect that this good and kindly man, who, during the short term in which he had been a member of this House, had won a place in all our hearts and who but yesterday was among us, is now no more. We all liked him, Mr. Speaker. We liked to see him in his place; we liked to hear him speak; we liked to converse with him in the corridors and elsewhere in social intercourse. I think we liked him most because of his strong individuality, his originality of thought, his homely philosophy, his shrewd knowledge of men and affairs, and the humour which illuminated all his speeches.

The late member for Prince came of fighting stock. Both his paternal and maternal grandfathers were connected with the Imperial Military and Naval Service. While a young man he followed the sea as his calling, and having taken a course in a nautical academy at Liverpool, he became entitled to an Imperial Master Mariner's Certificate. Later he entered commercial life in the province of Prince Edward Island, in which, I understand, he made a signal success. He was held in much respect in the commercial community, having been for a considerable time president of the Maritime Boards of Trade. He was keenly interested in public affairs before coming to this Parliament, having been for three terms a member of the Provincial Legislature. In 1917, at the last election, he was returned to this House. He took a keen interest in all affairs which came before the House from time to time, and as he had a wide knowledge of affairs, was listened to with interest and respect. Personally, and on behalf of all on this side of the House, I desire to express our very deep regret and sorrow at his death, and to extend to those of his family circle our most sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of members on this side of the House who sat with the late member, I wish to thank the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) for his kindly words in respect to our departed friend, Captain Joseph Read, who represented the constituency of Prince, P. E. I. I am sure that we all have much pleasure in taking to ourselves and representing as our own what has been so truly said by the leader of the Government with respect to Captain Read.

Captain Read was a splendid, strong, rugged type of that Canadian citizenship of which we are all so proud. He was a man of strong personal opinions, of honesty of purpose, of honesty of conviction. There was never any mistake as to where he stood on any question; this good, old, honest, sturdy mariner always made his position clear on the floor of this House with regard to any question in which he took part or interest. The leader of the Government has said that he was a master mariner; so he was. We have many master mariners in this country, but not so very many who hold the high position that Captain Read did. He passed the severe test to which men in that calling are subjected by the Imperial Board of Trade; he was a first class seaman and a splendid navigator. He carried that reputation all over the world. Moreover, he had the reputation of being good and kind to the men who served under him, all of whom regarded him as a gentleman and a hero.

The leader of the Government spoke of Captain Read having been in business. I should like to mention an event in his business life which was regarded as not common to very many men. At one time Captain Read failed in business, and what he had was not sufficient to pay all his creditors. He went back to sea and made money, and although under the laws of this country he was not obliged to pay his old debts, it stands to his credit that he paid every cent of these

old bills which he had not been able to pay when he was obliged to enter the Insolvency Court of Prince Edward Island. Few in the world have done that, and that circumstance reveals such an excellent trait of his character and stands so well in line with what we know of Captain Read that I think it is well to mention it. We are sad and sorrowful at his departure. He has served his country well; he lived to a respectable old age. We can only bow to the will of Him who does all things wisely and well.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 22, respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

On motion of Mr. H. B. Morphy (North Perth) for the third reading of Bill No. 13, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada:

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): This Bill was allowed to go through the Railway Committee at the request of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Reid). He said that he had conferred with the Acting Prime Minister, who had suggested that there would be no harm in letting the Bill go through, as it would be explained in the House. The Bill is to enable the Grand Trunk Railway Company to raise additional funds. The record of that company in the way of financing and raising money has been so remarkable that a great deal of opposition arose to the Bill in committee. I suppose it passed the Committee of the Whole; unfortunately, I was not here. The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) says that he did not know about it either; he was one of the members who opposed the Bill in the Railway Committee. If I am not trenching upon the rules of the House, I should like to ask an explanation from the Government as to the necessity for this Bill. If popular rumour is correct and the Grand Trunk is to fall into the hands of the country, there is no necessity for this Bill. If the Grand Trunk is not going to fall into the hands of the country it will be most unfortunate to permit this country to do any more of the wild-cat financing that it has been doing for the last number of years.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): I expressed the opinion of the

Government in regard to this Bill on Friday evening when it was in the committee stage on the second reading. I stated that the object of the legislation was to authorize the Grand Trunk to issue debentures for the purpose of its financing. I said that it was not thought wise for the Government to prevent the company from obtaining authority to issue these securities, pending negotiations which the Government is having with the company. The company has many pressing obligations and will require to finance. I pointed out also that if the Government took over the Grand Trunk Railway Company they would take it over, as the Canadian Northern Railway Company was taken over, as a corporation. Power to issue debentures will be required by the Grand Trunk Railway Company as a corporation if taken over by the Government, because as a corporation it would be its object to finance itself as much as possible. That is the policy we have adopted with regard to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Instead of advancing that company money from time to time, we encourage it to make issue of its own securities as a corporation in New York and in London. Some of those securities are guaranteed by the Dominion Government and some are not, but the point I make is that whether the Grand Trunk continues as a corporation or, as we expect, comes into the possession of the Government, it will still be a corporation with power to issue securities when necessary.

Another point is this. Pending the negotiations to withhold this power might have very serious consequences, consequences that I do not think any of us would like to see with respect to the Grand Trunk, and I have not been able to reach the conclusion that it would be fair or just for us to withhold power that is necessary for the temporary financing of the company. That is the general position which I indicated last Friday night when the matter was under consideration. I stated also that the Government was in a position though this legislation is passed, to control the issue in such a manner as to protect the public interest, and that, I take it, is all that the House is concerned with.

If no negotiations were pending and the Grand Trunk required authority from this Parliament to issue debenture stock such as it has issued in the past, I suppose no difficulty would be raised, because the proceeds of the debentures so issued would be devoted to the purposes of the company, namely, to take care of deficits or to provide

for betterments or improvements or extensions. That, in general, was the attitude which I adopted on Friday last. I have given the matter careful consideration, because I appreciate the point of view of my hon. friend and also what was put forward by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) when the Bill was in the second reading stage. But the Government has reached the conclusion that this legislation authorizing the Grand Trunk to issue securities should not be withheld.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton): I would like to point out that the statement made by the Acting Prime Minister has not been heard by at least twenty-five members sitting behind him. It is an unfortunate thing that this occurs in the House, but it is also an unfortunate thing that the members of the Government do not exert themselves so as to be heard. It is not fair that members on the back benches should have to wait until the publication of Hansard to find out what the Acting Prime Minister has stated. I would like the members on the front benches to keep that in mind so that they may let the members on the back benches know exactly what they are saying.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

NATIONAL WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION OF CANADA.

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (South Toronto) moved that Bill No. 45, to incorporate the National Wholesale Grocers' Association of Canada, be read the second time.

He said: This Bill seeks the incorporation of the Wholesale Grocers of the Dominion of Canada from coast to coast, with head offices in the city of Toronto and power to hold property not to exceed $100,000. The chief objects of this association are to procure reliable and official news concerning the grocery trade and the condition of the markets, and also to facilitate and reduce the cost of transportation and interchange of grocery commodities.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY STATIONS.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What have been the revenues, in detail, of each Transcontinental railway station in the year 1918?

2. How many freight cars were daily despatched and received at each of said stations in 1918?

Hon. Mr. REID: In order to answer this question one would have to give information concerning a railway which forms part of the Canadian National railways, and, therefore, it is not in the public interest to give this information.

ACCIDENTS ON TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BOURASSA:

What is the total amount of the damages caused by accidents which have occurred on the Transcontinental railway, between Mannie Station and the Quebec Bridge, since the 1st of November, 1918, to Government and residents' property, respectively?

Hon. Mr. REID: Damage to railway property, $11,770; damage to residents' property, nil.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. How many locomotives have been derailed or damaged within the last three years?

2. How many employees of, or passengers have been killed or injured owing to collisions or other accidents on the Intercolonial Railway?

3. How many animals, sheep, oxen. horses, etc., have been killed or struck by locomotives on the railways under the control and managed by the Government within the last three years?

4. Were they killed on the railways at public highways or at other points, and how many in each case?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Derailed, 1,362; damaged, 675.

2. Killed, 74; injured, 480.

3. Killed, 836; injured, 43.

4. At public highway, 146; at other points, 733.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY SYSTEM.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Canadian National Railway System, or the Board of Management thereof, purchased coal in Western Canada?

2. If so, from what companies or individuals have purchases been made?

3. What are the prices governing such purchases, and where are deliveries made?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Not in the public interest to give this information.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Is the Canadian National Railway System, or the Board of Management thereof, or any person or persons acting for either, purchasing ties from the Northern Construction Company?

2. If so, what arrangement has been made, and what price has been paid, or is to be paid per tie?

3. At what points on the railway are these ties to be delivered? If not at a point on the Canadian National Railway System, then on what other line of railway is delivery to be made?

4. Who pays the freight from the point of delivery to the place where the ties are used, and what is the cost of handling?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Canadian National Railway system is purchasing ties as well as many other things from the Canadian Northern Construction Company.

2, 3 and 4. Not in the public interest to give this information.

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE SOLDIERS' HOSPITAL.

Mr. BOYER:

What is the total amount of the contract given for the construction of the invalid soldiers' hospital at Ste. Anne de Bellevue?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: $1,027,995.37. Original contract awarded by Military Hospital Commission for $230,000 and rock excavation $28,595.30.

ST. MALO WORKSHOPS.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Is the Government aware of the decision of the Canadian National Railways Commission to open and operate the Transcontinental workshop at St. Malo, Quebec?

2. If so, on what date will these shops be put in operation?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. It is the intention of the Canadian National Railways to equip and operate shops at St. Malo.

2. Work will commence as soon as arrangements can be made and the Canadian National Railways expect to be in a position, during the present summer, to handle some repairs and have shops in operation the end of the year.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. On what date did the Government take possession of the Canadian Northern Railway System?

2. What is the total amount of the liabilities of said railway system, which the country assumed on taking possession?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Government received the controlling interest in the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway, on October 1, 1917.

2. The Dominion of Canada purchased the stock in the Canadian Northern Railway, but did not assume the outstanding liabilities which remained as debts of the company. According to the Government auditors the total outstanding liabilities as of October 1, 1917, including funded debt was $434,312,747.34.

[Mr. Reid.]

STEAMER "VOYAGEUR".

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Where is the steamer "Voyageur" at present?

2. Is she chartered? If so, to whom?

3. What is the nature of her cargo, and the rate of freight on current charter?

4. Between what ports is she trading, and what was the net freight earned on her last voyage?

5. Is she insured against marine and war risks, or either? If so, with what company, and at what rate?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. "Canadian Voyageur" left Barbados on March 27.

2. She is not chartered to any one.

3. Cargo of sugar for New York, at rate of 50c per 100 lbs.

4. She sailed from Halifax calling at various West Indian ports, going as far south as Demerara, carrying a cargo of general merchandise, and as she has not finished her trip from Barbados to New York the department will not know what her net freight earnings are, until she has completed this trip.

5. She is insured against marine risks but not war risk. The insurance was placed by the Department of Marine through Messrs. Johnston and Higgins, New York.

STEAMER McKEE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. To whom is the Steamer McKee chartered?

2. What is the nature of the cargo, the rate of freight per ton, the port of loading and port of discharge?

3. What is the return cargo, rate of freight per ton, and port of destination?

4. Is the hull insured? If so, with what company and for how much?

5. Is the freight insured?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. To the American Metal Transport Co., of New York.

2. Cargo of coal from New York to Chili, rate of freight 30 shillings per ton D.W. per month, and the charterers assume all expenses except wages of the crew.

3. Return cargo is ore, the rate of freight per ton is 30 shillings per ton D.W. Port of destination, New York.

4. The hull is insured through Willcox, Peck and Hughes of New York for $336,000.

5. Yes.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the Government aware that on or about the 1st March, 1919, twenty locomotives bear-

ing numbers 861 to 881 and the words "Canadian Government" inscribed thereon, were ordered at the car shops of the Montreal Locomotive Company?

2. Does the Government know that said locomotives were delivered to the Grand Trunk about the 15th of March?

3. If so, what agreement has been arrived at by the Government and the Grand Trunk respecting said locomotives?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. The locomotives are the property of the Canadian Government railways and are rented to the Grand Trunk railway.

OTTAWA CENTRAL STATION.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Does the Government intend to construct a connecting track between the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway and the main line of the Canadian National Railway at Ottawa which will enable the Montreal line trains of the latter railway to leave Central Station without running backward?

2. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Plans in connection with Ottawa entrance are under consideration.

2. It is impossible to state definitely when change will be undertaken.

MONTREAL TERMINAL AND TUNNEL.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Are the Canadian Northern Terminal, on Lagauchetière street, Montreal, and the Tunnel under Mount Royal in that city, the property of the Government of Canada?

2. If not, to whom do they belong?

3. How much is paid for the use of said Terminal and Tunnel by the trains of the Canadian National Railway?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Canadian Northern terminal on Lagauchetière St., and the tunnel under Mount Royal, in Montreal, is held by the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Co., Limited, the capital stock of which company is wholly owned by Canadian Northern Railway Company, which is controlled by Government through stock ownership.

2. Answered by Number 1.

3. Answered by Number 1.

LEVIS RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Government any knowledge of an association called the Levis Rifle Association?

2. If so, has it received any requests from this association to be allowed to use the rifle range at St. Joseph camp?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to encourage civilian rifle associations by allowing them the privilege of target practice at certain seasons of the year?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, No. 151, Levis Rifle Association, with headquarters at Levis, P.Q.

2. No.

3. Yes, but the future organization of rifle associations is under consideration.

DR. RUFUS H. PARENT.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. Has Dr. Rufus H. Parent, of Ottawa, been employed by the Government in connection with military matters at any time between the 4th August, 1914, and the 11th of November, 1918?

2. If so, what were his duties?

3. What sums were paid the said Dr. Rufus H. Parent on account of (a) salary; (b) separation allowance; (c) travelling expenses, and (d) office expenses?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Medical Officer, 230th Battalion, C.E.F., 15th April, 1916, to 4th January, 1917. French-Canadian Recruiting Staff, 5th January to 30th June, 1917.

3. (a) Pay, $1,827.75; field allowance, $452; subsistence allowance, $1,302.75; total, $3,582.50. (b) Separation allowance, $688. (c) Travelling expenses, $5. (d) Office expenses, nil.

TOTALLY DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

How many Canadian soldiers have: 1. Lost their four limbs; 2. Lost sight of both eyes; 3. Are bedridden from any cause due to service?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. One.

2. Sixty-six.

3. Seventy-four. This is understood to mean cases likely, from the nature of the war injury, to be compelled to remain in bed during the remainder of their lives. Most cases of this type are the result of gunshot wounds of the spine, with resulting paralysis.

COL. A. E. PRATT'S STATEMENTS.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

In view of the statements made by Col. A. E. Pratt in the Ontario Legislature that officers and others had to bribe officials in London in order to get passage to Canada, is it the intention of the Government to investigate the truth of the same?

Major-General MEWBURN: This information is not available in Canada, but a cable has been sent overseas for same.

GRAND TRUNK SUPERANNUATION AND PROVIDENT FUND.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many members are there at present who belong to the Superannuation and Pro-

vident Fund, which comes under the control of the Grand Trunk Consolidated Debentures Act of 1874, and the subsequent amendments?

2. What is the present financial condition of the above Superannuation and Provident Fund?

3. What surplus of cash have the trustees of the fund on hand to meet their obligations?

4. How many members are drawing benefits from the Superannuation and Provident Fund at the present time?

5. How many members are contributing to the Superannuation and Provident Fund at the present time?

6. Is the interest on the accumulated fund sufficient to pay annually to each of the retired and retiring officers two-thirds of their retiring salary?

7. What is the intention of the Committee of Management of the Superannuation and Provident Fund as regards the disposal of the fund when there are no surviving members, as I understand that the membership is now closed?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Department of Railways and Canals has no information on the subject, but the inquiry might be referred to the secretary of the fund.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SECURITIES.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton):

1. What was the par value of Canadian Northern Railway securities outstanding when the road was taken over by Government?

2. What amount of such securities was held in Great Britain on 1st February, 1917?

3. What was the market value of such securities held in Great Britain on 1st February, 1917?

4. What was the market value in Great Britain of Canadian Northern Income Bonds on 1st February, 1917?

5. What was the par value of Canadian Northern securities held in Great Britain on 1st January, 1919?

6. Is Government aware that before the transfer of the Canadian Northern Railway to Government a considerable volume of the securities of the road, then held in Great Britain, was said to have been purchased at prices much below par by Canadian interests?

7. Does Government intend to pay interest on the $25,000,000 of Canadian Northern Income Bonds?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. $384,931,494.40.

2. $238,625,437.82.

3. The Government has no official information.

4. The Government has no official information.

5. $238,164,150.81.

6. The Government has no information on the subject.

7. The trust deed covering the issue of the Canadian Northern Railway 5 per cent Income Charge Convertible Debenture Stock provides that interest shall be payable only if the net earnings of the company, after prior charges, permit. The Government sees no reason to vary from the terms of the mortgage.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY ARBITRATION.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton):

1. What officers of the Department of Railways and Canals were assigned to represent that department at the arbitration in Toronto in 1918 with respect to the value of Canadian Northern Railway common stock?

2. What were the salaries of such officers on 1st December, 1917, and what are their salaries now?

3. What were the ages and rank of R. A. C. Henry and Alexander Ferguson, officers of the Department of Railways and Canals. on 1st April, 1918?

4. How long were Mr. Henry and Mr. Ferguson engaged at the arbitration with respect to Canadian Northern Railway common stock?

5. How many days was Mr. Fairweather, Solicitor of the Department of Railways and Canals, at Toronto in connection with the arbitration regarding the value of Canadian Northern common stock?

6. Was Mr. Fairweather withdrawn from that arbitration? If so, by whom, when and why?

7. Did Graham A. Bell take any part in said arbitration as a witness or otherwise?

8. Did Graham A. Bell have anything to do with the arrangements for the presentation of the case of Government in connection with said arbitration?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Alex Ferguson, R. C. A. Henry, Gordon Grant, C.E., and E. E. Fairweather, the officers of the department assigned to represent the department as witnesses and assist the Government counsel, were those asked for by Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., of Toronto, counsel in charge of the case for the Government, to give so far as departmental requirements would allow, such assistance as might be required by him and by Mr. J. P. Newell, C.E., who was employed by counsel as a railway valuation expert. J. L. Payne, comptroller of railway statistics, also gave assistance and acted as witness.

2.

Alex Ferguson	$3,300 — $4,000
R. A. C. Henry.. ..	2,400 — 2,800
E. E. Fairweather..	4,500 — 5,000
Gordon Grant.	6,000 — 6,000
J. L. Payne	4,000 — 4,000

3. R. A. C. Henry, B.A., B.Sc., railway engineer, age 34; Alex Ferguson (graduate Glasgow Technical College) inspecting engineer, age 37.

4. Throughout the proceedings.

5. Most of the time during the first half of the proceedings.

6. Mr. Fairweather ceased attendance at the arbitration as his services were required by the Committee of the Senate, which was considering the Consolidated Railway Bill.

7. No, except to furnish information requested by counsel.

8. The arrangements for the presentation of the case on behalf of the Government was wholly in the hands of Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C. Mr. Bell and the other departmental officials gave him any assistance and information as requested.

DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Mr. MACKIE (East Edmonton):

1. What was the salary and rank of Graham A. Bell, now Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, on 1st January, 1900?

2. What was the date of each subsequent promotion of Graham A. Bell, and rank and salary attaching to such promotions at the time they were made?

3. When did Graham A. Bell, in his capacity as Departmental Auditor, first come in contact with the payment of moneys to the Canadian Northern Railway?

4. What was the total amount of payments received by Graham A. Bell for services as a Director of the Canadian Northern Railway?

5. While being paid as a Director of the Canadian Northern did Graham A. Bell also draw his full salary as an employee of the Government?

6. Did Gralham A. Bell receive from the Canadian Northern or Messrs Mackenzie and Mann any other payments either for services or as gratuities? If so, what were the amounts?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Appointed December 1st, 1890. 1st January, 1900, third class clerk, $800 per annum.

2. Promoted to second class clerk, 1903, $1,200; appointed assistant accountant, November 6th, 1906, $1,200; promoted to first class clerk, December 26th, 1906, $1,350; increased April 1st, 1908, to $1,700; appointed departmental auditor, September 1st, 1909, $2,800; appointed financial comptroller, April 1st, 1913, $3,300; appointed assistant to the minister and financial comptroller, January 1st, 1917, $4,500; increased April 1st, 1918, to $5,000; appointed acting deputy minister, 22nd June, 1918, $5,000; appointed deputy minister, April 1st, 1919, $6,000.

3. On his appointment as departmental auditor, September 1, 1909.

4. The usual director's remuneration of $2,000 per annum.

5. Yes.

6. No.

LOANS TO IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Has the Government loaned any money to the Imperial Government since 1914?

2. If so, what are the securities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. The obligation of the Imperial Government.

HULL ARMOURY.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is there an armoury in Hull, Que.?

2. If so, does the Government own the property?

3. If not, who are the owners? What is the price of the rent per year?

4. What amount has been paid in rents to date on said buildings?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. (a) Fortin & Gravelle. (b) $2,100.

4. $9,450, covering rent to January 31, 1919.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN HULL.

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Has the Government acquired, since 1917, a property in Hull, Que., for the Department of Agriculture?

2. If so, from whom, and what was the amount paid for the said property?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes.

2. (a) From the executors and trustees of the late Alexander Stewart. (b) $14,000.

DOMINION EXHIBITIONS.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Does Parliament vote the sum of $50,000 yearly to the credit of the Government to assist what is known as the Dominion or Provincial Exhibition? If so, is it the policy of the Government to allot said sum, by rotation so that each one of the several provinces of the Dominion may benefit thereby?

2. Has said sum been regularly granted, year after year, since it was first voted by Parliament? If not, in what years was said grant withheld, and for what reason?

3. If for any reason the Government has seen fit to suspend its policy in this respect has it done so definitely or will the grant be again continued?

4. What are the exhibitions, to date, which have benefited by this vote, stating the year the grant was made?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. No. Prior to the war the Government policy was to grant a sum of $50,000 to be allotted by rotation to the several provinces of the Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island.

2. No. In 1909, no vote was made by Parliament for exhibition purposes, no Dominion Exhibition being held that year. The last grant was made in 1914, and allotted to the British Columbia Agricultural Association of Victoria, British Columbia, but owing to the outbreak of the war

the exhibition buildings in Victoria were taken over by the Militia Department, and as a consequence the exhibition could not be held. The sum of $24,166.66 out of the $50,000 grant was given to the British Columbia Agricultural Association, to defray the expenses for permanent improvements, etc., which had already been made in connection with the preparation for the holding of the proposed exhibition.

3. It is not the intention of the Government to resume the giving of this grant.

4. 1903-04, Toronto Industrial Exhibition Association, $49,766.66; 1904-05, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Winnipeg, $50,000; 1905-06, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, New Westminster, $50,000; 1906-07, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Halifax, $50,000; 1907-08, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Sherbrooke, $50,000; 1908-09, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Calgary, $50,000; 1909-10, no grant; 1910-11, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, St. John, $50,000; 1911-12, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Regina, $50,000; 1912-13, Central Canada Exhibition, Ottawa, $50,000; 1913-14, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Brandon, $50,000; 1914-15, Dominion of Canada Exhibition, Victoria, $16,666.66; 1915-16, Dominion of Canada, Exhibition, Victoria, $7,500.

WAR PURCHASING COMMISSION.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What are the names of the members of the War Purchasing Commission?
2. What are their respective salaries?
3. Who is the chairman?
4. In purchasing goods, does this Commission advertise for tenders?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Hon. Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Mr. G. F. Galt, Mr. W. P. Gundy.

2. None; services are given without compensation.

3. Hon. Sir Hormisdas Laporte.

4. Purchases are made on a competitive basis, tenders being invited from all persons and firms known to the commission to be engaged in the business concerned, tender forms being distributed by mail instead of public advertising.

Mr. JAMES SIDNEY ROE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is James Sidney Roe still in the employ of the Department of Customs?
2. If so, what work does he do in said Department?
3. What is his salary?

[Mr. Crerar.]

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. At present he is attached to the correspondence staff and makes investigations in regard to complaints and in regard to persons seeking employment in the customs service, and does such other duties as may from time to time be assigned to him by the Commissioner of Customs.

3. $2,800.

WAR MEMORIALS BUILDING.

*Mr. FRIPP:

1. Is the Government aware that in a recent issue of the London Times it was stated that Her Majesty the Queen and Princess Mary had visited the Exhibition of Canadian War Memorial Paintings at the Royal Academy London, the "Times" adding:—

"The Royal visitors also spent some time inspecting the plans of the building which it is proposed to erect in Ottawa to house the collection."

2. Have these plans or a duplicate set, been received by the Government? If so, will an early opportunity be afforded to members of Parliament to see them?

3. Has a site for the proposed building been selected? If so, where?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. It is understood that the plans referred to were prepared by direction of the War Memorials Committee, Canadian War Records, by Lieut. E. A. Richards of the well known firm of architects, London, England, Messrs. Lanchester & Richards. A small booklet giving an outline of these plans has been received unofficially.

3. No site has yet been selected.

COLONEL A. C. PRATT.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Does the purported report of the Base Commandant at Dunkirk, dated February 20, 1918, quoted recently by the Ottawa Journal, form part of Colonel A. C. Pratt's official record?

2. If so, by whom, and on whose authority was it given out?

3. Is it lawful and according to the King's Regulations for newspaper men and others to have access to the official files of officers?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. It was not given out by the Militia Department.

3. Access to officers' files is not permitted.

SIBERIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is the Government aware that a number of Canadian Soldiers form part of the Allied Expeditionary Force in Northern Russia?

2. If so, against whom are these Canadian soldiers fighting?

3. Under whose command?

4. Has a report as yet been received from the general officer commanding regarding these operations?

5. Is it true that a considerable number of Canadians in this force have previously been casualties in France?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to return these soldiers to their homes at an early date? If so, when?

7. What is the total number of Canadians engaged, and to what units do they belong?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Bolsheviki.

3. This information is not available in Canada.

4. Yes.

5. This information is not available in Canada.

6. As soon as possible.

7. It is not considered in the public interest to make this information public at present, but I shall be glad to give it to the hon. member privately, if desired.

C.N.R.—MATANE COUNTY LUMBER.

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Has the Department of Railways bought lumber from the lumber merchants in Matane County since January 1, 1918? If so, from whom?

2. Has the department abandoned the custom of asking for tenders for lumber in said county? If not, who was asked to tender since January 1, 1918?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes. Price Brothers; J. A. Fenderson & Co.; Metis Lumber Co.; La Cie. Transfert Ltee.; La Cie. Couture Rheault Ltee.; Paul Therriault; J. W. Begin; Jos. Dufour; H. Boulay and Phillippe Gendron.

2. No. Answered by No. 1.

DOMINION REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the total estimated current and capital expenditure required for the fiscal year 1919-20?

2. What are the chief items of such expenditure and the amount thereof?

3. What are the chief sources of revenue to meet the same and the estimated revenue from each source?

4. What other sources are available for raising the deficiency in revenue?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. The estimated Consolidated Fund and Capital Expenditure for 1919-20 are contained in the Estimates already submitted to Parliament; certain Supplementary Estimates, not yet determined, will likely be submitted at a later date. The Estimates with regard to war expenditures are outlined in the resolution now before Parliament.

3 and 4. Estimated sources of revenue for 1919-20 will be announced in the Budget Speech.

QUEBEC MARINE DEPARTMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Were any recommendations or reports made to the Government by the officials of the Marine or Public Works Departments with regard to the transferring of the Marine Department buildings at Quebec to Bridgewater Cove, Sillery, during the years 1911 to 1918?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to consider these recommendations or reports?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes, in 1913.

2. Not at present.

Mr. POWER:

Were any recommendations or reports made to the Government by the officials of the Marine or Public Works Departments with regard to the transferring of the Marine Department buildings at Quebec to Sillery Cove, during the years 1911 to 1918? If so, is it the intention of the Government to consider these recommendations or reports?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: So far as the Department of Marine is concerned, no.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. What is the nature of the irregularities of which Major L'Heureux is charged in connection with the administration of the 167th Battalion?

2. Is the Government aware that the adjutant of the said battalion, Captain J. A. Poirier, who shared the commanding officer's confidence, was not at all disquieted, but, on the contrary, was sent overseas immediately after the termination of Lieut.-Colonel Readman's trial?

3. What were the charges alleged against the said Major L'Heureux and who investigated said charges?

4. Was Major L'Heureux called upon to enter a plea of defence?

5. Is the Government aware that on several occasions said Major L'Heureux demanded an investigation, and that the reply was that there was nothing for which to reproach him?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many men enlisted under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, were despatched from Canada to Siberia (a) before November 11, 1918, and (b) on or after November 11, 1918?

2. In virtue of what law, Order in Council, or other authority were said men sent to Siberia?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. Of the total amount of income tax collected for the last year for which returns are available, what amount thereof was contributed

by the nine provinces of the Dominion respectively?

2. Of the total amount of business war profits tax collected during the war, what amount thereof was paid by each province, respectively?

3. Of the total amount of customs duties collected during the last four fiscal years, what amount was paid by each province, respectively?

4. Of the total amount of excise and inland revenue collected during the last four years, what amount was paid by each province respectively?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the total amount of the domestic Dominion War Loans subscribed to date?

2. What is the amount thereof subscribed by each province of the Dominion?

3. What was the amount of deposits in the banks at the close of the fiscal year next prior to the date of the first of such loans?

4. What is the amount of deposits in Canadian banks according to the last issued statement, and the date of such statement?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

According to the latest available figures, what is the population of each of the four western provinces and of the cities of Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Brandon and Winnipeg?

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. What are the present duties of the Censor's Department?

2. Who are the men employed, and what are their salaries?

3. Have any of them other occupations?

4. How many of them are former newspaper men, and what are their names?

5. Is there any further need of a cable censor in Canada?

6. How much does the Censor's Office cost per year?

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy of all reports made, or letters written, by Graham A. Bell with respect to Canadian Northern Railway common stock, and also in connection with or leading up to the arbitration in 1918 with respect to the value of such common stock.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy of the evidence in the arbitration at Toronto in 1918 with respect to the value of Canadian Northern Railway common stock taken over by Government.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and other papers concerning the parole or pardon of one Charles McMillen, one Pearson, and one Heaton, sentenced to a certain term of imprisonment in the Alberta Penitentiary.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of the correspondence exchanged between F. X. Gagnon, Port Daniel East, Quebec, and the Department of Justice, regarding the Military Exemption Tribunal which sat at that place.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. McISAAC:

For a copy of all correspondence in connection with the lease of the Government Fish Drier at Souris, Prince Edward Island, including copy of the advertisement calling for tenders on the 15th day of May, 1914, and a copy of the lease.

THE GUELPH NOVITIATE—MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Lt.-General Sir SAM HUGHES moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the statements made public in relation to the Guelph Novitiate during the month of June, 1918, and the circumstances and facts concerning those and other similar charges concerning the evasion by young men and the connivance of others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act and other Acts and Orders relating to the upbuilding of the Military Forces of Canada, it is advisable that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the matter with full authority to examine witnesses under oath, to pay necessary expenses and to report to this House.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion concerns the practical claim to sovereignty on the part of the Jesuit Novitiate at Guelph, and the practical recognition of such claim by the Government of the Dominion of Canada. This charge may be laid not against this Government alone, but to my certain knowledge against practically every government that has preceded it for a great many years.

The Novitiate is a farm situated about two miles beyond the city limits of Guelph. About one year ago, in the spring of 1918, between forty and fifty people were said to be employed on this farm, and a number of these were reported liable for military service under the law. The military representative at Guelph at that time was a very reputable gentleman named W-e-s-t-o-b-y; I spell the name out because there has been some confusion over it. The military representative of the district was Colonel White, formerly in command of the 30th Wellington Rifles, and a gentleman of the highest standing in the city of Guelph. The assistant provost marshal was a young officer who had served with distinction at the front and had been wounded and invalided home, leaving his two brothers still in service at the front. This man's name was Captain Macauley, with then headquarters at London, Ontario. The Novitiate failed at the outset to report their men for medical examination under the Military Service Act; they failed to report their men for any purpose under the Military Service Act; they failed to report them under the military order relating to the 20-23 years of age class. The Novitiate, though repeatedly asked, refused

to give any names or any facts, or to recognize in any way the authority of the Government.

It was repeatedly requested to give information by Westoby, White and Macauley. Westoby on the 30th of November, 1917, wrote to the Novitiate and the letter is undisputed. The Novitiate resisted Macauley's actions on June 7, the time of the so-called raid, and the law was defied here, while the military police were everywhere else arresting people. No one was arrested at the Novitiate either for failure to register or to report, or for harbouring those who ought to have reported. I may say that some of the complaints concerning this Novitiate first came from those who were favourable to its religious persuasion. They felt ashamed to think that their sons at the front were doing their bit fearlessly in the cause, while here could be seen, from the roadside any day, forty or fifty of these men, all seemingly able-bodied husky fellows not reporting and practically defying the law—a condition of affairs which is fatal to the institutions under which we live. The Ministerial Association of Guelph has been brought into this matter to a considerable degree, with the object of trying to draw a herring across the trail. This association, in common with all ministerial associations throughout Canada, had been, at the request of the Government, long active in recruiting and had done yeoman service. Many congregations in Canada, before conscription was enacted, had scarcely one able-bodied man of military age who was not in the service. With one or two exceptions this was true of Guelph. Every one had clamoured for a solution of the Novitiate scandal. After the so-called raid an

4 p.m.

attempt was made to inflame a portion of the public against the Ministerial Association, who had been assisting recruiting at the request of the Government, and incidentally assisting in the elections to return the Union Government. And on the failure of the raid and the suppression of the press, and also the humiliation of Macauley, the association smashed the press censorship and issued the following statement:

1. That our attitude is not one of religious intolerance.

2. The issues involved are issues of universal interest, and consequently of universal obligation.

3. The association has not initiated this matter nor is it inspired by gossip.

4. The association makes no charges, but seeks investigation of charges made by the authorities.

5. If the Military Service Act hold any one responsible who shields a defaulter, an institution charged with harbouring 22 should also be held responsible.

6. We, as pastors, refuse to be regarded as a class who have no right to interfere with such matters, or of being incompetent or incapable of being leaders in the community, or in the charges to which we have been called for such purpose.

The Ministerial Association's assistance had been sought and freely given from the beginning, both in recruiting and in the elections. After the elections the Rev. Mr. Palmer, Presbyterian minister of Guelph, and a member of the Ministerial Association, spoke to a member of this Government, the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie), by whom he was assured that justice would be done. On his return from Ottawa, however, Mr. Guthrie told Mr. Palmer, in these colloquial terms, "Doherty says they are all right and are to be left alone." On another occasion Mr. Palmer again spoke to Mr. Guthrie, whereupon Mr. Guthrie returned to Ottawa and sent him Hansard of July 13, 1917, with pages 3498 to 3503, and of July 19, 1917, pages 3702 to 3717 marked, bearing on the case and showing clearly that these gentlemen in the Novitiate were amenable to the law.

There are further reports to which I shall now make passing reference in case the matter may be brought up in any tribunal. There is a report that there was a very important telegram sent by the Solicitor General to his law partner Mr. Kirwin, who, I understand, was the lawyer for the Novitiate. One can readily understand how excitement grew in this matter, and the circumstances connected with the incident had been a public scandal all over the country. London had repeatedly requested that action be taken; the officers were talking the matter over; the people were discussing it, and a rumour became current that these men, not only twenty-two of them but all of them were put there in hiding. Added to this was the story that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) had a son there. I have not had the privilege of seeing this gentleman for a number of years, but several years ago —he was a lad of 17 or 18 then—he certainly was not, in my opinion, a fit subject for military service. But the story got around that he was there in hiding, and one can easily conceive the intense excitement that these rumours engendered. Instead of doing what they should have done, namely, calling Westoby, Macauley and White and saying: "Here are the boys, come and inspect them and take those who should go,"

there was an attempt from start to finish to disregard the law, and they acted as if they considered that they were not amenable to the laws of Canada and would not recognize any authority. Further, there was a rumour of bad feeling between the Department of Justice and the Militia Department, and there was a report that the Militia Department, to its eternal credit, ordered the thing to be cleaned up. If that order was issued, then I congratulate the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn). Following this, on June 7th, 1918, a train from London arrived at Guelph at 7.35 p.m., and in order to obviate any tittle-tattle, and with a view to precision, I am giving the dates. Now Macauley had eleven men in mufti. He wore the chevron on his arm showing his authority, but he and his men were in mufti, because he did not want to go into Guelph with a body of troops and create any excitement on his way to the Novitiate. He came and made inquiries at the drill hall, got a cenveyance and drove quietly to the Novitiate, arriving there before nine o'clock at night. He took only three men to the door, and a member of the Novitiate refused to give any information, but telephoned to Judge Hayes and to Lawyer Kirwin. The latter came to the Novitiate and Macauley informed him that he had decided to take three of the students in order that he might have a test case. On the wall there was a long list which he glanced over, the list evidently containing the names of the people in the Novitiate. Not one occupant of the institution had any document exempting him from service. The Novitiate repudiated Macauley's authority and refused to accede to any request of his for information. They communicated with the Department of Justice at Ottawa—I understand with the Minister of Justice himself—and the department communicated with Macauley, who, however, being a military officer, very properly declined to take orders from any other department than the Militia. The Department of Justice then evidently communicated with the Militia Department, and in the absence of the Minister of Militia some of the officers, after midnight that night, telephoned Macauley, ordering him to leave the Novitiate the same night. An opportunity was thus given for any men who cared to do so to escape. Macauley returned the next day, however, to obtain the names of the occupants, but the list was gone. The Department of Justice that night,—that is the night of the raid—in order to entirely suppress the matter, ordered the press not to publish a word

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

in connection with it. That order came from the Department of Justice and can be traced directly to the Minister of Justice himself. The Minister of Militia later sent an apology. Then, Colonel Godson-Godson, Provost Marshal, followed. But the serious thing, so far as Colonel Godson-Godson is concerned, is that he visited London, and that letters on the subject either by him or his followers were taken from the files there. Macauley was sent to Winnipeg. There was a second press censorship issued, but the people of Guelph had been excited to such a pitch that they would not be bound by this censorship any longer, and the pulpits and some of the press, ignoring the censorship, published the facts of the case; but when the Rev. Mr. Palmer went to the Northwest on a lecturing tour he found that his addresses were not allowed to be published.

The matter was brought to the attention of the Dominion Government and they took the stand, possibly very properly—I think they were perfectly justified in demanding specific charges—that they would decline to go into the matter unless specific charges were given them. These have been furnished them by the Rev. Mr. Palmer and they are:

1. The Department of Justice at Ottawa interfered with the Military Board at Guelph in their efforts to obtain information as to the status of the inmates of the Guelph Novitiate.

2. That in doing so, the department extended special privileges to an institution which should have been treated like any other institution.

3. That the Hon. C. J. Doherty interfered with Captain A. C. Macauley on the night of June 7th, while he, Capt. Macauley, was carrying out the instructions of his superior officers.

4. That the Department of Justice, through its minister, prevented the placing in military service of young men of military age residing in the institution.

5. That the press censorship instigated by a minister of the Crown intensified the feeling that special protection was being given to the institution at Guelph.

I hereby state that the above charges are made by me in good faith, believing them to be true and fully borne out by evidence which can be produced.

Kennedy H. Palmer.

When the matter was brought to the attention of the Government, as I say, they declined to act unless specific charges were made involving the Government. Formal charges were made by the Rev. Mr. Palmer and are, to my mind, specific, but lest there should be any misunderstanding, I will, from my place in this House, assume the responsibility of enumerating some of the charges or rather statements, which are made for the purpose, not of attacking the

Government, but of challenging this pretended sovereignty of any organization or its assumption of superiority to the State. These statements are as follows:

1. That the Government improperly failed to make the occupants of the Novitiate register for medical examination or for service under the M.S.A., and the Government also failed to punish those harbouring defaulters in the Novitiate.

2. A member of the Government (Mr. Guthrie) informed a member of the Ministerial Association that "Doherty says they are all right and they are to be left alone."

This is improper interference.

3. The Militia Department order London to take action and Macauley took it.

This was proper.

4. The Novitiate communicated with the Justice Department.

That was perfectly constitutional.

5. The Justice Department improperly communicated with Macauley.

6. The Justice Department communicated with the Militia Department.

That was perfectly proper.

7. After midnight the Militia Department communicated with Macauley and improperly ordered him to retire from the Novitiate.

8. The Justice Department improperly ordered the press censorship.

9. The Minister of Militia apologized to the Principal of the Novitiate, and indirectly censured Macauley when the order should have been to the Principal to observe the law.

10. Col. Godson-Godson, Provost Marshal for the Militia Department, visited the Novitiate and it is claimed, further apologized.

That is a matter of no importance whatever.

11. Godson-Godson visited London and it is claimed improperly and surreptitiously had certain letters removed from the Military files there.

That is a matter of small account but it can be readily explained, I understand.

12. Macauley was improperly removed to Winnipeg by the Militia Department.

I need not comment upon these facts—they speak for themselves—but they do not carry out the principle that we should have equal rights, equal laws for all and special privileges for none. This Novitiate has arrogated to itself the right to be regarded as a sovereign power. I understand that Colonel Street, of Ottawa, himself a member of that community, who was acting in a military capacity, was refused and that he had the very same experience as Colonel Macauley at Guelph and London and as others had throughout the Dominion. If these institutions are to be superior to and override the law, I do not regard that as a proper condition of affairs and I certainly do not purpose consenting to having a sovereign body within a sovereign body in the Dominion of Canada. The State must be supreme and all organizations and corporations must bow to its will.

I remember once in an election case in Victoria county objecting to seven or eight names being put upon the list. The members of a corporation that owned a little building sought to get their names upon the list as voters. They had sworn a few months before that the building was only worth $250 and yet they came forward and wanted to get their names on the list as joint owners of this building. I objected on the ground that there was not sufficient property to qualify the members of a corporation of that kind and that their names should not go on. Judge Deacon who was presiding, said that these corporations were seeking to override the laws of the country, that they had neither sterns to kick nor souls to save and he held that the members of that corporation could not go on as voters. Others must do the same as Judge Deacon did if these corporations are to observe the law.

I might point out that serious complaints reached me regarding this Novitiate at Guelph, and they came from those of the same creed as the members of the novitiate themselves. They felt ashamed that any one should undertake to evade the law as was done in this instance. I might point out another instance, and there are many of them, to the credit of the ecclesiastics of that church, where a young man was called out by the Militia Department. He immediately ran to the leading ecclesiastic of his district and sought to get influence to have him exempted. The ecclesiastic looked him up and down, heard his case and said: "Get into a uniform; you are the type of man that should be fighting; why are you asking to be exempted?" That young man got into his uniform, but he finally got out of it in spite of his ecclesiastical friend. I could give instance after instance where people in that community have been humiliated to find that, because behind the scenes work was going on where young men have been improperly exempted from going to the front while others have been taken. There is nothing that has spread the spirit of rebellion in this Dominion, nothing that has created a feeling so strong against the Government, as the fact that the Military Service Act has not been administered in the spirit of equity throughout Canada. That has spread a bitter feeling. People have seen their sons taken and sent to the front while their neighbour's sons have been allowed to remain and have not been inter-

fered with. The military officers, who got $10 a head, could not be induced to touch certain young men, whereas they would go in and grab other young fellows under age, or close to the age, in order to take them away. It has bred that spirit of rebellion which injustice always breeds, and a particularly strong feeling characterizes this community around Guelph.

There is no intention of being intolerant. All the intolerance has been on the part of the Novitiate. Almost a year elapsed after the passing of the Military Service Act before any action was taken. Tolerance! The Militia and Defence people were more than tolerant. It was more than three months before they acted, and the Novitiate still defied them. I will read this definition of tolerance:

> It is first the recognition of the rights of private judgment in matters of faith and worship; it is also the liberty granted by the governing power of a state to every individual to hold, or publicly teach and defend his religious opinions and to worship whom, how and when he pleases provided that he does not thereby violate the rights of others or infringe laws designed for the protection of decency, morality, and good order or for the security of the governing power.

What was then to be done? Our men were being driven back from St. Quentin, and the whole civilized world was feeling that there was a possibility of the Allies meeting a defeat. These men were called out, and they failed to respond and defied the law. If even intolerance was displayed, it was displayed, under this definition, by the Novitiate at Guelph. If ever tolerance was displayed, it was displayed by the department in not taking prompt action before they did. Then there is the fact of recognition by the State of the right which every person has——

Mr. BUTTS: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, a dozen.

Mr. BUTTS: Is the hon. gentleman prepared to give the House any information as to the percentage of Catholics and Protestants that fought in the Allied armies?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not concerned as to whether a man was a Roman Catholic—

Mr. BUTTS: I know you are.

Sir SAM HUGHES:—or a Protestant, one way or the other. I am not going to deal with that aspect of the case at present. On a proper occasion I will be prepared to take up that phase of the matter, but it has nothing whatever to do with what I am arguing here

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

I might say that I am very glad indeed, now the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, to state that Roman Catholics throughout my constituency—English and French, British and other nationalities, in fact all the Roman Catholics in the district—have spoken to me again and again about my action in having this matter placed on a proper basis.

Now to resume my speech: Third, the fact of recognition by the State of the right—

Mr. BUTTS: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow me to ask another question?

Sir SAM HUGHES: With pleasure, anything to satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. BUTTS: Were there not more Catholics fighting in the Allied armies than there were Protestants?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I really could not say. I have never asked a man what his religious faith was. In my life time—

Mr. BUTTS: I can tell you now that there were.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have followed the motto of Talleyrand. He was asked at one time, "What is your religion?" Talleyrand replied, "My religion is that of every wise man." He was asked, "What is the religion of every wise man?" To this he replied, "A wise man never tells his religion."

I will now make a third attempt to continue my speech: Third: the fact of recognition by the State of the right which every person has to enjoy the benefit of all the laws and all social privileges without any regard to difference of religion. That is all I have to say on the question. I merely desire to present the facts of the case without comment. I might say that since putting this motion on the Order Paper, in consultation with a number of my friends, they think that if the Government would consider the matter and refer it to a judge, or a commission, or some tribunal of that kind, other than to the individual members of the House, it might possibly be a quieter way of solving the trouble, and might get at the facts much more readily, and with less circumlocution. Bearing that in mind I will accept any proper solution the Government may have to offer with respect to the matter.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I have listened to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) with a great deal of interest, and while the specific charges that he wishes to have investigated do not materially affect the Department of Militia and Defence, yet

I feel that that department has been referred to and it does, in connection with this matter, touch very closely the Department of Justice in the operation of the Military Service Act. The hon. member stated that great criticism was levelled at us for our not looking into this matter at an earlier stage, and I do not wish to cast the responsibility on any other department, or, according to a slang military term, "pass the buck." I am prepared to take the responsibility for my department to the fullest possible extent. Up to some time in April the Department of Justice, as is well known, was charged with the apprehension of all men liable for military service. The Department of Militia and Defence had nothing to do with apprehending men for military service until such time as we were notified by the registrars under the Justice Department that any individual man was not entitled to exemption, and had been ordered to report to one of the depot units. If that man failed to report then he became a deserter and the duty devolved upon the Militia Department of apprehending him. Towards the end of April an Order in Council was passed releasing the Dominion police from duty in connection with this work, and the Militia Department was then charged with the work of apprehension, so that from a period of the end of April until some time in May, which is not a very long time, passed before we could assume control of this work after having received the necessary information.

I would like to explain to the House at the outset that as far as my department is concerned, I have always felt, since publicity has been given to this unfortunate matter, that we would welcome any investigation. We are not afraid for the light of day to shine on any of our work, and I will be willing, and be only too glad, speaking personally, to have any investigation that the Government may decide to grant. But I wish to state my position regarding this matter, and will first refer to the instructions I gave regarding an investigation at the Novitiate, because the first instructions emanated from me. Secondly, I desire to read the apology that I sent to the rector of this institution I am not ashamed of that apology, and I think any hon. gentleman when he knows the facts will agree that it was the only manly course to take. I say without hesitation that I would take that action again were I to be put in the same position.

Throughout the whole of this unfortunate affair, and throughout the operation of the Military Service Act, I regret to say, there has been too much talk indulged in through the country, and too much questioning as to whether a man was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant—as to whether he was a Roman Catholic, or a Presbyterian, or a Methodist, or an Anglican, or a French-Canadian. I say that all the men that enlisted were Canadian soldiers and should be treated as such. If that had been the spirit which prevailed throughout there would have been considerably less heart-burning and greater unity in the country.

Now, Sir, on the 31st day of May, 1918, I was informed by a very reliable party that there were several men in the Jesuit College at Guelph who were evading military service. The names of two young men were given to me specifically, and the name of a third young man in Guelph, who had nothing to do with the Novitiate, was mentioned. I immediately sent a minute to Captain Tyndale, who was acting as secretary of a sub-committee of the Militia Department which was looking after the operation of the Military Service Act, and keeping closely in touch with the Department of Justice to whom the whole operation of this Act had been entrusted. That sub-committee was meeting every afternoon considering matters that arose in connection with the Military Service Act, keeping closely in touch with the Department of Justice, as I have said, and carrying out any instructions that might be given. I will now read the instructions that I issued, and these are the only instructions that I ever gave relating to this matter. I shall read from a true and correct copy of the Minute of Instructions given by me. The original of this document was sent to Captain Tyndale.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Of London?

Major General MEWBURN: No, Captain Tyndale of Ottawa, who was secretary of the sub-committee in my department. He in his turn passed the original on to the Provost Marshal, by whom it was forwarded to London where it was filed. When this matter came up the statement was made, publicly and otherwise, that I had given definite instructions different from what I actually did give, and I requested that the original document be returned to the Headquarters file in Ottawa, from which it should never have gone. The document was returned from London. The statement made that the Provost Marshal went to London and took certain documents

off the files there was not true. The instructions given were:

Memo to Captain Tyndale:

I am informed through a very reliable source that there are several men at the Jesuit College, Guelph; particularly men by the name of Newman and Craig, who are escaping military service. Steps should be taken to get after these men. There is also another very glaring case, and that is James Alexander, son of A. W. Alexander, Guelph. Can you have these cases followed up? Probably the Provost Marshal would help you.

(Signed) S. C. Mewburn.

I do not think it is necessary to refer here to the Alexander case, because very shortly after that the young man in question joined the forces and went overseas. That is a copy of the original and it is the only document that I ever issued in connection with this matter, except the apology which I have referred to.

I would like to give the House the benefit of what followed, as far as my department is concerned: Captain Tyndale immediately transmitted that document to the Provost Marshal, who in turn sent it to London and gave instructions to the Deputy Assistant Provost Marshal there to look into the matter.

Captain Macauley proceeded to Guelph on the night of the 7th of June, and that night called at the Novitiate. At midnight on June 7 the Adjutant General received a telephone communication from the Minister of Justice (Hon. C. J. Doherty) stating that Captain Macauley had arrived at the Novitiate at 9 p.m. and proposed to make certain arrests of men who were not, in fact, liable for military service. In view of the representations of the Minister of Justice the Adjutant General gave instructions to Captain Macauley by long distance telephone to suspend action for the night, but to revisit the college in the morning and obtain full information.

Briefly, this is what appears to have occurred on the evening in question. Captain Macauley reached the Novitiate about 9.20 p.m., accompanied by nine military policemen whom he posted about the building. Entering in plain clothes and not producing any written authority from the General Officer Commanding the District or from the Provost Marshal or the Assistant Provost Marshal, as is required by the Order in Council of 30th April, 1918, he demanded as an alternative to an immediate search of the whole premises that all the men of military age in the Novitiate should be assembled in the dining room for interrogation. During the interval Captain Hingston, a chaplain who had served for some years overseas and who was on leave and happened to be visiting the Novitiate, asked him for his authority.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Father Hingston is himself a member of the order.

Major-General MEWBURN: He was visiting there; he had been a chaplain overseas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is a member of the order.

Major-General MEWBURN: He may have been. He was on leave and was there for a few days, I understand.

To that request his reply was a demand to know who Captain Hingston was and why he was wearing uniform with captain's badges. Captain Hingston protested against the illegality of Captain Macauley's proceeding, but the assembling of the men of military age was conceded in the face of Captain Macauley's reiterated statement of his intention to search the house forthwith. The men were assembled accordingly and their interrogation proceeded. While this was going on the rector, or Father Hingston, got into telephone communication with a solicitor and through him with the Minister of Justice, who himself reached Captain Macauley by telephone at about the time that he had decided that he would remove in custody three of the men of the Novitiate. Captain Macauley refused to take any order from the Minister of Justice—I do not blame him in that—but complied with the order subsequently given by the Adjutant General at the latter's request. That confirms, I think, what the hon. member referred to in this regard.

A letter from the rector of the Novitiate protesting against the illegality and irregularity of Captain Macauley's conduct was received by me, and a letter of apology for the mode in which the inquiry had been carried out sent in reply. In order that the House may have full information and see just exactly what the feeling was with regard to this matter, I wish to read the letter from the rector of the Novitiate to the Minister of Militia, written from St. Stanislaus' Novitiate, Guelph, dated June 8, 1918. I was out of the city at the time, and I had no knowledge of this until I returned the following day. The letter is as follows:

The Honourable Major-General Mewburn,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to lodge a most emphatic protest against the conduct of certain military author-

ities of Military District 1, at St. Stanislaus' Novitiate, Guelph, Ont.

Last evening at 9.35 three men in plain clothes, one of whom said he was a Deputy Provost Marshal, called at this house, and demanded that all the members of this community be paraded before him within the delay of five minutes.

When I asked him for his authority for a proceeding so unusual and at such an unseemly hour he produced from his pocket a brassard with the letters D.P.M., which he said was his authority, and added that if I did not summon the community at once, he would proceed to search the house for deserters and defaulters under the Military Service Act.

I went to the telephone to consult our lawyer as to the legality of the proceedings, and asked Father Hingston, who was but three weeks back from service overseas as military chaplain, to interview these military gentlemen. To Father Hingston's questions the leader of the party said that his name was Macauley, that he was a captain and a D.P.M., in proof whereof he again produced the brassard from his pocket. As the possession of a brassard was not thought to be of itself sufficient proof, the gentleman in grey tweeds, who said he was Captain Macauley, exhibited a typewritten copy of instructions which he proceeded to read. The passage which seemed relevant and on which he based his right of search was substantially as follows: "Any officer or N.C.O. acting under written authorization of G.O.C. or O.C. of a military district or area, if he has good grounds for believing that deserters or defaulters under the M.S.A. are being harboured and concealed, after reasonable demand of entrance and refusal thereof, and upon producing the aforesaid written authorization, may forcibly enter and search the premises, etc. . . ." Asked for the written authority mentioned in the instructions, the gentleman could produce none, but insisted nevertheless on his right of search.

Meanwhile, about an hour and a half went by, during which time various telephone messages were sent to three different lawyers, and Captain Macauley himself tried to have another automobile sent out from the city. The community, which rises at a very early hour, had long since gone to bed.

Finally, Captain Macauley, who had grown impatient at my reluctance to submit to the indignity of a search, especially on the part of persons who could not show proper authorization for so doing, this delay, moreover, being attributed by one of his party to quibbling and a desire to gain time for concealment, declared his intention of proceeding forthwith to search the house. Two outside witnesses had been summoned by me, Thomas Bedford, a neighbour and a J.P., and Joseph O'Leary. In their presence Father Hingston reiterated his formal request for the production of some written authorization, and as this was not forthcoming, he registered a formal protest against the search without proper authorization, and warned Captain Macauley that he must take the responsibility for his illegal act. Captain Macauley declared his intention of searching the house without further ado, and taking out his note-book began by asking the names of the four persons then in the room.

Just then one of the legal gentlemen consulted telephoned, and after hearing the circumstances advised me to overlook any irregularity there might be in the proceedings and to do all I could to facilitate the obtaining of all the information required. I did so, and offered Captain Macauley either that he himself should visit the bedrooms and dormitories or that I should have all the members of the community wakened and summoned to the refectory. He chose the latter alternative. Meanwhile, it appeared that the three men with whom we had been dealing up till now were not alone, but had all along been accompanied by a force of deputy police, some of whom, if not all, were armed, who had formed a cordon about the house, and could be seen, some peering in at the windows, others standing guard at various intervals or pacing their beat on all sides of the house. Of these as many as eleven were counted, and when later on our lawyer arrived, for we found the actual presence of a lawyer absolutely necessary, he found the front gate closed and guarded, which, however, was opened for him.

The interrogatory began about eleven o'clock and lasted about an hour and a quarter. Three members of my community were seized as deserters and placed under close arrest. They were told to make ready to leave for the barracks and were conducted under escort to the dormitories to make the necessary changes in their clothing. None of these young men, as I understand, come within the scope of the Military Service Act, or of any subsequent Order in Council, our order being moreover strictly and exclusively a religious order. A telephone message was sent to the Hon. Minister of Justice at Ottawa. Thereupon he communicated with the A.A.G. who stayed the unjustifiable proceedings. After much telephoning to London and to Ottawa Captain Macauley and his party left our house at 1.40 a.m.

I now beg to protest as strongly as I can against this outrageous conduct. If the Militia Department of Ottawa needs any information about the Novitiate at Guelph, I will do all in my power to furnish it. If the Military authorities of this district wish to ascertain for themselves the status of this house and of its members, I will give them every facility for so doing. But I will not submit without protest to the wholesale indignity of having my house invaded at night, of having the gates of the grounds closed and a guard set over them, and of having a cordon of police on patrol around the buildings, as was done last night. I will not accept in silence the base imputation that this religious community is in league with deserters to evade the law, nor can I tolerate in the least degree that such an odious impression be made on the public mind as undoubtedly must be made by such a preposterous display of force. For the only inference that can be drawn from such special treatment, from the unwarranted and high handed manner of the whole proceedings, which we regard as an insult not merely to ourselves but to the Catholics of the Dominion and to all decent men, is that we must indeed be what ignorant and often confuted factions have made us out to be, double-dealing, dangerous men, who can be made to obey the just law of the land only at the point of the bayonet.

This morning when Captain Macauley called he seemed at pains to minimize the events of last night. He excused himself for the number of men he had brought with him from London on the plea that he did not know what violence he might have to contend with. This is almost on a par with the disappointed credulity of those searchers who poked into the

alcoves of the dormitories and even into the latrines, and were amazed to find only bareness and simplicity where they hoped to raise startling mysteries.

Captain Macauley assured the A.G. that there had been no friction of any kind. This is true in the sense that on our part he met throughout with unfailing courtesy; that the delay caused in the beginning, due to his failure to show proper written authorization, was qualified by the assurance of our readiness to comply under proper procedure; that we even gave refreshments to all his party, most of whom had spent several hours in the cold. But it is not true in the sense that we did not most deeply feel and resent the opprobrious treatment to which we were so unjustly and unjustifiably subjected.

It is not for me to say who is to blame for such an unprecedented manner of acting, but this I will say, that it would be hard to devise a clumsier or more exasperating manner of extorting information which a polite letter or visit would have readily elicited, than that of bringing a posse of armed men from London to Guelph to a peaceable religious house.

It is thanks to the Hon. Minister of Justice and to the prompt and courteous intervention of Major General Ashton that a very painful situation was somewhat softened and a much more critical situation averted. A repetition of such an indignity would be bad for the country at large. Is it too much to hope that those who have such large discretionary powers as those enjoyed by the Provost Marshal should be possessed of at least ordinary consideration and tact, and not permit themselves to become in any way the instruments of bigotry?

It is not the intention that this letter should be published. The same motives that promoted us to endure with patience what we considered unjust and high-handed treatment rather than to create a scene, prompt us now to withhold from the press anything of a nature to excite public opinion. If, however, untrue and defamatory accounts of the events complained of should be circulated, it may become necessary to publish this letter, adding, if need be, some further details.

Incidents of this nature become known very rapidly and so strange a proceeding could soon be reported not only in Canada but also in the United States and elsewhere, causing a great deal of ill-feeling and possibly religious strife, which at all times is most deplorable, but especially when the exigencies of war demand a closely united people.

I am, Sir,

Your very respectfully,

(Sgd.) H. Bourque,

Rector of St. Stanislaus' Novitiate,

Guelph, Ontario.

The instructions contained in the Order in Council regarding the right of search were advisedly made very explicit and were well defined, so that a man could not make a search in any place without first receiving proper written instructions from a superior authority. Everybody in my department has been warned that in connection with any action taken under the Military Service Act they must use the greatest possible discretion and courtesy. When I received that letter I was horrified at the manner in which this officer had performed his duty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the minister consult Captain Macauley and get his version of the case?

Major General MEWBURN: I have received his written report since. If the statements made in the rector's letter are true, I do not think it was necessary, except under very different circumstances, to take the action that was taken, and I cannot conceive why it was necessary to raid that or any other institution in such a manner. I, therefore, wrote this letter to the rector on the 11th of June, 1918:

My dear Sir:—

I am just in receipt of your letter of the 8th instant on my return to Ottawa, and words cannot express to you my deep regret of the action taken by the Deputy Provost Marshal, Captain Macauley, on the evening of the 7th instant.

My attention was called to this matter on my arrival in Ottawa this morning and I find that my Adjutant General has taken immediate action for a most thorough investigation, and if the facts are as stated in your letter—which of course I do not doubt—I can assure you that the error in judgment committed by this officer will be dealt with in a proper way, as I will not tolerate any such action on the part of any military officer as far as the operation of the Military Service Act goes.

As I have already stated, I deeply regret this occurrence and I thank you for your frank letter.

The question of the liability for military service of any of your students is a matter that is now being considered by the Department of Justice.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) S. C. Mewburn.

The Rev. H. Bourque,
Rector of St. Stanislaus' Novitiate,
Guelph, Ontario.

That is the letter of apology I wrote. I thought then I was doing what was right and I am not ashamed of my action to-day. Hon. members will note that a thorough investigation was to be made and a thorough investigation was made; the case of every individual at that school being investigated. Letters passed from my department to the Department of Justice, and written opinions were given by the Department of Justice to my department, covering the whole question of the liability of every man in that college. As I said before and as I have always said I would court any investigation that would clear this matter up in the public interest. The originals of the documents which I have read are on file in the Militia Department, and a list of every individual in the Novitiate can be produced. Everything was

done openly and above board, and I fail to see where I was wrong in the action I took.

Mr. EDWARDS: Had the students in the Novitiate presented themselves for registration and received certificates of exemption?

Major General MEWBURN: I understand from the report received after this took place, that the Novitiate had failed in its duty to give the names of those who were in the institution. I did not see any certificates of exemption.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister a record of the number of times that Westoby, Macauley, and the London office asked the Novitiate for the very information which he is prepared to produce to-day?

Major General MEWBURN: I am speaking only from memory, but I understand that upon at least two occasions the Novitiate were asked by the registrar under the Military Service Act for a list of the names and they failed to furnish it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They were asked twenty times.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Seeing that one account of this raid, so to speak, has been laid before the House, would it not be well for us to have the other side of the matter, that is, Captain Macauley's account of it. We would then be in a position to judge the matter better.

Major General MEWBURN: I could give the House the benefit of all the information I have including the names of all in the Novitiate, but I wish to carry out as far as possible the wishes of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and I inferred that there would be an investigation when all the original documents would be produced.

I just wish to touch on one more point, because the hon. member (Sir Sam Hughes) referred to it. He spoke in regard to the son of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who, I deeply regret, is not here to-day, because this touches him personally and through his department. I was aware that the son of the Minister of Justice was in the Novitiate, and long before this raid took place we were informed that he was not of military age, that he was medically unfit, and that there were medical certificates from three military medical officers in Montreal stating that he was unfit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: A private board.

Major General MEWBURN: I know there were three medical officers examined him.

Mr. DEVLIN: I notice that the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) denies that. I have a personal information as to that fact myself.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If I may be permitted to say so, I have defended Judge Doherty's son. I do not think he was entitled to go at all; I never did; but he had not a certificate from a military medical board; though he had certificates from private doctors.

Mr. DEVLIN: He was turned down by the board.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): The subject covered by the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) and referred to by the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn), has in one form or another been before the Government for many months, and has absorbed throughout the country a degree of attention which I humbly venture to suggest is out of proportion to its importance.

When the question first came up in June, 1918, I personally, being overseas, had no knowledge whatever of the circumstances, but on my assumption of the duties of Acting Minister of Justice in November, 1918, the subject very soon came to my attention. I think it was toward the end of that month that a deputation headed by the reverend gentleman the hon. member for Victoria has referred to, the Rev. Mr. Palmer, waited upon certain members of the Government to make a plea for an investigation into what they called the Novitiate affair in Guelph. That deputation was composed of other reverend gentlemen besides the Rev. Mr. Palmer, and accompanying it were certain members of Parliament. The subject at the time was carefully reviewed in the presence of the Acting Prime Minister, of the Minister of Militia, and of myself; possibly other ministers were present as well. A statement was then read before the ministers. which statement, however, appeared to be for the most part a recital of reports, and contained nothing in the way of definite allegations and nothing, in our judgment, upon which the investigation which they sought could with any propriety be hung. The Acting Prime Minister at that time made it very clear to those present that if anything in the nature of charges of impropriety were brought by responsible persons to the attention of the Government —anything in the nature of specific allegations of fact that constituted wrong-doing on the part either of members of the Gov-

ernment or of officers of the Government, or of any one under the Government's control—necessarily an appropriate investigation would have to take place, and that the Government stood prepared, when that was done, to deal with the matter as such matters are properly dealt with by a government. Should those charges when so made involve the integrity and public conduct of a minister of the Crown, it would, of course, become necessary that they should be communicated to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister would then take into consideration the proper course to pursue.

I understood from the members of that delegation that they would proceed to formulate charges of that character. I knew or heard nothing further about the matter for some time thereafter, when I noticed in the press a statement to the effect that these charges would not be formulated or presented. Later on, however, and indeed very recently, I was informed that such charges were to be formulated, and we then stood prepared, as we had stood prepared all along, to recommend the appointment of a commission or some appropriate tribunal to investigate anything that could be said in such definite and meaningful language that a commission could address itself to the task of ascertaining the truth or falsity of the charges made. On last Thursday night, I think it was, there was communicated to the Acting Prime Minister a document signed by the Rev. Kennedy H. Palmer which the hon. member for Victoria reads to-day. I rather understand the hon. member endorses this schedule of charges and follows it by certain allegations which for convenience he summarizes towards the close of his remarks but which had not been brought to my attention until I heard them from his lips this afternoon. Consequently, as to these latter it will be impossible for me to deal with them with that degree of care and consideration which such a matter demands. However, I wish to make some reference in the House to the document presented by a responsible citizen, the Rev. Mr. Palmer, last Thursday night.

The first charge reads as follows:

> The Department of Justice at Ottawa interfered with the Military Board at Guelph in their efforts to obtain information as to the status of the inmates of the Guelph Novitiate.

In this connection it is proper, I think, to remark that among the duties of the Department of Justice is a supervision, from the legal standpoint, of all the de-

partments of government, to the end that the activities of every department may be conducted within their proper legal limitations. Consequently, it might be quite the fact that the Department of Justice would interfere with some specific act of another department, and provided that act were not within the limits of the law, the Department of Justice might be justified in so doing, if the circumstances of the moment made interference necessary in the public interest. There might, therefore, be such a thing as interference on the part of the Department of Justice of the nature alleged in the first charge, which interference would not necessarily be improper. On the other hand, there might be interference which would be wholly improper. Consequently, to constitute the first allegation something in the nature of a charge of improper or wrongful conduct on the part of either of a member of the Government or of any officer of the department, the word "improper" or some word to that effect should be read into the first sentence.

The second charge is to this effect:

> That in doing so, the department extended special privileges to an institution which should have been treated like any other institution.

I would be the last to intimate to the House that any institution in this country should be treated differently from any other, and if any action of the Department of Justice resulted in discrimination in favour of or against any institution, then that action was ipso facto an improper action.

The third charge is to this effect:

> That the Hon. C. J. Doherty interfered with Captain A. C. Macauley on the night of June 7th, while he, Captain Macauley was carrying out the instructions of his superior officers.

The remarks which I made bearing on the first allegation apply just as clearly and with equal force to the third. The fourth allegation is this:

> That the Department of Justice, through its minister, prevented the placing in military service of young men of military age residing in the institution.

It will be very apparent to you, Mr. Speaker, and to every hon. member of this House that the Department of Justice might have done exactly what is stated in clause 4, and have been acting only in the discharge of its duties. There were thousands of young men of military age in this country, who under the Military Service Act, were exempt for various reasons, and one of the duties of the Department of Justice in the enforcement of the Act was

to see that such exemptions were duly exempted. Consequently it is manifest, beyond the possibility of question, that some allegation of impropriety would require to be inserted in clause 4 of this document before there would be anything which, if it were established before an investigation board, would constitute an offence or a wrong-doing on the part of the administrative authorities. The fifth reads:

That the press censorship instituted by a minister of the Crown intensified the feeling that special protection was being given to the institution at Guelph.

I do not think that this could have been worded as intended by the draftsman of the document—that the press censorship, instituted by a minister, intensified feeling. The press censorship may have been wrong or it may have been right; it may or it may not have intensified feeling. But the question whether or not it intensified feeling is not at all dependent on whether it was right or wrong, and for the life of me, I can see nothing in clause 5, in its present wording, to constitute anything
5 p.m. that could be inquired into and which, if it were found to be true, would necessarily involve either a minister or an officer in any wrong-doing or malfeasance.

Such is the document that was then presented; and, generally speaking, I think it is about as wide as the summary presented by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) to-day.

In what I have to say as to the recommendation I shall make in regard to the charges of Mr. Palmer, I wish to be understood as applying as well to any additional matter in the way of a specific charge as to this affair that may be included in the entire address of the hon. member for Victoria this afternoon.

As to the attitude of the Department of Justice at the present time, the position in which I find myself is not by any means one that is free from difficulty. I am in the position of Acting Minister of Justice, and am of course responsible for the department and for all that is done in it while I hold that position. At the same time I speak in this Parliament as well on behalf of the minister. By the supplementary words that I think must be taken as implied in the charges made by Mr. Palmer, the minister himself—assuming those words to be implied or inserted—is charged with something that can be properly denominated an impropriety, something at all events in the nature of malfeasance of office. Were the minister present in person he might take the course which I think I would take if my name were substituted for his in this document, namely, to review in detail all the circumstances connected with the transaction, as, for example, to take the name of each individual who was within the institution at the time in question and to make an argument in full in defence, accompanied by the presentation of evidence, precisely as might be done in the final investigation itself. That, I think, is the course I would pursue. But as representing the minister, and without direct authority from him, I do not feel I would be justified in anticipating judicial investigation, and in disclosing the evidence that would necessarily have to be brought to the attention of the tribunal of inquiry. I think, rather, it is my duty to enter a statement of the final conclusions which the Department of Justice desires to be recorded as its conclusion, and to place on record as well a statement which I have received from the Minister of Justice as to the allegations contained in this document. Before doing so, however, I feel bound to say that after examination of all the facts brought before the department, the Deputy Minister of Justice has furnished me with a document which, if it is correct—and all this may be inquired into—would go to show that not one single novice or individual in the institution at the time of the raid or, I think, at any subsequent time, was liable for military service.

In this connection I wish to bring to the attention of the House a distinction which some hon. members seem to have overlooked. The Military Service Act, as drafted, established certain qualifications which would entitle an applicant to exemption under that Act. If he was entitled to exemption his business was to prove his right to it and to obtain a certificate. There was another feature. The Act under section 2 stated that all men described therein came under its operation, with the exception of those mentioned in the schedule at the end of the Act. Now, the schedule was one of exceptions and not of grounds of exemption at all; and any one coming within the four corners of this schedule of exemptions was not within the operation of the Act. In this respect the Act followed the principle adopted by the British Act and I think, by the American Act as well. Included in these exceptions are, first, men who hold certificates granted under this Act, and—

Mr. BURNHAM: Is not this question now to be considered by the House one of evasion and not of jurisdiction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of evasion? I thought this was a question of misconduct on the part of a minister. And, second: members of His Majesty's regular, or reserve, or auxiliary forces, etc. Coming to the last, which is the one more immediately in point: Clergy, including members of any recognized order of exclusively religious character, and ministers of all religious denominations existing in Canada at the date of the passing of this Act. Hon. members will observe carefully this exception, and particularly the fact that it is an exception and not a ground of exemption.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that part of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understood it was from the date of the introduction of the Bill in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I think what the hon. member is thinking of is the provision with reference to marriage.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He must be thinking of that, or he is wrong.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The matter will come out later, I suppose; but the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) gave us to understand in the House that this applied from the date of the introduction of the Bill and not from the date of the passing of the Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It says its passing—clergy, etc., " at the date of the passing of this Act." That is to say, denominations existing at the date of the passing of the Act were denominations whose ministers would come under the exception. The first words, of course, are the important words. But the point I wish to impress particularly is this—those who came within the provision of any of those exceptions did not require certificates of exemption at all. If any man claimed he came within them but did not come within them, he was liable to arrest, and liable to have his case tried and, if found guilty of the offence charged against him, he was liable to the punishment that the Act provided. But, on the other hand, if he was within the exception, he did not require any certificate of exemption as a protection against the action of any officers enforcing the law.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do I understand the minister to claim that students at the Novitiate come within the classification of "clergy" as contained in clause 6?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that point but I do not think I will discuss it at any great length. I shall not do so because of the fact that I purpose recommending that an investigation be held wide enough to cover that question. The point I am making now is that, assuming that any member of the institution was properly included in that sixth exception, he was not guilty of any offence merely because he did not have a certificate of exemption. He did not require it at all. He was guilty of no offence provided he came within the exception and he did not need to present any certificate of exemption for protection against the police or any one else.

Mr. EDWARDS: That question as to whether these students did come under that classification or not was still a question of doubt that had not been settled by the Government at the time of this so-called raid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true, I think, but it was no question of doubt. What I am trying to impress upon the House is the difference between exemption and exception.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I get that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was the question as to whether they had been received in the order, whether, as they claimed to be, they were members of this institution; and there was the question whether they actually came within exception 6. I do not purpose at all to go into the details regarding any of the men but I simply wish to say that a list of the members was submitted to the Justice Department together with such facts as were necessary to enable the department to come to a decision as to whether they were within the exception or not, namely, the date of birth, the date of admission to the institution, if merely a member of the order, and also the date of the tonsure if the individual claimed to be a member of the clergy. The report of the Deputy Minister of Justice which we have on file, and which I will read to the House if desired, was to the effect that on the facts submitted there were none of the members liable except three as to whom there might be doubt. The names of the three were given and as to them further inquiry was suggested. That further inquiry elicited the following facts: As to one he was an American citizen, that is so established, to the satisfaction of the Deputy Minister of Jus-

tice; as to the second he already had been tonsured and if he had been previous to admission to the Novitiate, and previous to the proclamation he would not be liable. As to the third he was in the 19-year class, and had entered the Novitiate four days before the proclamation of the 6th May. That, in brief, is the result of the investigation and report. I think that later on there was a doubt as to another—I do not need to give the name—but, when the facts were presented the Deputy Minister gave the opinion that the person in question was not liable.

Now I see no reason why I should not make as plain as I can to hon. members here what constitutes, at all events, one of the points which has aroused confusion and doubt and which has created very much of the difficulty that has arisen over this institution. The wording of the exception is this:

> Clergy, including members of any recognized order of an exclusively religious character, ministers—

I do not need to go past the second comma to anchor the few remarks that I desire to make on this question:

> Clergy, including members of any recognized order of an exclusively religious character.

We have a class of exception in these words "clergy, including members." Parliament by the wording of this enactment, places within the category of those defined as clergy members of any recognized order of an exclusively religious character. It cannot be doubted I think that there are on the one hand a class of men known as clergy and that there are on the other hand a class of men known as members of an order of an exclusively religious character. It has been asserted, whether rightly or wrongly I do not intend to debate, that the word "clergy" must be held to have dominating application to the words following the word "including" and that no one, being a member of the order, unless he was also of the class first indicated "clergy" could claim to come within this exception. That opinion the Deputy Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice do not entertain. Such opinion has however been advanced but I do not know on what legal authority.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe): In the debate on this particular subject in the House of Commons it was distinctly stated who would be included in that phrase and that no one would be considered to be a member of a religious order of this kind until he had been for one year in the institution. That was stated by the Minister of Justice in the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend may be able to establish that, but from memory—I fear he will have difficulty, I cannot speak with certainty, although I looked it up some months ago. The discussion which the hon. member refers to centered around the length of time a student would be a student before getting the "tonsure" because in the Act as it stood for a time in the committee the words "divinity student" were mentioned but subsequently they were excised by amendment the discussion centered around the question as to how long a student would continue to be a student before he would become of the class known as the clergy that is before he received the tonsure. I think the remarks of the minister applied not to members of the order, not to members entitled to exemption as coming within the class of those included in the order, but to how long a time it took students to become members of the clergy themselves having received the tonsure so as to come within the class described in the very first word of clause 6. I do not know whether I have made myself clear but that was what the discussion was about at the time and the minister I think said something to the effect that one year, or perhaps more than one year, would be required to put in by a student before he received the tonsure.

As to that, of course, I do not make myself responsible; the debate will have to speak for itself, and the minister will answer for himself and for what he said at that time.

Now, I have outlined what has been presented to me as one of the matters in dispute, and it occurs to me that it would be well that the subjects referred for investigation should be so wide, and the tribunal of such a character, that a reference might be made of that question, so that at all events the opinion of the commission may be obtained. On the other hand, the opinion of the Department of Justice in this regard has not been something in the nature of a fortress that no man could overthrow. There was an appeal. This question could have been taken at any time before a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, who acted as Central Appeal Judge under the Military Service Act. I am not sure, I have not made inquiries, but possibly this very point has come before Mr. Justice Duff, in the discharge of his duties as Senior Appeal Judge. So that if the ruling of the department on that point of law was believed to be wrong, there was always a door open

through which appeal could be taken and a final determination of the subject gained.

I will say only this: That having reviewed the record, in so far as it is now in the Department of Justice, and having received from the Minister of Justice a full account of his connection with the subject, in June, 1918, and since, I have no reason at all to come to any other conclusion than that his whole relation to the affair, and his conduct throughout, was only what would become a conscientious and competent minister of the Crown and a gentleman. I have received from him to-day a specific denial of the allegations contained in Mr. Palmer's statement, and that denial he asked me to read to Parliament, and in it he says: The imputations made with regard to his action, and that of the Department of Justice in respect to the Guelph Novitiate are entirely baseless. The facts as ascertained by the Militia Department fully establish this. He will welcome any inquiry by which, in the judgment of his colleagues, the public interests may be served.

It would seem to me, in view of the nature of the problem that now confronts the House, and of the nature of the investigation that will be most useful and most appropriate, that the commission that is to so investigate, should be composed of a judge, or judges. And I believe,—assuming that Mr. Palmer will agree,—that where in the points I mention, allegations do not amount to a charge of wrong-doing, there should be inserted or agreed to be implied therein, some word of the nature of "improper." Assuming that he will agree to that, so that there really may be wrong-doing alleged, and something to investigate, I propose to recommend that a Royal Commission issue for the investigation of these charges, and that the powers of the commission shall be wide so as to embrace anything of a specific charge of impropriety affecting the same matter that can be gathered from the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) this afternoon, and so ample in scope that the whole matter can be searched to the bottom.

There is nothing to conceal on the part of the Department of Militia—of that I am quite certain from the minister—and I beg to assure the House that on the part of the Department of Justice there is equally nothing to conceal. The Minister of Justice at present is several thousand miles from here, but it is our hope that it will not be long before he returns. I am sure that the member for Victoria would be the last to suggest that proceedings should be taken by way of this motion until he does return and has full opportunity to put in his defence. Consequently, with the intimation that the commission shall be able to act as soon as the minister returns—at all events that it shall be appointed upon his return—and that it shall be ample and wide enough to cover the charges alleged, I ask leave to suggest that such be the form of investigation, and that in the meantime the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for inquiry of another kind be withdrawn.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches which have been delivered this afternoon on the motion made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). I now gather from the remarks of the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) that a Royal Commission will issue so that a thorough investigation may take place of the hon. gentleman's charges. As to the resolution itself, it is thus worded:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the statements made public in relation to the Guelph Novitiate during the month of June, 1918, and the circumstances and facts concerning those and other similar charges concerning the evasion by young men and the connivance of others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act and other Acts and Orders relating to the upbuilding of the military forces of Canada, it is advisable that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the matter with full authority to examine witnesses under oath, to pay necessary expenses and to report to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I daresay, although I hold no brief for the Jesuit Order, that the reverend gentlemen from Guelph, and the members of that Order generally in Canada, will welcome any investigation that may be ordered by the Government under that resolution. But the Acting Minister of Justice will notice that this is a very broad resolution because the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) proposes to inquire into:

> "other similar charges concerning the evasion by young men and the connivance by others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act."

The proposed inquiry would therefore apply to other charges as well as to those which affect the Guelph institution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The investigation would be upon the charges, as stated by me, contained in the Rev. Mr. Palmer's statement, and anything else relating to the same matter that can be gathered from the speech of the hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the Government intended to have such a wide investigation through a Royal Commission, I would say that those Cabinet ministers who instigated the exemptions for farmers' sons in the province of Ontario should be brought before it. Because I find, Mr. Speaker, that during the election of 1917 very wily circulars were issued, especially in the province of Ontario, by means of which the farmers were invited specifically to disregard the Military Service Act. In these circulars the farmers were told not to mind the consequences, their sons would remain on the farm and not be called upon to bear arms. I am very positive in my statement because I have one of those very circulars under my hand, and which reads as follows:

The Farmers Will Be Protected.

Union Ministers Issue Statement.

Ottawa, December 3, 1917.

General Mewburn, Minister of Militia, states: Farmers coming within Class A called out for military service, who are actually employed upon a farm in the production of foodstuffs for Canada and her Allies, and whose services are necessary in the work of such farm, will be exempted from military service.

If their claim for exemption is not allowed by the tribunal, an immediate appeal should be made. Arrangements are being made to extend the time for such appeals. The Minister of Militia further states that if the farmer so called out for military service who is now honestly employed in the production of foodstuffs should be drafted into the army, General Mewburn feels it will be his duty to relieve him from military service on the condition that he returns to the farm and continues to be so employed.

Then, we have a long letter written by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. J. D. Reid) to some candidates in Ontario, telling them in effect "Do not mind; you can restore the waning faith of the farmers. Tell them not to be afraid; we have taken all the necessary precautions to ensure that these farmers' sons will not be called to arms."

I regret indeed that the scope of the investigation will not permit such evidence to be adduced as I mentioned a moment ago. Evidently a very crafty appeal was made to the electors of rural Ontario. First, the Minister of Militia and Defence—he is such an honest minister that I think he did not devise this scheme himself. In fact, I am told that the master of the administration, the man who owned the Government at that time, Sir Clifford Sifton, is the man who initiated this proceeding; it is said that he came hurriedly back to Ottawa after a survey of the constituencies and told the Government that the dictum of the Minister of Militia and Defence would not be sufficient and that a test case should be taken at once before Mr. Justice Duff, the Central Appeal Judge, to whom my hon. friend a moment ago referred. So the test case came before Mr. Justice Duff, and, of course, the promise made by my good friend the Minister of Militia and Defence was thus implemented in time, and the elections were won. As the member for Victoria says, there was then "evasion by young men and the connivance of others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act." I would like to have that charge fully and thoroughly investigated, so that the good farmers of Ontario and the members of the Ministerial Association of that province may see clearly how they were doped during that election and what a fraud and a sham was the administration of the Military Service Act.

Any fair-minded citizen, any broad-minded member of the House of Commons, whether he be Roman Catholic or Protestant, will admit with me that the raid organized against the Guelph Novitiate in the dead of night on the 7th of June last spells humiliation, spells indignity, bitterness and disunion in Canada. Sir, we live in a British country, and any British country can claim to be a free country; but it cannot be a free country if a religious minority is not respected.

I must thank the Minister of Militia and Defence for the very frank statement he made to the House this afternoon. He read from the beginning to end the dignified protest he received from the rector of the Novitiate at Guelph. He acted the part of a man of honour when he sent that apology to the Novitiate after he had received the protest from the rector in June last. Now, what, briefly stated, are the facts?

One thing that I remember in my practice of law is a dictum of Mr. Justice Johnston, one of the brightest judges who ever sat on the bench in the district of Montreal. He once said to a jury: "Gentlemen of the jury, when I was a young man I read a book the suggestive title of which was: 'Put yourself in his place.' You are now about to pass judgment on the prisoner at the bar; your duty is to put yourself in his place." Mr. Speaker, in relating briefly the facts concerning the raid on the Guelph Novitiate on the 7th of June last, I ask every fair-minded Protestant to put himself in the place of the rector of that Catholic institution.

On the 7th of June—not at noon, not at three o'clock in the afternoon, not even at

six o'clock, but at 9.30 at night—three men appear suddenly in the parlour of the institution, wearing plain clothes, and, without any parleying with the rector of the Novitiate, give a general order to parade all the members of the Novitiate within five minutes.

The first thing that the rector asked of the gentlemen who appeared to lead the other two was to produce the authority with which he was vested. The member for Victoria said a moment ago that his authority was his brassard. But Captain Macauley did not wear his brassard; he had it in his pocket, and when he was asked by the rector to produce his authority he took this brassard from his pocket and said: "Here is my authority."

Let me point out to the member for Victoria that the Guelph Novitiate is not a farm; it is a college.

Then the rector went to the telephone to consult the counsel of the institution. Then Father Hingston appeared. Father Hingston is a Jesuit, son of the late Sir William Hingston, who was a member of the Senate and one of the leading physicians of Canada—indeed, of America. Father Hingston, as I insisted on a moment ago, was just back from the front where he had served as a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force—here he was under military garb in that institution. So that the gentlemen from London and from Guelph who were so nervous at that moment lest the institution would shelter evaders and slackers could well have confided their consciences to Father Hingston, then Captain Hingston, a gentleman who had served his King and his country, and who had lost his younger brother on the battlefield of Flanders. It was only at the moment that Father Hingston appeared that Captain Macauley gave his name and produced his brassard as the symbol of his authority, and then, on being further questioned, produced a typewritten letter which purported to give his authority.

Mr. MURPHY: A copy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A copy of a letter purporting to give him the necessary authority. The passage which seemed relevant and on which he based his right of search was substantially as follows:

Any officer or non-commissioned officer, acting under written authorization—

Mark the words.

—of G.O.C. or O.C. of a military district or area, if he has good grounds for believing that deserters or defaulters under the Military Service Act are being harboured or concealed after

reasonable demand of entrance and refusal thereof, and upon producing the aforesaid written authorization, may forcibly enter and search the premises.

When Captain Macauley was asked for the written authority mentioned in the instructions, he could produce none, and yet he insisted on having the whole order paraded before him at that late hour. Moreover he threatened, he was not going to listen to any parleying, and he began putting questions to three or four members of the Order who were present in the parlour. Then Captain Hingston registered a last protest against a search without proper authorization. Overlooking the irregularity of the proceedings, the Rector invited Captain Macauley to visit the bedrooms or dormitories, or if he preferred, offered to summon all the members of the Novitiate to the refectory. Captain Macauley chose this latter alternative. While he appeared to have come there with only three men, as a matter of fact—and I wish to impress this on the House—he had come within the precincts of the Novitiate with three men, but there was a cordon of eleven other men around the premises and the gates of the institution were closed and guarded by one of the eleven.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know the hon. member does not want to mislead the House. Captain Macauley took three men into the house with him, as is admitted by all parties, and there were eight more outside.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Between my hon. friend and the Rector of the Novitiate my heart is in the balance, but I have the words of the Rector that there were three men with Captain Macauley and eleven around the building, fourteen in all.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There were eleven altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The interrorgatory began about eleven o'clock and lasted about an hour and a quarter. Three members of the community were seized as deserters and placed under close arrest. They were told to make ready to leave for the barracks and were conducted under escort to the dormitories to make the necessary changes in their clothing. None of these young men were within the scope of the Military Service Act, or of any of the subsequent Orders in Council, as has been clearly established by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen). They all come within the exceptions under the Schedule to the Military Service Act.

6. Clergy, including members of any recognized order of an exclusively religious character,

and ministers of all religious denominations existing in Canada at the date of the passing of this Act.

The three men were about to follow Captain Macauley as far as the barracks when a telephone message from the Adjutant General at Ottawa was received, staying the unjustifiable proceedings, and after much telephoning between London and Ottawa, when one of the officers from Guelph reminded Captain Macauley that he was not acting within the military law, Captain Macauley left and returned at 12.40 in the morning, after having accepted the courtesies of the Order and partaken of the delicacies offered by them. All this occurred in the refectory at a late hour, and to show how those sinister Jesuits are, they who are supposed to eat at least one Protestant a day, the members of the Order placed before them the delicacies of the refectory, and the officers and men all left well pleased with the hospitality they had received. The action that was taken was most unwarranted; it was a high-handed way of dealing with the citizens of a free country like Canada. It is true that next morning Captain Macauley went and excused himself; but the "heather was afire," the harm was done, because the news had been telegraphed to all parts of the Dominion, and possibly to Europe. The Press and pulpit denounced the double dealing of those sinister Jesuits. The rector addressed a dignified protest to the Minister of Militia and Defence, and the latter answered in the same manly way that he has spoken this afternoon. This is the letter sent by the minister to the rector of the Novitiate on the 11th June from Ottawa:

My dear Sir,—I am just in receipt of your letter of the 8th instant on my return to Ottawa, and words cannot express to you my deep regret of the action taken by the Deputy Provost Marshal, Captain Macauley, on the evening of the 7th instant.

My attention was called to the matter on my arrival in Ottawa this morning and I find that my Adjutant General has taken immediate action for a most thorough investigation, and if the facts are as stated in your letter—which of course I do not doubt—I can assure you that the error in judgment committed by this officer will be dealt with in a proper way, as I will not tolerate any such action on the part of any military officer as far as the operation of the Military Service Act goes.

As I have already stated, I deeply regret this occurrence and I thank you for your frank letter.

The question of the liability for military service of any of your students is a matter that is now being considered by the Department of Justice.

Believe me,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) S. C. Mewburn.

This apology having been made, every one thought the matter would remain at rest, but the agitators throughout Ontario began pouring accusation upon accusation upon the Guelph Novitiate, and they, in self defence, although there was a special censorship for this special case, insisted that the facts should be made known to the people of Canada.

Later on, on June 22nd, a statement was issued by the Department of Militia and Defence as follows:—

A list of the members of the Novitiate of military age, together with the dates on which they entered the order, has been furnished by the adjutant-general, the ages being stated as accurately as is possible without the production of official certificates.

From this it appears that there are now in the community thirty-five men of military age, of whom twenty-five entered the order before the first proclamation under the Military Service Act, on October 13, 1917, the greater number of them having entered during the year of 1915-16, or earlier.

It seems clear on the information available that there can be no question but that all the young men, except the two named, are free from liability to military service by virtue of the fifth exception in the schedule to the Military Service Act, which excepts all members of an order of an exclusively religious character, which the St. Stanislaus' Novitiate undoubtedly is. The same exception applies to men affected by the order in Council of April 20, 1918.

It appears that the son of the Minister of Justice entered the order on March 30, 1918, when he was under no liability under the Military Service Act. Before taking this step he presented himself for a medical examination before physicians, of whom two were members of the Medical Board of Review in Montreal, and their finding was that his condition was such that it would be necessary to place him in Category E, which would make it impossible for him to undertake military service.

The result of the investigation indicates that the inquiries instituted were justified, and the Department of Militia will take steps to insure that any members of the Novitiate liable under the Military Service Act will be required to serve.

In this statement it is said that there were two members of the order liable at that time. These two members were John Holland and John O'Halloran. It was found later that John Holland came under the fifth exception in the schedule to the Military Service Act, as he became a cleric on September 9, 1917. A copy of certificate of his ordination is now in the possession of the Department of Militia and Defence, Ottawa. John O'Halloran was found to be an American citizen, and therefore not liable under the Act. His birth certificate and certificate of his father's naturalization as an American are also in the hands of the department. So, not one of those who were

found at the Novitiate on the 7th June last were liable under the Military Service Act. The raid was therefore most unjustified. It would have been easy for the gentlemen who were at the bottom of this conspiracy—and it was nothing but a conspiracy to bring into contempt the Jesuit Order in Canada—to send an officer in broad daylight to get the information which was obtained during the night of June the 7th. I say the raid was most unjustifiable and exceedingly regrettable. It was something which does not promote union and harmony in this country.

Perhaps I shall be told that the Jesuits might have waived their exemptions under the Military Service Act, and should have sent their young men to the front. The ignorance, Mr. Speaker, of some people is unfathomable. Do you know how many of the Jesuit Order have joined the colours? Seven hundred of them joined the colours at the front, and one hundred and sixty have fallen. From a single branch of the Jesuit Order in Canada, Loyola College, Montreal, 287 pupils enlisted, 34 of whom made the supreme sacrifice. On the 17th of March last Father Hingston, who had served his King and country nobly at the front, and whose poor brother Basil was killed in Flanders, presided over the impressive ceremony of unfurling a service flag on the staff at Loyola College, Montreal, in memory of the 34 pupils who had given their lives in the great war. I quote from the Montreal Gazette's report:—

General Wilson—

That is General Wilson, a trusted officer of the Militia Department, and a friend of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes).

General Wilson said he was proud to officiate at such a function, and to express his appreciation of what Loyola and its graduates had done for their country and the Allies. As an Irishman, coming from a liberty-loving race, it was no surprise to him to see that the young men from Loyola had so distinguished themselves.

The General congratulated Father Hingston on the splendid manner in which Loyola College was recognizing the services of those who had fallen, by looking after the education of their orphans. After Mr. Hackett—

A son of Judge Hackett.

—had read a list of those who had fallen, the audience standing, an address was given by Rev. Father Milway Filion, Superior-General of the Jesuit Order in the province of Quebec. He said that of the whole Order, seven hundred had gone to the front, many had won distinction, and 160 had fallen.

Let me read the list of the fallen boys of Loyola College:—

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Stuart Barnston, killed in battle of Amiens; Herbert Butler, killed in action; Glendyn Cloran, died of influenza at Camp Hancock, U.S.A.; Emmett Conroy, died in training; Paul Conroy, died in training; Arthur Dissette, who was decorated with the Croix de guerre, killed in action; James de Beaujeu Domville, grandson of Senator Domville, killed in training; Edward Dwyer, drowned on active service; Howard Farley, no details; James Grant, wounded at Courcelette, died of wounds; Basil Hingston,—brother of Captain Hingston, who protested against Captain Macauley's raid, but for which Captain Macauley was not responsible,—killed in action at the battle of Amiens; John Howe, killed in action; Stanton Hudson, killed in action; Melvin Johnson, killed at Passchendaele; Leo Le Bouthilier, killed in action; Rodolphe Lemieux, killed in action while leading the company after all the senior officers had become casualties; Donald MacArthur, killed in action; Fraser MacDonald, killed in action; Francis Maguire, killed while rescuing wounded soldier; Temple MacDonald killed in action; Frances McGee, killed in action; Arthur McGovern, killed at Hooge; Adrian McKenna; Gregory Nagle, killed in action; Desmond O'Boyle, killed; Sargent Owens, 5th Royal Highlanders, died of wounds—son of Mr. T. P. Owens, editor of Hansard—Guy Palardy, died of wounds; William Pearson, accidentally killed; Edward Plunkett, killed in action; Leo Shortall, died of wounds; Wilfrid Sullivan, killed in action; Henri de Varennes, killed in action; Maurice Vidal, killed in action; John P. Walsh, died of wounds; John Wilkins, killed in action.

There, Sir, you have the names of the 34 young men, students at the Jesuit College in Montreal, who fought and died for their King and country!

Mr. Speaker, I shall speak but two minutes longer. As I said a moment ago, I hold no brief for the Jesuit Order. Their record, Sir, stands before the world, and their history is an open book. Were I to take a Protestant's opinion of the Jesuits, I would take that of Parkman, who says:

The Jesuit was and is everywhere—in the school room, in the library, in the cabinet of princes and ministers, in the huts of savages, in the tropics, in the frozen north, in India, in China, in Japan, in Africa, in America; now as a Christian priest, now as a soldier, a mathematician, an astrologer.

True, they have been persecuted in other countries. But of all countries, Canada should be the last to persecute them, to insult and traduce them; for they are part and parcel of the history of this country, yes, part and parcel of the history of the old province of Ontario. Sir, it is in Ontario that the Jesuit missionaries went forth into the wilderness to win to Christ the savages along the shores of the Georgian bay and up in the hinterland, giving to the world an imperishable example of devotion and sacrifice. Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, the mangled and charred bodies of Breboeuf and Lallemant buried at

Ste. Marie beside the waters of the Georgian bay. The ashes of Jesuit martyrs mingle with the earth of Old Ontario; and the soil of Ontario ought to be a sanctuary to the successors of those martyrs.

At the beginning of my remarks, I said that this was a free country, a British country, and an eminent English judge, Lord Acton, has said that the most infallible indication of the degree of freedom which a country enjoys is the security vouchsafed its minorities. Prince Von Bulow, once German Chancellor, in his book on Imperial Germany, thus expressed himself:

> In the struggle between nationalities, one nation is the hammer and the other the anvil; one is the victor and the other the vanquished.

That, Sir, is the Prussian spirit; it is not the spirit of the British, because Great Britain, both within her own limits and abroad, where the Union Jack waves, is ever fighting to stay the hand that wields the hammer. The moving spirit in this matter, the spirit that initiated the Guelph raid, was not British—it was a Prussian spirit!

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I am led to support the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) because of the circumstances surrounding this incident in connection with the Jesuit Novitiate at Guelph. The facts have been stated so fully both by the hon. member for Victoria and by the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) that it is unnecesary for me to go over them again. But the very fact that the authorities of this institution resisted an investigation by the military authorities was bound to lead to a good deal of dissatisfaction in that neighbourhood and, as the news spread, throughout the whole of Ontario and the other provinces. The members of the Ministerial Association of Guelph only took the matter up when it had been pressed upon them from several different sources. The first parties to raise an objection to what was being done at the Novitiate were the members of the Roman Catholic faith in the city of Guelph. They saw their boys being drafted, and some of them enlisting, and then they saw their neighbour's sons of the same faith going into the Novitiate and escaping service. They learned from the statements of the military authorities that the rector, and those in charge of the college, were refusing to give the information that the military authorities required and which they were bound to give under the Act. That tended to further excite feeling in the city of Guelph.

I believe that every impartial man, no matter what his faith may be, will agree that the circumstances surrounding this case ought to be investigated judicially. At least I can quote one man in my own city, the Rev. Father Minehan, who stated publicly that after what had been said in connection with this institution he was of the opinion that there should be an investigation. This is a matter affecting not one particular class of the people only, but, I believe, that every person having a knowledge of the facts, and a knowledge of the rumours and reports which were going around, was anxious to have an investigation.

An hon. MEMBER: Perhaps he was one of the conspirators.

Mr. HOCKEN: If he was one of the conspirators I do not think he was conspiring to the injury of the rector of the institution or any person connected with it. The conduct of the Ministerial Association of Guelph was admirable. These men had gone to their own congregations and urged all their young men to enlist. One Presbyterian minister went so far as to report a young man in his congregation who was eligible and who was trying to escape. By reporting that young man to the authorities, he drove the young man's family from his congregation. They resented his action but I am glad of what he did because it shows you that the men who went after the Novitiate and asked for an investigation in this case had done everything in their power to get every person they could influence to do his duty under the Military Service Act. You have a group of men acting in that way and, under those circumstances, is it any wonder that they should resent what they saw and what the military authorities told them was going on in the Novitiate?

It was not only the citizens of Guelph that came to them and told them what was going on, but the men who were charged with the enforcement of the Military Service Act in Guelph reported to the Ministerial Association that they had tried over and over again to get the information that it was necessary for them to get from the authorities of that institution and that they had been refused.

Up to the time that Captain Macauley made his visit to the institution, very many attempts had been made to avoid anything like a raid, to avoid force, to avoid anything that complaint might be made about and to get the information in as reasonable and easy a way as the authorities of the college could give it. Is it any wonder that in the city, as well as over the whole countryside, there should be a great deal of excitement? Is it any wonder that the press censorship and the fact that the daily papers in Guelph and Toronto were notified that nothing was to be said about this institution, or about the visits of Captain Macauley and his officers to it, should have increased the excitement and intensified the resentment that the people felt over this case? The rector and those in authority acting with him were responsible for this excitement. If they had observed the law they would have reported all the men who were there at least for registration. If the rector had been willing to give the names to Captain Westoby when asked for them instead of putting obstacles in the way, and if, when he had been called upon, he had thrown open all the doors and said, "Come in, and see what is here, and whom you think you have a right to take," this trouble would have been avoided. That is what the chancellors and the rectors of all the other universities and colleges up our way did. There was no military raid at Victoria, Knox, Wycliffe or Trinity colleges. In none of these colleges would you find a man who was of military age. But Captain Macauley apparently thrust the case upon the authorities in Ottawa and he got instructions to visit the institution and, because he could not get in by their leave, he went in by force, as he had a right to do.

I am entirely in agreement with the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) when he says that the very method that Captain Macauley took to get in there was designed to allay excitement and to prevent anything like a disturbance. If he had marched through the city of Guelph, as he might have done, with a force of men, there would have been a group of people following him and if a crowd from Guelph had gone out that night there might have been much more serious consequences than happened. Whether he violated some military red tape or not, I do not know, but in my judgment he acted wisely and he adopted the course that enabled him to accomplish his purpose without trouble. This visit was made in a way to which objection cannot be taken. It certainly is not at all to be compared in violence with the method that was adopted in the city of Toronto by the head of the military police there who went into social functions, the Y.M.C.A., and all kinds of institutions to drag young men out. He would go where a dance was being held as he did one night to the Knights of Columbus Hall. He would not give these young men time to go home and get their exemption papers, some of them having been exempted; he took them away. He went down to the boat when the ball games were on and every man who did not have his paper he apprehended. That is the way the law was enforced in Toronto, and if that is not a good deal rougher and more inconsiderate than anything that happened in Guelph, I am very much mistaken. When that kind of thing was going on in Toronto, Hamilton, and Guelph itself, is it surprising that a great deal of excitement and dissatisfaction existed when this institution refused to open its doors and show who were there? That in itself is the cause of the trouble that has arisen. I am inclined to think, Sir, that the Superior of the order which is represented in Guelph at St. Stanislaus College shares in the opinion that I hold myself that the rector of that institution acted very unwisely because we find that immediately after the raid took place the rector was removed to some other sphere of action. He may have been promoted, or he may have been removed for some other cause, but we know that he did not enhance the reputation of his institution by the course that he pursued because he brought upon it a great deal of criticism that was entirely unnecessary and would never have been levelled against it if he had acted in a different way.

Now my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) talks about the respect that is due a religious minority. Mr. Speaker, I have respect for every man's religious beliefs; I have respect for a religious minority. I think that in a matter of a man's religious belief, whether he be a Mohammedan, a Hindu, or anything else, if he honestly believes in those religious opinions, he has a right to practise them and he ought to be protected in practising them, and as I understand the law of the country and the sentiment of the people he will be protected. But a religious minority should not be exempted from performing its duty at a crisis such as we were in at that time. A

man cannot claim that because he is a member of a small sect he should receive special consideration as a citizen. First and foremost, in time of war a citizen of Canada has to obey the military laws of the country. He cannot be exempted on that ground, and he should not ask for any special privileges because he is a member of a minority. I think that to advance arguments of that kind shows how remarkably weak the case is. The chancellors in Toronto colleges did not feel humiliated, and did not take it as an insult when the military police visited their institutions to ascertain whether they contained any men fit to go on service. That being so why should the rector of this institution feel humiliated? Yet that was the whole case made out by the hon. member for Maisonneuve; that this was a humiliation to the Guelph institution and those in charge of it, and that they were insulted by the military police going there. I do not think they had any reason to feel insulted. The head of any other institution of the same kind, that I know of, would not have regarded it as an insult. On the contrary he would have assisted in the investigation, and would have been glad to provide all the information that was in his power. I think such a plea is only drawing a red herring across the trail, and if that is the best excuse that the Rector of the Guelph institution has to offer I think he has very little indeed. It was no time for any man, whether the head of a college, or a bank, or a factory, to be standing upon his dignity. Dignity is all right in its place, but when a man stands upon his dignity and resents the admission of properly constituted officers to examine whether the men in his place are fit and eligible for service, I think he is straining his regard for his own dignity, and I do not think it will have very much effect in that way. Then hon. gentlemen will notice the fact that there was a list of all the inmates in the college displayed the night that Captain Macauley visited the institution, but when he went back next day that list had been taken down and could not be found. Why remove those names unless there was some cause for it?

The Minister of Militia said he was not disposed to go into the Alexander case. "I do not think it is necessary to refer here to the Alexander case," he said. I think that it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to refer to it. I will put the Alexander case alongside of the Noonan case, and this is what happened. Alexander and Noonan were both reported to the Militia Department. Alexander was employed by his father in the manufacture of war material. He asked for exemption, but was refused and was placed in khaki.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He volunteered.

Major-General MEWBURN: He came forward afterwards.

Mr. HOCKEN: I thought he had been drafted. At any rate he was engaged in making munitions. Now place his case against that of Noonan. Noonan was playing baseball on a Guelph team, and when these proceedings arose he entered the Novitiate. In the one case a man was engaged in the manufacture of war materials and he was taken. In the other case a man was engaged in playing baseball and goes into the Novitiate and escapes service. How is it possible that the people of Guelph should not resent such unequal treatment given to two different young men in the same place? That kind of thing stirred the people up, and it is the reason for all the dissatisfaction and trouble that has occurred.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve gave a long list of Jesuits who had served in the war. I have not got a list of ministers who went to the war, but I know scores of them who volunteered as privates and went out and did their work in the trenches, so that this service in the war was not all on one side. I think the ministers are entitled to the same consideration as any person else.

Now the Acting Minister of Justice tells us that these young men are not liable for service, and if I understood him aright the Deputy Minister of Justice is responsible for an opinion to that effect. If that is the case the members of this House who passed the Act certainly did so under very serious misapprehension. They passed the Act after having received an opinion from the Minister of Justice that warranted them in believing it was impossible for any man to hide in a college in the way complained of. This is the statement made by the Minister of Justice.—

Sir SAM HUGHES: On what page of Hansard is it to be found?

Mr. HOCKEN: The statement which I am about to quote was made on July 19, 1917, and is to be found at page 3,568 of the revised Hansard. The minister was replying to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the then leader of the Opposition. He said:

The right hon. leader of the Opposition will recognize that the theological student, from the moment he gets his tonsure, or minor orders, which he does at the end of his first year—or, at all events, that is the general practice—enters and forms part of the clergy.

My right hon. friend shakes his head? I am not making that statement without having verified it on the very best authority. I have satisfied myself beyond peradventure on that subject. So that that leaves, under the class to be covered as divinity students, so far as the Catholic colleges are concerned, only the young men just coming in, before they have got any orders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these young men who went into the college—

Mr. BUTTS: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? My hon. friend has been speaking now for a considerable length of time. Will he give one figure?

Mr. HOCKEN: What figure would the hon. gentleman like?

Mr. BUTTS: I have just put it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not see that that question has any bearing on what I am quoting. Now I have quoted from the statement made by the Minister of Justice, on which this House voted. The members of the House at that time had the right to believe that the Minister of Justice was able properly to interpret the practice, and state it as accurately as any man here, because he himself was brought up in a college of the same order, and therefore one would suppose he would know the rules of that order. That is what the Minister of Justice said at that time, and that is what led this House to believe that it was impossible for a young man to enter a college and be exempted from military service simply by getting in there. Further, the rector of the institution is authority for the statement that any young man entering the institution could leave at any time within three years and change his whole course of life. Instead of remaining and preparing himself to be a member of that order, he could leave and become a physician or an engineer, or enter any profession. So that no young man entering that order is bound by any vows, he cannot be classed, I do not see how he can be, as a member of the clergy. And when we have regard to the way this Act was enforced against the clergy of other denominations, the proceedings in this case will appear most strange. Up at Sault Ste. Marie I knew a young man who had been for two years preaching as a Methodist. He was a clergyman lacking but one thing—the single act of ordination. He had gone through all his studies, he had been on probation in the field, he had had charge of different congregations, and all he lacked of being a clergyman was that which is conferred by the ceremony of ordination, yet he was drafted under the Military Service Act. Notwithstanding that it is claimed, I understand, by the Deputy Minister of Justice that the minute a young man went into this college he was exempt from military service. There is an inequality, an unfairness about that, which impresses anyone who does not understand the remarkably fine distinctions of the particular order concerned in this investigation. I submit, therefore, that the Government is justified in submitting this case, with all its attendant circumstances—the things that went before it and the things that followed after it—to a judicial inquiry to bring out the facts and let us see whether it was possible under the Act for a young man to go in there and immediately become immune from serving the country as our other young men had to serve the country. The matter will have to be established beyond peradventure in order to satisfy the people, because no good citizen wants to shirk his duty; every man objects and has a right to object to inequalities of service as between different classes of citizens. That there have been inequalities is a matter that does not admit of discussion. They have been so obtrusive and so extensive that it is not at all surprising that the people of Ontario in the neighbourhood of Guelph should be extremely excited about it and should demand an investigation into all the facts.

Mr. J. E. O. GLADU (Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, if there is anything really disagreeable to me it is to take part in a discussion of this kind. I come from a province in which racial and religious questions are absolutely unknown; where a man, provided he is honest, is considered as a man and as a British citizen, no matter whether he is English or French, or Irish or any other nationality; no matter whether he is an Orangeman, a Catholic or a Protestant. We do not mind about these things in the province of Quebec. I regret to have to take part in a discussion of this kind, because after all that had been said on the other side of the House since the beginning of the session we were entitled to hope and believe that we are getting rid of all these questions, as to their being brought up in

the manner in which they have, the rules of the House do not permit me to qualify that at this moment.

Sir, we are discussing a question which affects the Jesuits. I do not wish to boast about my province, but to show you what is our mentality in the province of Quebec let me remind you of something that happened in 1888. Long years before, the Jesuits had been deprived of the properties of which they were the owners in the province of Quebec, properties worth millions of dollars at that time. Several times the Government of that province had been asked to settle the question of the Jesuits' properties, and when the Hon. Mr. Mercier was Premier of Quebec he decided to settle the question. The whole case was investigated and the Legislative Assembly of Quebec decided to vote $400,000 for the benefit of the Jesuits. But it was contended by some in the Legislative Assembly that a part of the population of the province of Quebec was Protestant; that this money was to be taken from the public funds and that, therefore, money of the Protestants was being taken to satisfy the Jesuits. Hon. Mr. Mercier then decided—he was supported by the whole Government—to give to the Protestants of Quebec an amount of the $400,000 in proportion to the English Protestant population. Accordingly, $60,000 was distributed to the Protestants of that province to dispose of as they wished; the balance was given to the Catholic bishops to dispose of as they saw fit. That is the kind of mentality we have in the province of Quebec; that is why you never hear such outrageous questions discussed there as the one which has been brought up to-day by the hon. gentleman.

The member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) declared a moment ago that nothing extraordinary was done at the Guelph Novitiate. He says that the same thing was done at the Toronto University; the same thing has been done in all the Protestant Universities and nobody was scandalized. But will he tell us whether the officers of the Department of Militia went to those universities to make investigations at 9.30 at night? If they had gone to the Guelph Novitiate in the day time no one would have had anything to say, but they thought that when everybody was in bed was the proper time to disturb and create trouble in that institution.

We are told by the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) and by the member for Maisonneuve (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) that a cordon of soldiers was placed around the building. The member for Victoria said that the order came from Ottawa to leave the Novitiate alone at night, thereby giving a chance to the Jesuits to evade the law and escape their duty. As to that I shall answer later on; but I want to point out that I am not surprised at what has been said. I heard something more wonderful than that when I was a student at the Jesuits' college in Montreal. We were told—I was then a young man—that there was a tunnel connecting the Jesuits' college with l'Hotel-Dieu, a hospital where nurses are tending the poor and the sick—and there were stupid asses who came to see if that was true. So, Sir, we need not be surprised at what we hear to-day.

My intention, Sir, is not to give any special attention to this Guelph business; it has been disposed of this afternoon in a most noble and generous way by the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn), the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Meighen), and the member for Maisonneuve (Hon. Mr. Lemieux).

If the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) thinks for a moment that the Jesuits are trying to evade their responsibilities and to shirk their duties as citizens of Canada and of the British Empire, he does not understand the Jesuits at all. Let me give an illustration to show that he is absolutely in error, and—I trust he will take this in the right sense—that he does not know what he is speaking about. Much has been said this afternoon concerning Rev. Father Hingston, whom I know personally. It has been said that he has done service overseas. He has done more than that and credit must be given to him as well as to any other man who has done his bit for his country. Father Hingston was the promoter and the first recruiting officer of the Irish Rangers in Montreal. He was their chaplain, accompanying them to England and France, and when later on he was called back to this country, he did not think that he was through, but he went to the United States and delivered addresses wherever he had an opportunity of doing so for the benefit of the Allies.

Shirking their duties! Let me give another illustration. Rev. Father Arcand, Rector of St. Mary's College, when war was declared in 1914, asked the hon. Mr. Patenaude, who was then a minister of the Cabinet, to send instructors to the college to drill the students. What was the answer given by the Government at that time? The answer was that they could not do that as it would be too expensive. Imagine

the Government becoming thrifty at that time. The Government also stated that St. Mary's College was the first college to make such a demand. Later on, this same Father Arcand came to Ottawa and asked the Government for permission to form a corps of students for overseas service. That permission was refused and I can give as authorities to support my statement, Judge Delorimier, Mr. O. S. Perreault, a most distinguished member of the Chambre de Commerce of Montreal and Mr. Laberge, a very distinguished architect of Montreal. This same Father Arcand came to Ottawa in order to get precise information as to what young boys of the college could do to help in producing foodstuffs. He addressed himself to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who referred him to the Minister of Agriculture but no practical result ensued. May I add that the Jesuits of St. Mary's College were the first to relieve their students from attendance at school so as to permit them to fulfil their duties towards their country? I can go further to show my hon. friend that he is certainly ill-informed and absolutely wrong, and that he is, I have no doubt, unwittingly misleading the House when he tries to make the House believe that those Jesuits are endeavouring to shirk their duty and to save their students from fulfilling their duty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think the hon. member is unintentionally doing me an injustice. I never in my lifetime referred to St. Mary's College. I could have referred to Mont St. Louis College which did its duty splendidly. It is the hon. member who is in error.

Mr. GLADU: I have just this to answer to my hon. friend, that all the colleges of the community of Jesuits are, in solidarity, responsible one for the other, just as certain members of certain lodges are responsible for all the lodges.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Then I shall be only too glad to hold the whole Order of Jesuits responsible for the misconduct at Guelph.

Mr. GLADU: Certainly you would.

Mr. BUREAU: Just one head, one general, one black coat.

Mr. GLADU: It was in the afternoon on a Sunday in the month of May, 1918, that the students of St. Mary's College who were called to the colours, were convened in the sanctuary of the chapel. After the blessing of the Holy Sacrament, the rector, Rev. Father Arcand, addressed the boys as follows, and I must give credit to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) for having given me a copy of the speech:

> Dear boys, the hour of departure has come for you. I have only this sentence to utter: Do your duty—do your duty to yourself, to your family, to your race, to your Alma Mater and to your country. We have done all that we could to give you the very best of education. You will hear that conscription is a bad law; that it is a curse. Do not listen to such expressions. It is the law of your country, and you owe it obedience. We will not let you go alone; two of our priests will follow you to the barracks and even on the firing line. They will be your comrades; they will do their duty as you will do yours.
>
> But before entering into your new career, you have a last sacrifice to submit to. Go and bid good-bye to your mother. This task will cause you sorrow, but stand up like men, buckle your belt, conceal the tears in your eye, and let a smile be on your lips, so that your mother will not realize the enormity of the sacrifice imposed on you by your country.

I ask any fair-minded man in this House, no matter on what side he sits, if this is the language of a man who is endeavouring to shirk his duty and to teach his students that they should not fulfil theirs.

Let me give my hon. friend the name of another Jesuit who did something that was certainly worthy of notice. The patients in the pest house at St. Johns, in the province of Quebec, to which those suffering from contagious diseases are sent, asked for a chaplain to attend them. There was a man who could not go overseas, not being of military age or fit for service at the front, but who was ready to face death in another form. He offered his services as chaplain at this pest house, and was locked in with all those sick people, and for months and months he has been facing death through breathing the poisoned breath of those poor soldiers. His name is Rev. Father George Lebel. Nobody in the outside world knows his name; his work at the pest house has received no recognition, but he has the satisfaction of having done his duty. He has done his duty, not as a soldier, not as an honorary colonel who needs a major-general to defend him; he was not a John Wesley Allison, but merely a Jesuit who offered his services without any remuneration whatever.

There is another Jesuit whom I will name —the Rev. Father Sigouin. He was unable to go to the front, but he was able to serve in other ways. He is giving all his time to re-education. The Jesuits have never refused to give chaplains; they have supplied as many as were requested.

Let me give another example. I have known for years the Rev. Father Cadot; in fact, he was my professor at college. He is now a missionary amongst the Indians at Cape Croker in Ontario. Not one of those Indians could have been compelled to enlist as they were exempt under the law, but Father Cadot, appreciating his duties as a citizen of this country, appealed to the Indians, and 63 out of a total of 67 of military age offered their services. Fifty-seven were accepted, and fifty-three have gone to England, the other four being turned down as unfit for military service at London, Ontario. Forty-eight of these Indians got as far as France; five were sent back to Canada on reaching England. Of the forty-eight who went to France, twenty-two were wounded, and six were killed. I have said that sixty-three enlisted out of sixty-seven. The other four never enlisted for the very good reason that Father Cadot had no influence or authority whatever over them, because they were not Catholics. To sum it up, the sixty-three Catholics enlisted, and the four who were not Catholics did not endist.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) spoke this afternoon of Loyola college, Montreal. This college is not yet twenty-five years old, but at least 287 of her boys were in active service, and 34 of them were killed, amongst whom I might mention the only son of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, also the brother of Rev. Father Hingston. These boys won 20 Victoria Crosses and other distinctions. St. Mary's college, also in Montreal, has furnished at least double the number Loyola college did—double in enlisted men, double in wounded, and double in killed.

Turning to the West, I am in a position to state that all the pupils at St. Boniface College, in the province of Manitoba, who were fit and of military age enlisted right from the beginning of the war to the end. The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) has been Minister of Militia in this country, and knows that there is a hospital at St. Cloud in France, but what he does not know is the fact that 75 per cent of the doctors who are giving their services at that hospital were educated by the Jesuits in Montreal, mostly at Loyola and St. Mary's colleges. The same is true of the Laval hospital. Many of the doctors at that hospital were students at St. Mary's or Loyola college.

Surveying the Jesuit order in general, I find that over 700 Jesuits have enlisted, over 160 of whom have given their all. They have won decorations as follows: Legion of Honour, 39; Military Medals, 36; Croix de Guerre, 303; Citations, 519; and other decorations, 30.

Shall I say something about the Jesuits in France? Does my hon. friend know that Marshal Foch, the glorious and immortal Marshal Foch, was educated by the Jesuits? Does he know that as far back as 1872 the General's professor of mathematics predicted his future greatness when he told him that he would one day be the man who would bring down the German flag which was then floating on the fortress of Metz? Foch, who was educated by the Jesuits, was the man who achieved this glorious success, and he is undobutedly the most brilliant student ever educated by the Jesuits. My hon. friend has probably heard of another distinguished man, General Mangin, and I am sure the name of General de Castelnau, who gave four sons to the cause of the Allies and civilization, is also familiar to him. A large number of the Generals of the French army were educated by the Jesuits, and in England over 2,000 students of Jesuit colleges volunteered before conscription went into force. Of these students 400 have laid down their lives for their country, and the great Jesuit college of Stoneyhurst has the distinction of having contributed over 160 of her students to the ranks. These figures may probably be of little interest to many hon. members, but as it has pleased the hon. gentleman to create an impression and a feeling that it was the spirit of the Jesuits to shirk their duty and evade their responsibilities, I think it is only right to put before the House and the country facts showing the splendid work which the Jesuits have done in this war, and proving that the hon. gentleman, had no grounds whatever for the statements which he made.

We are told, Sir, that those who are accused of shirking their duty are disloyal to the Empire. How many times have we not heard that during the last two or three years? May I state certain facts, which probably are of no great interest to my hon. friend but which will certainly prove of considerable importance to others. The hon. member is no doubt ignorant of the fact that every day during the war 15,000 Jesuits prayed for the success of the Allies, and he is probably also unaware that since the signing of the armistice every Jesuit in the world has been ordered to offer a special prayer that the Allies may obtain a just and substantial peace. Does he know that in our Catholic churches the Jesuits

every day pray for the King? If the House will bear with me I will repeat this prayer.

We beseech Thee Almighty God, that Thy servant George who hath received from Thy mercy the reins of power, may receive also an increase of all virtues so that, adorned with these, he may graciously arrive unto Thee who art the way, the truth and the life. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

I observe that my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) is laughing. Let me ask him a question. There are thousands of Jesuits praying daily for the King. Will he state frankly whether he has gone to church once a year for the express purpose of praying for His Majesty? The Jesuits offer another prayer, for the Royal Family. Is that an indication of disloyalty? They say:

Oh Lord save Our King George,
And hear us in the day we call upon Thee.
We beseech Thee Almighty God, that Thy servant George, who by Thy divine mercy hath taken upon himself the government of this realm, may receive an increase of all virtues, wherewith, being becomingly adorned, he may turn aside from what is evil and foul, may overcome his enemies, and being made pleasing in Thy sight, together with the Queen Consort and Royal Family, may he happily come unto Thee who art the way, the truth, and the life. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

I am sure the hon. gentleman has never said half as much as that for the Royal Family. It does not do simply to boast of your loyalty; you must prove it, and the men who have been offering their lives upon the altar of sacrifice have been proving their loyalty in a far greater way than many of those who are traducing them to-day. Sir, it is true that in this country there are disloyal men; but those who are disloyal are not the ones that are sometimes attacked for disloyalty. They are neither the Catholics nor the French Canadians; they are not the majority of those who sit on this side of the House. No. They are the very few men who, on the other side of the House are always ready and eager to sling mud and heap censure on those who do not share their views.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GLADU: I do not mention anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's language is certainly not parliamentary.

Mr. GLADU: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I deeply regret at this moment my unfortunate unfamiliarity with the English language. It would afford me an opportunity of saying about the same thing in other words. What I want to say, however, is simply this: Those who are disloyal to the Empire are not those who are attacked to-day, but rather those who seize every opportunity that presents itself to spread dissension and create disunion in this country. They are the disloyal men. There are, I think, but few hon. gentlemen in this House who hold the conviction that the British flag is not wide enough to afford shelter and protection to every British subject in this country. What is the ambition of those who are always attacked? Our ambition is very simply stated.

Our aim is to create a great country in Canada; we have no other ambition. We want to respect the convictions of others and we pray those who do not share our convictions to be kind and generous enough not to attack at any moment without any reason whatever.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I intend to occupy the time of the House for a very few minutes only and in doing so I wish to say in agreement with the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gladu), that discussions and statements which have to deal with religious dissentions are very disagreeable to me. It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of that kind to-night or to follow the hon. member through the more or less rambling remarks that he made. I would also like to say that I do not belong to either of those orders to which he made reference at the beginning, but I want to make these few remarks as one who belongs to the soldiers of this country, and in doing so I want to remind hon. members that the resolution before the House deals with what purported to be an evasion of the Military Service Act. I do not say that these charges are true or that they are not true, but I do say that when we ask for an investigation into the truth of these matters we are doing a kindness to that institution if the remarks of those who speak for it are correct. This is not an outrageous question or one which should not have come before the people or Parliament of this country. The impression has gone forth that the facts as alleged are true, and it is the duty of every honest man who has the good of his country at heart to have the truth of this matter cleared up, no matter who is injured in the clearing up of it.

I want also to state that these charges go a little farther than that; they involve a minister of the Crown. We have had read on the floor of this House to-day what I take to be a denial by the hon. the Minister

of Justice (Mr. Doherty) that he had any part in this affair. I fully believe that not one shadow of suspicion will eventually rest upon any one in authority here. I cannot believe, for example, that the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) would have been for one second a party to allowing any body of men to violate the spirit or the letter of the Military Service Act.

That brings me to the point that I rose to-night to make. We must be very guarded about interference in these affairs by any one in authority. Some of us fought the election a year ago on the Military Service Act or conscription. We did so because we thought that equality of service was the basis of all democracy and that we should get more equal service under that Act. We might have been wrong. Hon. members in this House may differ with me honestly on that question, but I do not believe that any man will differ from me when I say that a greater injustice could not exist in any country than that conscription having been adopted you could take the poor man's boy and let the rich man's boy get off free, or that any one with authority or influence could keep his boy or some of his friends from coming under the working of the Act. Because we tried to enforce this Act with an honesty and fairness worthy of a democratic people, I rose to make these few remarks and I say that the Government did right when they placed this matter for investigation in the hands of one of the judges of the country. Every one interested will profit by it. The Novitiate itself has every reason to profit by it if the statements of its representatives are true. The minister involved stands to profit by it because there is no denying the fact that there is suspicion abroad. It is the duty of the country and of Parliament to remove the stigma which has been cast on the good name of Canada and in doing this let us be honest and fair.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, living in an adjoining county to the county of Wellington, in which the Novitiate is situated, I think it is proper that I should represent the sentiment which exists in my county. I want to mention a few things in regard to which we have had a lot of trouble. In the town of Orangeville, the county town, there were half a dozen young men arrested for not having their exemption papers with them, in some cases young married men. These young men were not allowed to go aboard the train with their wives and children. They were held there until they got their exemption papers sent from their homes. These were cases of young men who were really exempted under the Order in Council of the 20th April last year but it was weeks and weeks before they could be got off. We tried to explain this to the people. I wrote to the Minister of Militia (Major General Mewburn) in several cases and said that these people did not come under the Military Service Act but the reply to my letter was that "This is out of our hands; the officer commanding at the headquarters of the district is the one to apply to." We could get very little satisfaction in some cases. In the midst of it this trouble came about at the Novitiate. I do not wish to say a word about this Novitiate because it is a Catholic institution and I was very sorry to hear the last speaker on the Opposition side of the House (Mr. Gladu) get up with the anger that he did because there was religion in this question. Then he started to repeat some very fine prayer and wound up with desperate anger again. I really thought when he was reading that prayer that he represented quite a number of people in Canada who thought it was far safer to be behind a solid stone wall praying than to be facing the mouth of a cannon. You can understand our feelings when we found that inside twenty-four hours orders were given exempting those in that one institution, whether these men were exempt under the law or not, and that these orders came direct from Ottawa, not from Toronto or London, instructing the officers at Guelph that proceedings were to be called off and an apology made. If the Minister of Militia undertakes to apologize for every young man who was unlawfully taken against the Military Service Act it will take him at least six months to write these apologies. There were young men in the county of Dufferin that I wrote to Ottawa about and each one of them got exemption only after from three to six weeks' hard work. I do not think there was any need of that. In many cases the law went to extremes. I honestly believe in the resolution before the House to-day if the Government is honest in dealing with it. I believe it is in the interest of all churches and of all classes represented in this House. If I believed that an institution or class with which I was connected had done wrong I would be the first to try to have the stigma removed from them; I would be the man that would be asking for an investigation. Why should not the parties interested in this matter feel the same way? It has been admitted to-day, I think by the Minister of Militia, that the

men concerned in this case had not their discharge papers, nor any papers that would set them free. Under the circumstances I think they should have been held for military service just as any other young man was.

Now let me deal for a moment with what the Acting Minister of Justice has told us to-day. I will frankly admit that when this Military Service Bill was being brought down I was one of a few members that went to the Minister of Justice and asked that the divinity student clause be stricken out, and I will tell hon. gentlemen why I did so. I know boys that were raised right beside where I live, who had gone to college and been there for from two to three years ready to be ordained. Did they wait for exemption when the call came for their services? No, as soon as the war started they heard the call, they volunteered to go to the front, and the universities and colleges of Ontario were consequently almost stripped of men. Afterwards the Bill was introduced containing the divinity student clause to exempt all the young men that were in college. Was that a fair thing to do? Is there a man to-day in this country who will stand up and say that it was honest and fair to the rest of Canada? I deplore the fact that Protestantism and Catholicism have been made an issue in this matter to-day. Some of the very best friends I have in the county of Dufferin to-day are Catholics. There are Catholic friends of mine in that county that had two sons and a daughter go overseas. I know of hon. gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House whose only sons have fallen in the war. Those men deserve credit, but why should we—because somebody has done wrong, or is supposed to have done wrong, no matter what church they belong to—shut our eyes to what is alleged to be an evasion of the law? I was somewhat surprised when the Acting Minister of Justice told us to-day that there was a provision in the Act to the effect that so long as young men had got into a college or university they were free from the operation of the Act. I cannot understand that. We could well have left in the divinity student clause if we had understood that we were going to be misled in that way. What was told us, and what was distinctly understood, in this House, was that unless a young man had been in a college for two, three, or four years—I do not remember the exact period now—and was about to be ordained, that he would be liable under the Military Service Act.

[Mr. Best.]

Why should fault be found with some hon. members in this House in asking that there should be a fair and honest investigation? For my part I cannot see why there should not be such an inquiry. I do not think that the investigation that has so far been held can be so designated. The Minister of Militia told us to-day that he inquired as well as he could. But he heard only one side of the story, and, of course, it was denied. I am not saying whether that was, or was not, right, but I do say that when men such as the members of this Ministerial Association, men who did their utmost to help the Militia Department of Canada, and to help Canada, to get all the young men they could for service overseas, are asking for a fair and honest investigation, I cannot see why it should not be granted? I hope that when the investigation is granted that it will take place with open doors, that there will be nothing covered up, and that nothing will be done but what is just and right. If the people who are now accused are exonerated they should have every reason to feel satisfied. I tell hon. gentlemen plainly that no member of this House will feel more satisfied than I if I can go to those who have complained to me that justice is not being done and tell them, "The complaint was only hearsay, it was only a report. A fair and honest investigation has been held into the conduct of the persons charged, and it has been found that they did not do wrong, but did their duty."

Mr. W. A. BOYS (Simcoe South): This afternoon I had no intention of making any remarks in connection with the matter now engaging the attention of the House. I have not had the opportunity of reading the file in this case, and for that reason do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the various matters involved, but I happen to have in my possession a copy of a report made by Captain Macauley to his superior officer, dated London, June 10, 1918. I mentioned the matter to the Minister of Militia to ascertain if there was any objection to placing that report on the pages of Hansard, and he replied there was none whatever. It did seem to me, as the debate progressed, that as Captain Macauley was not here to make a statement himself, and as he had been severely censured for what he had done, it was only fair that the House should know what he has to say regarding this matter. It is true that the case will be investigated by a royal commission, but that will not result in the report being printed in Hansard unless it is placed there during the

course of this debate, at all events, not in all probability. I therefore rise merely for the purpose of reading the report to which I have referred.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the document? Is it a report?

Mr. BOYS: It is headed "Investigation and Report re Bedford Farm, Guelph, Ontario." I understand it is the same institution that is under discussion here. The report is from Captain A. C. Macauley to Major J. Hirsch, his senior officer, as I understand:—

Sir:—Acting under your instructions I proceeded to Guelph on the 7th inst., and on arrival made arrangements to visit the marginally noted farm. I arrived there about 8.20 p.m.—"Bedford Farm time," they do not adhere to the daylight saving time—accompanied by Inspector Minard, C.S.B., Sergt.-Major Garner, C.M.P.C., one Sergeant C.S.B., and six constables. I took the precaution to place (3) three men at points that would enable them to see if any one left the buildings while the investigation was being made. I asked for someone in authority and was informed that the rector would be down in a moment. The rector came and I introduced myself, informing him of the object of the visit. I asked to see all the men of military age who were stopping at the farm, and after satisfying him that I had the authority to request same, he agreed to have them all assemble in the dining room, which was the only room large enough for the purpose. About this time a Father Hinkson appeared on the scene and asked again for my authority. I asked him who he was and why he was wearing military uniform with the rank of captain. He stated that he had been to France, attached to the 5th Art. Division as chaplain. He tried to prevent any investigation being made, although he admitted being only a guest at the farm. However, he phoned a lawyer by the name of Kerwin, and a Judge Hayes. The latter advised him not to put any obstacles in my way and asked if I would speak to him, Judge Hayes, over the phone. During the conversation Judge Hayes told me that he had advised Father Hinkson that it would be wiser to help rather than hinder me, in carrying out my instructions, if he was satisfied that I was Captain Macauley as I represented myself to be. I might state here that Father Hinkson told Judge Hayes that he had no reason whatever to doubt my identity.

After all this delay the previous arrangement was carried out and all were assembled in the dining room. During the time that the men were assembling, two tried, unsuccessfully, to leave the building by a window. The men assembled were questioned by Inspector Minard and myself. Three of the men I examined I had detained for further examination, as they appeared to me to be defaulters under the Act.

About this time I was informed that Mr. Doherty of Ottawa, father of one of the guests at the farm, wished to speak to me. During the conversation, Mr. Doherty stated that he was the Minister of Justice and ordered me to stop all action, saying I had no right to be in Bedford Farm making any investigation. As I was acting under instructions from my C.O., I told Mr. Doherty that I could not take any instructions from him that would in any way interfere with the carrying out of my instructions. He then asked me if I would at least suspend further action until he communicated with General Mewburn, the Minister of Militia. This request I complied with. Sometime later I received a phone call from General Ashton, Adjutant General, Ottawa, instructing me to suspend any further action other than to make a thorough investigation, and forward to him a complete report, and that he was informing the A.P.M. London, that such instructions had been given me. This was confirmed later by a wire from A.P.M., M.D. No. 1.

I am attaching a list of names of men of military age, who are living at Bedford Farm, together with their ages and the dates that they became guests at the farm, not one of them registered under the M.S.A. I am firmly convinced that the majority of these men are defaulters under the Act, and in support of my belief, I submit for your consideration the following information I gleaned from the "Rector" himself.

1. Any young man may enter the place providing he is in good health and has his matriculation.

2. He pays no fees and receives no salary for any work he does on the farm.

3. He signs no agreements whatever and is under no obligation of any kind.

I have since learned that parapraph 3 is not altogether accurate; that an obligation is taken which compels the young man in question to renounce home, so to speak, and remain with the institution. It is only fair to state that. The letter continues :

4. He may stay any length of time or he can leave any time he chooses at his own discretion.

5. He may take certain studies, which would eventually admit him to the priesthood after fifteen years.

6. He would not necessarily be ordained a priest though he lived there a lifetime.

In view of this information, I contend that these people do not come within the meaning of Para. 6, Schedule of Exemptions on page 26,—

I think he means "exceptions" when he says that.

—Red Book of Instructions dealing with Deserters and Absentees without leave. Should my interpretation of this paragraph be wrong, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that all young men of military age could avail themselves of the opportunities thus presented by institution of this kind, for the express purpose of evading military service. It seems to me Sir, that it is of vital importance that a ruling regarding this case be obtained without delay.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servent,

A. C. Macauley,

Captain.

To complete his report I shall read the list of names attached thereto. I am told —and I have no reason to doubt the reliability of the information—that this list

of names was obtained by him at the institution on the night in question.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, the next day.

Mr. BOYS: I am only stating what my information is: I am not saying whether it is correct or not, although I have no reason to doubt it. Possibly the member for Victoria is correct. The list of names follows:

Name in full.	Date of birth.	Date entered Bedford Farm.
Jos. Marchand	July 12th, 1896	July 30th, 1915 (claims American citizenship).
Vincent Morrison	March 6th, 1898	September 8th, 1916.
Ignatius Leaver	August 2nd., 1897	September 20th, 1916 (claims American citizenship).
Frederick Nell	February 24th, 1895	September 23rd, 1916.
Wm. McTague	February 12th, 1899	September 22nd, 1916.
Albert Vadelbonceur	August 21st, 1897	October 4th, 1916 (claims American citizenship).
Eugene Chabot	July 20th, 1896	November 11th, 1916.
J. O. Doyon	December 1st, 1897	July 30th, 1917.
Chas. Garrell	September 16th, 1899	July 30th, 1917.
Geo. Nunan	July 9th, 1896	August 14th, 1917.
Chas. Pieper	February 6th, 1899	September 7th, 1917 (claims American citizenship).
John Holland	December 2nd, 1896	November 12th, 1917.
Jas. Dalton	August 12th, 1894	December 7th, 1915.
Chas. Kelly	July 29th, 1890	November 12th, 1915.
John Moore	July 16th, 1896	September 19th, 1915.
John Roach	September 2nd, 1897	January 21st, 1916.
Ladislas White	October 8th, 1892	September 6th, 1913.
Patrick Connolly	August 10th, 1898	September 16th, 1917.
John O'Halloran	February 12th, 1897	March 2nd, 1918 (claims American citizenship).
Marcus Doherty	December 31st, 1898	March 30th, 1918.
Andrew Schmidt	January 13th, 1898	April 2nd, 1918.
John Penfold	February 19th, 1901	April 12th, 1918.
Raymond Sutton	May 2nd, 1899	April 26th, 1918.
Patrick Ryan	October 17th, 1899	May 18th, 1918.
Chas Smith	March 27th, 1898	May 29th, 1918.
Leo. Fitzgerald	July 11th, 1896	August 14th. 1916 (claims American citizenship).
Dominic Pesant	August 3rd, 1895	June 28th, 1916.
Origenes Dubreuil	December 9th, 1898	September 7th, 1916.
Peter Bela	June 5th, 1890	June 23rd, 1917.
Emile Fortier	April 14th, 1897	August 14th, 1914.

Mr. BOYCE: How many names are there in that statement?

Mr. BOYS: Thirty.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be able to add anything of value to this discussion, but I desire as a Protestant to express my sincere sorrow that the Ministerial Association of Guelph found it necessary to meddle in this regrettable affair. I suppose that the Ministerial Association is composed of Protestant Ministers, and I should like to feel that they were engaged in spreading the gospel of peace rather than doing police and detective work in connection with the Military Service Act. I cannot for the life of me understand why an association of clergymen would want to interfere with the administration of the Military Service Act when the country was filled with officers of all descriptions whose duty it was to attend to that duty.

Suppose we put the boot on the other foot. Suppose an Association of Roman Catholic clergymen—Jesuits, if you like, but Roman Catholic clergymen—held a meeting at some point and passed a resolution inviting the military officers to make a raid on some Protestant theological institution, Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist. You can imagine the wild scene that would follow in the office of the Orange Sentinel and the speeches that would be made in the school houses and lodges throughout Ontario.

The member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) expressed regret that the Minister of Militia (Major General Mewburn) had apologized for this unjustifiable raid. In my judgment, the Minister of Militia did just what any gentleman would do. I regret that the member for Dufferin does not himself see it in that way. What else could the Minister of Militia do? We must all admit that what was done was certainly very roughly done. Captain Macauley the officer in charge acted with unusual and unnecessary severity, and it was right

that the Minister of Militia should frankly and promptly express his regret. I wish to be permitted to assure my Catholic fellow citizens, both in this House and out of it, that the spirit which instigated this raid is, I hope peculiar to the district around the town of Guelph and to certain places in the province of Ontario. Thank God it does not exist generally throughout Canada, and I am certain that it does not exist at all in the province from which I come. Speaking for the Protestants of my province, I wish to say that they desire to accord to our Catholic fellow citizens the same respect and freedom that they claim for themselves. I was pleased to learn from the acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) that after a careful and thorough investigation the charges against the Jesuit college at Guelph were found to be unfounded, and that there was not in the institution a single man who was liable for military service. If that be the case,—and no hon. member has any just reason to doubt it—one wonders why this investigation is asked for and why it is granted. I trust this step is not being taken for the purpose of giving further annoyance to those worthy citizens who have already been very badly used. After hearing the speeches of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) and the Acting Minister of Justice, both of whom assured the House that there was nothing to investigate, I was disappointed that they should end up by saying that they had decided to grant a Royal Commission. I understand, however, there is no objection on the part of the Jesuit Order to have a full and thorough investigation and that they are quite ready to meet it. What justification, let me ask, can there be for the insulting manner in which this raid was carried out? Can any fair minded man justify it? Why was it necessary to go there in the night time? Why did the officer not go there in a manly and soldierly way in the daytime and ask the principal of the college for the names and ages of the boys and of the other residents of the institution? Surely that would have been the proper and decent manner in which to carry out his duties as a military officer. The whole proceedings are to my mind contemptible. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that on that particular night the only man in the Novitiate fit for military duty was a returned soldier who had a good record at the front and who had lost a brother on the battlefield. One can imagine the feelings of this man at the treatment his associates were receiving at the hands of the Government that he had served with so much courage and at such a sacrifice! The hon member for Maisonneuve also referred to the splendid record that the students of the various Jesuit Colleges throughout Canada had made in this war. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the time of the last election an unfortunate slander was spread throughout the country that the clergy, that were expelled from France during recent years and that had come to Canada, were instigating people to resist the Military Service Act and that they were not loyal and were not doing their duty as good citizens of this country. I have the honour of having a monastery in the county which I represent. Most of the Brothers in that monastery were men who had left France for the reason I have mentioned and who had been residents of Canada for some years, but as soon as war broke out, every one of those men of military age started for Halifax in order to take passage to France and join the colours, and some of them I am told made the supreme sacrifice. I am not familiar with the clergy in other institutions of that kind, but I know what happened in my own constituency and there is in that constituency no class of men whom I have more reason to be proud of than the fathers and brothers belonging to the monastery at Tracadie. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has also told us that 35 students of one of those very Jesuit institutions laid down their lives on the battlefields of France and Flanders, amongst them being his own brave son. Surely that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite who are pressing for this investigation. I regret that my hon. friend the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) deemed it necessary to make this motion, and all I wish to say is that this discussion if it will do nothing else, will serve to vindicate the character of those worthy men whose only fault is that they belong to a different faith from that of some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): I am very pleased to learn that the Government are going to have an investigation. I have listened very carefully to the speeches that have been delivered this afternoon, and the whole trend of some of them has been to shelter a certain number of men in the town of Guelph. It was asserted that Ontario had promised to raise a certain number

of men and that it had not done its duty. Some people in the province may not have done their duty, but they constitute only a very small percentage. The largest percentage of those who have not done their duty has been in the Novitiate at Guelph, and hon. members, instead of trying to whitewash those men, should ask why they did not come out like loyal citizens and be examined by the medical officers rather than take shelter behind the doors of the Novitiate. We are told that Captain Macauley followed his instructions and that he should apologize for an order given by the Minister of Militia. I think he did his duty very well. We are all British people and it takes all nationalities, it takes the people of Quebec, the people of Ontario and the people of the other provinces to make this Dominion of Canada, and so far as I know, a large number of those of French origin who went to the front did their duty like men. That will be admitted by all. But when an hon. gentleman shakes his finger at us and tells us what we in Ontario are, I ask him what he will do with the 40,000 slackers in the province of Quebec? There is not a swamp in Quebec from the Ottawa river to the Arctic circle that is not full of these slackers, and what has been done to those who have been caught? They have been fined $5 or let off. If, on the other hand, a slacker is caught in Ontario, he is fined from $100 to $500 and deprived of his right and privilege of voting in this Dominion. Hon. members instead of finding fault with Ontario and lauding up their own race —and, I hope, not religion because there is no religion in this matter so far as I am concerned—let them clear their own door and get rid of those slackers in Quebec before they point the finger of scorn at the people of any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to have to take part in this discussion. I think the subject should not have been introduced in this House at all. I think Parliament is a little too broad to be devoting its time to a matter that, boiled down, amounts to nothing more or less than this: Catholic versus Protestant. Let us end this quickly. I am not a very good Catholic, though I try to be one. I am somewhat like the Irishman who, when asked by an Englishman what he would be if he could not be an Irishman, replied, "I would be ashamed of myself." Let us get rid of this discussion. I have read the history of the Jesuits from the days of Ignatius Loyola down to the present time, and I say this: There never was a Jesuit yet who was afraid to have his life exposed to the world. Let us settle this by investigating.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. member for Cape Breton South says that he sees in this debate nothing more or less than a difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant. All I have to say with regard to that remark is that I think his eyesight is very bad. I regret it, because I have a kindly feeling for my hon. friend, and I should like to think his physical condition was of the best.

Mr. BUTTS: I have no glasses on, you will notice.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would suggest that he put glasses on before he make a statement of that kind. The speech of the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Gladu) reminded me of a story I heard once about an old Scotch preacher who took for his text: "The devil goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour." The preacher divided his subject under three heads. He said: "We will ask, first, who the devil he was; secondly, where the devil he was going, and thirdly, what the devil he was roaring about." As I listened to my hon. friend from Yamaska I thought I might very well ask him what he was roaring about, and whom he was seeking to devour. It did not seem to me that this discussion should have aroused in him such an ebullition of youthful feeling as he exhibited here to-night. He has spoken of this institution and that college, and carried us to practically every Jesuit institution in the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, giving us the name of the person in charge and reciting some of the prayers which are said for the King and the Royal Family. The hon. gentleman said that prayers alone were not enough, that loyalty must be proved by acts as well as words. I was glad to hear him say that because I think when the enlistment figures from certain parts of this country came to His Majesty's ears he might be excused for asking for something more substantial than prayers. The hon. member himself is entitled to special consideration, because he is a very great friend of the soldiers. He has told us so himself, and I am not disposed to dispute his statement; in fact, I think the figures bear him out. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was so popular with the soldiers at the

last election that he received every soldier vote that was polled in his county, and there are not many members here who can make that boast. The polling of those votes indicated, to a certain degree at all events, what the county of Yamaska did in backing up its prayers by acts. I have said the hon. member received all the soldier votes that were cast in his riding, the total number was eight.

Referring to one of the Jesuit institutions in the province of Quebec, I think at Montreal, he said that before some of the students attending that Jesuit college started for overseas the reverend head of the college called the students together and made a brief addresss. I caught a few words which my hon. friend quoted from that address. He said that the reverend head said to the boys: "You have heard that conscription is a bad law, that it is a curse; do not listen to such words." I should like to ask my hon. friend where the students of that particular college could possibly have heard words like those. Were they carried down from the province of Ontario? Who made use of such words? If they were made use of, it must have been by some person whom the head of the college thought the boys would listen to and be influenced by. I think I am justified in asking my hon. friend to tell us who made use of those words.

Mr. GLADU: Certainly. The words were used by those who were the anti-British champions in 1910 and 1911, and who since that date have become, with their friends, ministers of the Crown. They breathed in 1917 the same spirit throughout the province of Quebec as they breathed in 1911.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was very glad to see hon. members opposite endorse the answer given by the hon. gentleman. He said that persons who made use of these expressions were people of anti-British tendencies in the province of Quebec.

Mr. GLADU: I do not understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend said that the persons who had declared the conscription law to be a bad law were anti-British people. Well, we shall see how this statement applies. I desire to read a few words which were uttered by Archbishop Begin, the senior archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church of Quebec, and published broadcast throughout that province as the expression of his opinion of the conscription law. My hon. friend says that those who deemed conscription a bad thing were the anti-British. I shall now read what the senior archbishop of the province of Quebec said concerning the law.

Mr. GLADU: Will my hon. friend pardon me. I—

Mr. EDWARDS: I knew my hon. friend would squirm.

Mr. GLADU: I never said that.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend sees the necessity for a disclaimer, but he committed himself before I undertook to read this. He is like many boys and youthful members; he is rather prone to say what he does not mean. He allowed himself to be carried away by the vehemence of his own eloquence, and said things that he will find it rather difficult to back up, even in Quebec. Now may I be permitted to place on Hansard the statement of the senior archbishop of the province of Quebec in regard to the conscription law. He said:

10 p.m.

This conscription law is a menace which causes the Canadian clergy the worst apprehensions.

This military service, as it is proposed, or at least as we are enabled to judge from the speeches and statements its discussions have provoked, is not only a serious blow to the rights of the Church of Christ, independent in its domain, and whose laws and practice exempt the clergy and that class of the society which that name designates from the service under arms.

Mr. GLADU: Is it signed?

Mr. EDWARDS: Certainly.

Mr. GLADU: By whom is it signed?

Mr. EDWARDS: The senior archbishop of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER: What paper is the hon. member quoting from? Is it the Sentinel?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not sure whether it was printed in the Sentinel or not, but it is not taken from the Sentinel. The paper from which I took it was the Kingston Standard. Let me quote some more.

The clause as it is written might lose some of its ill if it were interpreted in the spirit of the Church. But what guarantees have we that the members of the special tribunals will be all Catholics, enlightened and good-willed, capable of pronouncing with sincerity and knowledge on a question of its importance?

If we judge by the very crude knowledge revealed by certain speeches made in the Commons, one may, indeed, fear that some legisla-

tors, so little ill-willed, may not make a choice that we would approve, and here is what legitimatizes all the fears.

I have given you the words of the senior archbishop of Quebec, in regard to conscription. Do my hon. friends opposite deny that he made use of those words? Does any hon. gentleman opposite say that he did not issue a statement to the press of this country? Now, notwithstanding those remarks of the archbishop, I am not prepared to go as far as the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Gladu) who characterized as anti-British every one that was opposed to this law and regarded it as a bad law; but I do say that the utterances of a man in the high position of the archbishop in question in regard to the conscription law—such utterances as I have read, and similar assertions by other dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in this country—are to a certain extent responsible for the doubts that existed in the minds of Canadians in regard to the situation in the Guelph Novitiate. That cannot be gainsaid. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux)——

Some hon. MEMBERS: For what?

Mr. EDWARDS: Maisonneuve.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What?

Mr. EDWARDS: I shall take another constituency the name of which is more easily pronounced. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), I will say. To one who has not the advantage of being able to speak the French language with the accuracy and the fluency with which I would like to speak it, it is exceedingly convenient to refer to a member who represents two or three constituencies, for it gives him a choice in names. I will therefore refer to my hon. friend as the member for Gaspé. He gave expression to his usual wail in regard to the Military Service Act and the usual condemnation of the Minister of Militia for the message he sent to the farmers of the country. It strikes me as coming with extremely bad grace from any hon. gentleman on the opposite side from the province of Quebec or any of the Maritime Provinces to refer to the Military Service Act. Under the Act about 85,000 men were obtained. If the province of Quebec had done its duty and had supplied by voluntary enlistment its share in proportion to population as Ontario and the Western Provinces did, there would not have been any Military Service Act for it would have been unnecessary. It is very well for the hon. member for Gaspé or some other hon. member from the province of Quebec to refer to the matter of conscripting farmers in Ontario and the Western Provinces, but Ontario had sent overseas thousands of farmers to take the place of farmers who stayed at home in Quebec and who were advised to do so by persons who should have shown a different disposition. I am not saying for one moment that the hon. member for Gaspé advised men to stay at home, but I do say that there were persons who gave expressions to opinions such as those of the senior archbishop of the province of Quebec which I have read and which induced or influenced thousands of young men in that province to stay at home and thereby accentuated the farming difficulties in Ontario and the Western Provinces.

The hon. member for Gaspé pleads for the minority. Well, I suppose that every church you could mention in Canada is a minority, whether it is Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, Anglican, Methodist, or whatever it may be. But I would like it to sink deeply into his heart that there are duties and responsibilities devolving upon minorities just as much as upon majorities. I do not think that any person who has read and studied the history of this country can claim that harshness has characterized everything that has been done towards the minority. They have been treated with generosity. There is no desire on the part of any person to persecute the people connected with the Guelph Novitiate.

What is the situation? Captain Macauley has come in for a great deal of criticism. He did not use tact, it is said; he did not use good judgment, and so on. His lack of tact or judgment has not been specially mentioned. He went there not at the dead of night. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) should travel a little, should come further west. He will find out that in June it is not dark at eight or nine o'clock in the evening. Captain Macauley went to this institution in daylight, in civilian clothes, as he says, so as not to attract special attention to the carrying out of his orders. He did not go of his own accord. He went because he was ordered to go, and the Minister of Militia told us this afternoon that he had information from what he considered a most reliable source that there were men in the institution who were liable to military service. Acting upon that information, I presume, he or some other person, ordered that investigation as he had a perfect right to do. It does seem to me that all the trouble could have been avoided on the evening on which Captain Macauley

made his visit if, when he made known the reason for his visit, the head of the institution had called the students together at once and said: "Here they are; if there are any men liable for military service, I am not aware of the fact; question them for yourself." That would have been the simple and proper course for him to have taken.

Why was there any holding back? I fail to see the reason why. Will any person tell me that because a student happens to be an inmate of a certain institution he is exempted, or should be exempted, because of that fact? That is something I am sure no person will attempt to argue in cool blood. It is something I am not prepared to accept. I do not see any reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should profess such annoyance because of the investigation of the institution. The Minister of Militia understood from a reliable source that there were men there who were liable to military service and the order was given to make an investigation. Captain Macauley goes up to make that investigation. The wires are set to work and he is told to leave the instution and let the fellows stay there.

The Minister of Militia, in his letter of June 11,—I think it was—to the head of the institution shortly after the so-called raid, said: that the whole question of the liability of these students was being given consideration by the Justice Department. If there was doubt in regard to the liability of the men in this institution to service, why was an investigation ordered until that doubt was cleared up? Why is it when the matter was in doubt and being investigated by the Justice Department that the so-called raid was made? It seems to me that if it was a matter which had not been definitely settled as to whether the students were liable or not there should not have been any orders given for an investigation until the doubt was cleared away. There was not only a matter of doubt then, but there appears to be a matter of doubt now, as to whether these young men were liable for service or not.

I am glad that the Government intimated its entire willingness to have an investigation. I am glad for two particular reasons. If you like, there are two classes in the country concerned. If you like, there is a difference of opinion between Roman Catholics on the one side and Protestants on the other. Certainly, there are some people who think there has been favouritism shown to certain ones in that institution and I think it advisable that that impression should be dispelled. The statement has been made here that none in this institution were liable to military service. I think that is another reason why there should be an investigation. It is decidedly in the interest, not only of this particular institution but of general harmony in the country, that there should be a full, fair and complete investigation which will remove any doubts that may exist in any person's mind as to whether any favouritism has been shown in regard to the students in this institution or not. That is the reason why I commend the action of the Government in granting an investigation. I think they have taken the proper course in withholding this investigation until the return of the Minister of Justice who is particularly concerned. I do not think anybody will object to that for a moment. That is only fair play, and it is fair play that wins in the long run.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, it had been my firm intention not to take any part in this debate. I now rise simply for the purpose of correcting, for the public benefit, a statement which has just been made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) with reference to the hierarchy and Cardinal Begin of Quebec. My hon. friend is certainly not aware of the very commendable manner in which Cardinal Begin acted at the beginning of the recent great war. I have no authority to speak on behalf of Cardinal Begin, but we happen to be very closely related, being the sons of sisters, and knowing the Cardinal's sentiments with respect to the great war, I feel that I would not be doing my duty if I were to allow the hon. member for Frontenac's remarks with respect to the Cardinal to pass unchallenged. My hon. friend has stated what Cardinal Begin is supposed to have said with respect to the clause affecting students of the church in Canada. The clause in question was one which had been inserted by the Prime Minister in the original Bill exempting clerical students from military service, and which was adopted in modified form by the Prime Minister at the instigation of some hon. members on this side. It was while that clause was under discussion that Cardinal Begin gave expression to his opinions with respect to its possible effects in relation to divinity students. But my hon. friend has not seen fit to direct the attention of the House, or of the country, to what Cardinal Begin had done since the outbreak of hostilities to induce the young men of his province and of his diocese to make the necessary sacrifice in order to enlist

and rally to the support of the British Empire and of the Allies in Belgium and France. Had my hon. friend put the matter at issue honestly and squarely before the House I would not have intervened in these proceedings. I have only done so in order to give this explanation and in order that Cardinal Begin might not rest under the imputation of being opposed to Canada's participation in the war and of not having done his full duty, not only as a British subject, but as a prince of the church in Canada. My object is to make the point clear and unmistakable for the benefit of the people of Canada, and more particularly the people of Ontario, so that the friends of those hon. gentlemen who brought forward this motion cannot plead that the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec, or other Catholic dioceses, have not done their duty in that regard; when it is the fact that their addresses to their people should be yet fresh in the memory of every member of the House and of the people of Canada as well.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): I have listened with considerable interest to this whole debate. At times I doubted whether I should take part in it, and at other moments I felt the impulse to say a few words. To my mind, and I know that hon. gentlemen upon the opposite side who do not agree with all the sentiments that have been expressed this afternoon will also say so, the debate has been somewhat rambling.

The hon. member for Frontenac who spoke a few moments ago has an unhappy way of saying things. It is not so much what he says, but the manner in which he says it, that is particularly displeasing to hon. members from the province of Quebec. I would like to tell the hon. gentleman—and we have perhaps had a tilt or two in the last twelve years—that I have given up all hope of him. If I had any influence in the right quarter, I would ask that the prayers that were read this afternoon might be somewhat amended, so that not only would we pray for His Majesty the King, the Queen Consort, and the Royal Family, but that we might also add a prayer for the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. EDWARDS: I suppose it would do me about as much good as it does the Royal Family?

Mr. DEVLIN: I suppose even prayers would not have any weight with the hon. gentleman, much less words. The resolution that was introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the statements made public in relation to the Guelph Novitiate during the month of June, 1918, and the circumstances and facts concerning those and other similar charges concerning the evasion by young men and the connivance of others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act and other Acts and Orders relating to the upbuilding of the military forces of Canada, it is advisable that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the matter with full authority to examine witnesses under oath, to pay necessary expenses and to report to this House.

In connection with this resolution the hon. member for Frontenac succeeded in making a speech dealing with the soldiers, with the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic church, and succeeded in getting in his customary attacks upon the province of Quebec, and went on to dilate upon the subject in his own inimitable style. My thoughts were running along a different line. As I read the resolution I saw more in it than an attack upon the Guelph Novitiate. I saw also these words:

> and the connivance of others to defeat the ends and aims of the Military Service Act and other Acts and Orders relating to the up-building of the military forces in Canada.

I do not know if it is the intention of the Government to allow my hon. friend from Victoria to go to the extent of his resolution, but I find that in glancing over an address which he delivered to his constituents there is this passage:

> More than one year ago an agitation was begun on the question of labour. We were recruiting "too many regiments"; we were "taking too many men away from work"; "munitions manufacturers and others would be at a standstill"; "farmers could not put in their crops"; and "Canada has already done her full duty," were daily recited. They, unfortunately, had an effect upon the Prime Minister. The result was that I was asked in March, 1916, not to press recruiting, and recruiting to-day is, and has been, dead in Canada for fighting purposes. "Safety First," or the useful and well paid, but not dangerous jobs are readily filled; but for the gallant boys in the trenches there is little or no backing.

That, to the casual observer at least, will tally exactly with what the hon. member for Victoria means by "other Acts and Orders relating to the upbuilding of the Military Forces of Canada." Knowing the resourcefulness of my hon. friend from Victoria I just wonder how far he will go with this investigation. Will he, for instance, be allowed the opportunity to investigate the conduct of the leader of the Government?

Will he be allowed to investigate the conduct of my hon. friend who is one of the two Presidents of the Privy Council for Canada? I say "one of the two" Presidents of the Privy Council, not that I mean any disrespect, but because I find by the Auditor General's Report that Canada is graced to-day with two Presidents of the Privy Council, one in his seat in this House, the other abroad, in the person of the Prime Minister. Will he investigate the conduct of one of these? He may wish to investigate the conduct of several other ministers; does the Government intend to give him that latitude? He asks for it in the resolution. Will the member for Victoria be allowed to inquire into the conduct of the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of Canada who protested against their sons being taken? The member for Victoria asks for that. Or, forsooth, will the Government simply say: eliminate everything else and we will give you the right to investigate what the member for West Toronto and the member for Frontenac ask —the conduct of the Guelph Novitiate? Sir, does it seem just, does it seem fair, that every other influence or element that worked against the upbuilding of the military force of Canada should not have its conduct investigated, but that attention should be given solely to this poor little Novitiate in Guelph? I ask in all sincerity; is it because this little Novitiate belongs to the religious minority of this country that their conduct alone should be investigated, not the conduct of every man who tried to prevent the upbuilding of Canada's military force? Surely the Government will allow the member for Victoria to have a thorough and full investigation; surely he, aided I hope by members on both sides of this House, will have a right to go before that Court of Inquiry and examine into the conduct of this one and that one, great or small—because there must be no class difference; all men must be upon the same footing.

Sir, I am not charged by the Jesuit Order of Canada to interfere with an investigation into their conduct. I listened with great pleasure to the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), who does not belong to the same church as the Jesuits, speaking about the pettiness of this investigation into the affairs of one small Novitiate. The voice of the hon. member was pleasing to my ears, for here was one man who, though not belonging to the faith of the minority, urged that all this pettiness be put aside. Time after time the greatest and most eminent statesmen of this country have advocated that these questions be not approached from the standpoint of parish politics, and that all differences between races and creeds be put aside. Would you, Mr. Speaker, not be surprised if I, belonging to the religion of the minority, should ask that the conduct of some particular sect or faith other than my own should be investigated? Hon. gentlemen opposite are of too large mind not to be heartily sick of these petty little attacks against certain people of this country solely because they belong to the religious minority.

We have heard it said to-day that in the province of Quebec, to which most of us on this side belong, we do not understand these petty little attacks. We have there, living in close community and in the very best of good-fellowship, members of different religious beliefs. Never do you hear one gentleman of the province of Quebec make attacks upon the religious minority of the province. The member for West Toronto, I think it was—it may have been the member for Frontenac—said very truthfully that there should be no minority or class of people in this country with privileges that are not extended to others. Make no mistake about it: we advocate that on this side of the House. We ask for no privileges; what we insist upon and what we mean to hold are the rights and the privileges that have been granted to us, not by certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but by the British North America Act of 1867. We do not plead for more extended privileges; we do not plead for any particular rights. We want the constitution protected. We are asked to live upon the rock of the constitution. Sir, we will not try by any means whatever to evade the working of the British North America Act, nor will we brook any interference with the rights that we have under that Act. I say this so that once and for all what is understood by the "Quebec question" may be grasped by even the most ignorant man in the country. That is the Quebec question; it is absolutely nothing more than that.

Occasionally, through the kindness, I assume, of the member for West Toronto, I get a copy of the Orange Sentinel. I read it with great care. I have other friends in the country who send me pamphlets bearing the "no popery" cry; others are kind enough to send me circulars about the damnation of the church to which I belong. I sometimes marvel how it is that I have so many kind friends throughout the country.

I read all these things as much as I possibly can, just as I have listened to this debate to-day about the Jesuits at Guelph. One hon. gentleman said that the conduct of the Jesuits from one end of the country to the other was joint and several with that of all the other colleges in Canada. Do hon. members know who the Jesuits are? They are without exception a band of the cleverest young men in the Dominion of Canada to-day. I do not mean that those who have gone to their schools, or may be graduates from their colleges, are the cleverest young men of the country, but I say, without a moment's hesitation and without fear of contradiction, that the young Jesuit men, who are amongst the teachers of the Catholics and Protestants of this country—because young Protestant gentlemen go to their colleges just the same as Catholics—are amongst the cleverest teachers, if not the cleverest teachers, in the Dominion of Canada. Who are they? Are they some wonderful individuals who have come from some unknown country with some wonderful code of morals, with some precepts that they are trying to instil into the minds of our youth? Not at all. They are young men of the best families of Canada. They follow simply the line of conduct laid down for them by Ignatius Loyola, a young Spanish nobleman, who gave up all the good things of this world to devote his life to education and preaching. Have hon. members ever met them in their constituencies? How many hon. gentlemen not following their faith, when they knew that the Jesuits had come to their town forsooth to preach a mission, have not gone to the church to hear them and have not been amazed at their teaching and their preaching? The Jesuits are not at all a sect by themselves; they are simply a religious order within the Church. They do not make the rules of religion that guide the Catholics. We are guided by the same Christian principles exactly that hon. gentlemen seated on either side of the House who may not worship at the same altar as I do are guided by. They do not profess to teach anything that the Catholic Church does not teach, because, if they did, they would not be allowed to remain members of the Catholic Church. They are simply a community of young men who go out to teach and to preach, nothing more. Why make this onslaught upon them? Is it because Captain Hingston came forward, with the knowledge that he possessed, with the experience that he had gained upon the battlefields of France, to ask forsooth a Captain Macauley to show him his authority for disturbing that community at that hour of the night? I heard the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) say that it was a very seemly hour. It may be a very seemly hour for him or for most of us who work into the small hours of the morning; but, according to their rules, the Jesuits have, I understand, to get up at 4.30 every morning in their lifetime, and their day's work begins then. They save daylight, and they must, of necessity, go to bed very early. Most of them had, I presume, retired, and they were somewhat surprised to be called forth at that hour of the night. The hon. member for West Toronto says that Guelph was shocked. Well, pity for Guelph! If I, carrying a military badge in my pocket, instead of on my breast or somewhere on my uniform, to show my authority, should go during the night into some quiet peaceful home in Guelph and ask for the papers of the inhabitants of that house, let us say it was the home of the hon. member for West Toronto—I know he does not live in Guelph, but let us suppose he did live in Guelph and he could, I presume, live in that city—would he not protest just a little bit? And if he had an officer in his house, would he not ask him to go down and see this gentleman and ask why he should be disturbed at that hour of the night? I think Shakespeare would put it, "Much ado about nothing." To me, however, it seems that hon. members upon the opposite side ought to have sufficient confidence in the Government to believe at least that the investigation that was made by their Government was honest. I did not see the report; I know absolutely nothing about the investigation, and I am not a supporter of the Government, but I think I can trust the word of the leader of the Government when he tells me that the investigation was an honest one and that all the facts were elicited. I am sorry for hon. members opposite if they have not the same confidence in their Government, but if they have not and if they insist upon an investigation, then let it be the widest possible investigation with the full powers asked for by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and I am sure that neither the Jesuits of Guelph nor Father William Hingston will regret at all having an investigation into their or his conduct or the conduct of any branch of the Jesuits. Father Hingston, who has been very frequently spoken of to-day, I know very well. He is the son of one of the most distinguished senators we had in

Canada, whose only fault was that he was a Conservative and was appointed by a Conservative Government. Hon. members will remember, Sir William Hingston, the great surgeon of his day, the eminent gentleman that he was, the true father of brilliant sons who have followed his course and who are fulfilling their duties as eminent citizens of this country.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The Acting Minister of Justice has clearly and accurately stated the position of the Government with reference to this resolution. That position is precisely the same as that which it took when the matter was first formally presented to us in December last by Rev. Mr. Palmer and some other members of the Guelph Ministerial Association and some hon. members who have spoken here to-day. We stated at that time the attitude of the Government towards all charges involving allegations of impropriety or wrong-doing to be that these charges should be investigated; that if a charge was preferred against a minister, the matter should be drawn to the attention of the Prime Minister whose duty it would be to take such action as he deemed expedient; that if allegations were made respecting departmental administration, then appropriate inquiry should be had in such a case. In other words, the attitude of the Government was that, upon all charges definitely formulated by responsible parties, appropriate investigation should follow. We therefore stated to the members of the Ministerial Association and the others who were present with the deputation on the occasion referred to, that if charges were formulated the Government would take action by way of having a proper investigation made. It was necessary, we thought, that there should be a formulation of charges, first, in order to justify the Government in taking action, and secondly, as affording the foundation of allegation upon which a commission could be based. No specific charges were formulated following that interview, but on Thursday night last I received the charges signed by the Rev. Mr. Palmer which were presented here to-day by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and I at once cabled them to the Prime Minister. The acting Minister of Justice has read to the House the reply received from the Minister of Justice, that he would welcome any inquiry by which, in the opinion of his colleagues, the public interest would be served. He stated further, as was read by the acting Minister of Justice, that the imputations made with respect to his action and that of the Department of Justice in respect of the Guelph Novitiate, are entirely baseless. That is the position of the Minister of Justice.

The Minister of Militia and Defence has stated that he also desires an inquiry, and in view of the fact that these charges, or like charges, have attained wide publicity and that there has been a good deal of public discussion of the affair in question, the Government has reached the conclusion that a full investigation should be had through a commission, as stated to-day by the Acting Minister of Justice. That is all I desire to say with reference to the matter, except this: That the hon. member for Victoria, who was obliged to leave for Toronto to-night, asked me before leaving the House to state on his behalf that he accepted the statement of the Acting Minister of Justice, and authorized me to withdraw on his behalf the resolution; which I now beg leave to do.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I had no intention of saying anything upon this very sensitive question that is now before the House, nor do I propose to say very much at this stage. I think it is very regrettable that questions of this character should be brought up in the House of Commons. Questions of a religious character are bound to divide the House along those lines, and it is very regrettable that they should be introduced into this House if they can be otherwise settled. I think the Government is more or less to blame in this connection, in view of the explanation they have given. It is very clear that the resolution put upon the Order Paper by the hon. member for Victoria contains a great many charges, and if one of those charges is to be investigated by the Government every one of them should be investigated. The Government, of course, is responsible for the character of every motion that goes upon the Order Paper and is allowed to come before the House. I am long enough in the House of Commons to know that no motion can get on the Order Paper without going through a certain routine, and if it contains anything objectionable it should not get on the Order Paper. Surely, if there is not enough machinery now to prevent questions of a questionable character appearing on the Order Paper there ought to be some censorship of them. If it is desirable to have censorship of the mails and newspapers and public speakers,

in order to avoid dissension and disorder throughout the country, surely there ought to be some sort of censorship over the matters allowed to come before the House, and I hold the Government responsible to some extent for motions of this character that are allowed to come here for discussion. Before the hon. member for Victoria was allowed to move his motion, there should have been some satisfactory explanation by the acting Minister of Justice or by the acting Prime Minister, by the latter more particularly, that the charges set forth—and they are charges—could be substantiated. It appears that only one of nine or ten charges has been formulated or backed up in such a way as to call for an inquiry, and that one is in connection with the Guelph Novitiate. The charges against that institution are not made by the hon. member for Victoria. They are evidently made by the Ministerial Association, and by the Ministerial Association placed in the hands of the acting Prime Minister. What, in my judgment, should have been the course of the acting Prime Minister was to say to the hon. member for Victoria: "We have charges in our hands from a private source."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not understand that these are charges made by the Guelph Ministerial Association. I understand that they are made by Rev. Mr. Palmer in his individual capacity, and added to, somewhat, by the hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. McKENZIE: That does not change my position at all. Let us say that Rev. Mr. Palmer made these charges himself, and placed them in the hands of the acting Prime Minister with a request for investigation. The acting Minister of Justice tells us that the charges were sufficiently in order to justify him in advising the Prime Minister that they were entitled to an investigation. Well and good. That investigation, I understand, is to be a judicial one, which means that it will take place before one or two judges. My understanding is that the proper course in this or any other country, when an investigation is in shape to go before a properly constituted court, is that open discussion of the matter at issue should cease, particularly in the House of Commons.

It is practically contempt of court, after you have made up your mind that the facts are to be brought out under oath before a judge, to discuss the matter openly anywhere, except, perhaps, in the House of Commons. No newspaper is allowed to make comments on possible evidence that may be given before a court, for in doing so it would be guilty of contempt, the matter being sub judice, and neither the witnesses nor the court must be prejudiced by any previous commentaries in newspapers. I submit that the moment the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister decided that the charges by Rev. Mr. Palmer were to be considered by a court, they should have prohibited any discussion of them in this House and should have suggested to the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) that if he had no other charges than those which were presented to him it would be advisable to leave the discussion of the matter entirely to the tribunal that would investigate it, and thus avoid an open, acrimonious and disagreeable airing of the affair in Parliament. That, I think, is the position the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice should have taken, and it certainly would have been the dignified position. Then we would know that they meant business, and desired the judges to approach the question with clear and open minds, untrammelled by any influence that discussion in the House might bring to bear upon witnesses. For that reason, Sir, I am sorry that the course which I suggest now had not been followed. I am sure that the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), a keen lawyer and practitioner, and many lawyers who are sitting in front of me, will see at once that that would have been the proper and judicial course to take. We should thereby have avoided reaching any conclusions that the facts may not justify.

11 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member not recall that at the close of my remarks I suggested to the hon. member for Victoria that his resolution be withdrawn, and also that at the close of the remarks of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) he did withdraw the resolution?

Mr. McKENZIE: If the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) suggested to the hon. member for Victoria to withdraw the resolution and it was withdrawn, I would like to know what we have been discussing. What has been before the Chair? The whole thing is wrong and irregular.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only time it was withdrawn was when the Acting Prime Minister spoke.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was absent in the early part of the evening, but three or four hon. members have spoken since I came in and I never heard of any other motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not withdrawn before. I simply suggested its withdrawal but the suggestion was not taken up.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then it seems to be a sort of imaginary withdrawal. The minister says it was withdrawn, and still discussion continued. It had no right to be discussed and the whole proceeding was irregular, if the hon. member is correct in saying that he suggests the withdrawal and it was withdrawn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No withdrawal took place until immediately before the hon. gentleman himself rose.

Mr. McKENZIE: There had been a great deal of discussion before I rose. I understand the question was discussed the whole evening on this motion, which I say should have been withdrawn the very moment the Acting Minister of Justice announced the mode by which he intended it should be dealt with. This acrimonious discussion could have been avoided and the investigation of the matter approached in a more proper frame of mind than is possible after the country has been influenced by the discussion that has taken place this evening.

An hon. MEMBER: Why did the hon. gentleman not take his objection at a more appropriate time than now?

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not think that all the wisdom of the House was centered in me, and more than that, I was not here. I was keeping exceedingly quiet until I found that the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) had something to say. I told him I was not going to speak and I thought he would follow suit and say nothing. However, I simply point out what would have been the proper course, and I must say that I have not heard any great argument in support of this investigation. I take the same ground as I took on the resolution with reference to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, that I will take my law from the Acting Minister of Justice in matters of the kind. He has not given any good reason, or any reason that satisfies himself, that there is very much to investigate in this matter. He said he would give permission to Mr. Palmer to reconstruct these charges and possibly put something in them that would hold water, but, as they stood, I understood him to say, there was not much in them. He gave a certificate of character to the Minister of Justice, and expressed the opinion that everything in connection with the matter was satisfactory. Nevertheless he thinks that something should be done to placate the mob, like the judge of old who allowed the populace to choose Barabbas. That, I think, is largely the frame of mind of the minister. There is nothing in it, he says; I find no fault in this man; my hands are clean; let his blood be upon you and your children.

I hope that if the investigation takes place it will be such a one as will do ample justice to all concerned and that the tribunal will be of such a character as to be entirely above the slightest suspicion, and that cleancut justice and fair play will be meted out to all parties.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not be amiss to inform the House that there has been no withdrawal of the motion. The question would have to be put from the Chair and then a withdrawal could only be made with the consent of the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Acting Minister of Justice is wrong then.

Mr. SPEAKER: Strictly speaking, a motion can only be withdrawn at the request of the mover, but I think I may take it for granted, from the statement of the Acting Prime Minister, that he speaks for the hon. member for Victoria I therefore put the question as to whether the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Tuesday, April 8, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 53 to amend the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Bill No. 54 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917.—Sir Thomas White.

Bill No. 55 to change the name of The Canada Accident Assurance Company to The Canada Accident and Fire Assurance Company.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 56 for the relief of Eva St. Lawrence Cronk.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 57 for the relief of Helena Clara Gabriel.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill No. 58 for the relief of Gretna Harris Hawkins.—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

Bill No. 59 for the relief of Samuel Burgoyne.—Mr. Smith (Ontario).

Bill No. 60. for the relief of James Arthur McGregor.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 61 for the relief of William Lewes Evans.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 62 for the relief of Richard Wilson Crashley.—Mr. McMaster.

IMMIGRATION—MENNONITES AND HUTTERITES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): I would like to ask if the Government has received any protests regarding the immigration into Western Canada of Hutterites and Mennonites from the United States; and, if so, what action, if any, has been taken by the Government to meet the situation?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): The hon. Minister of Immigration (Mr. J. A. Calder) is out of town and he has asked me to answer this question, notice of which had been given previously. This is his answer:

The answer to the first part of the question is "Yes." A large number of protests has been received from various parts of Western Canada objecting to the settlement of Mennonites, Hutterites, and other conscientious objectors arriving from the United States.

The protests are based mainly on the following grounds:

(1) That these people are conscientious objectors and as a consequence, will in future claim exemption from military service or endeavour to evade same if called upon;

(2) That they claim special school and language privileges for their children and that they will resist the enforcement of the school laws of the several provinces in which they reside;

(3) That they live in communities and are a detriment to other settlers residing in the same neighbourhood.

As regards these settlers and the action taken or proposed to be taken to deal with the situation, I desire upon behalf of the Government to state:

(1) The great majority of these settlers are citizens of the United States. They are seeking homes in Canada as all American citizens have a right to do under existing laws and regulations.

(2) The Government is not encouraging this particular movement of settlers to Canada.

(3) The Government has not granted to these settlers any special privileges as regards schools or language.

(4) Under the provisions of an Order in Council (P.C. No. 2622), dated October 25, 1918, all Mennonites entering Canada are subject to military service, as provided by existing laws for all residents or citizens of Canada. Such immigrants are not now and never have been entitled to the special privileges granted to Mennonites who settled in Western Canada under the provisions of an Order in Council dated August 13, 1873.

(5) Under the provisions of an Order in Council (P.C. 1676), dated August 12, 1899, Hutterites who entered Canada as settlers any time thereafter were given the fullest assurance of absolute immunity from military service. This Order in Council has been cancelled as regards Hutterites entering Canada in future.

(6) The Government proposes to submit to Parliament at an early date a Bill, the provisions of which will debar all immigrants entering Canada in future to claim exemption from military service on conscientious grounds.

COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—PERSONNEL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Speaker, the creation of a Commission on Industrial Relations has been announced by the Minister of Labour, and the gentlemen mentioned by the papers as commissioners are Chief Justice Mathers, Senator White, Mr. Tom Moore, Mr. Riordon and Mr. John Bruce. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to nominate a French-Canadian member to this commission? I would suggest as a matter of justice, the province of Quebec being the second largest industrial province of the Dominion, and 90 per cent of the labourers in the factories there being French-Canadians, that it would only be fair to have at least one French-speaking member of the commission.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The commission has not yet been created by the Government. I believe the personnel will be announced within the next couple of days.

RECIPROCITY IN COASTING PRIVILEGES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Marine): The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) a few days ago inquired if the United States had refused coasting trade privileges to Canadian shippers in American waters. In response to an inquiry upon the subject I have received from

Washington a message to the following effect:

Advices from our representative for Lakes District indicates apparent scarcity business on Lakes for American ships for this season. Coastwise permits are now almost invariably declined on Atlantic and Pacific coasts only exceptional situation warranting departure from this policy.

By Order in Council the Minister of Customs is permitted to grant coasting privileges to American shipping in Canadian waters. The Order in Council, which is dated the 5th February, 1918, provides:

During the period of the war, until otherwise ordered the Minister of Customs may, under conditions specified by him, authorize collectors of customs to issue licenses permitting vessels of the United States of America to engage in the Coasting Trade of Canada.

Inasmuch as the United States now declines to confer the privilege upon Canadian vessels engaged in their coasting trade, it is contemplated that no further licenses be granted to American shipping for coasting trade in Canadian waters except under very exceptional circumstances. This will place our policy in this regard on a parity with that of the United States.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is the hon. minister aware that a number of armed American vessels are on the Great Lakes at the present time?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not aware of there being any armed vessels on the Great Lakes at the present time. I shall make inquiries and let my hon. friend know to-morrow.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

BILL TO APPOINT A RECEIVER.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that Bill No. 28, to confirm two Orders of the Governor General in Council respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System be read a third time.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, in addition to the remarks that I had the honour to make recently when this Bill was before the House, I think it is also my duty to draw the attention of the Government to the grave situation which arises by the fact that the Government instead of proceeding amicably with the company has proceeded by way of what is virtually expropriation. If the Government had been a little more prudent probably it might have come to an amicable arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. By proceeding as it has done it has absolutely no control over the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The only thing the Government can do is to take over whatever property is actually situated in Canada. It cannot attach or seize the holdings of the company; these are kept in London. It cannot attach or seize whatever railway connections are held by the Grand Trunk or by the Grand Trunk Pacific outside Canadian territory. This shows in what an awkward situation the Government will be. The Government will have no control whatever of the connections of the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific in the States. Deprived of their American railway connections the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific are more a burden to this country than an advantage. By proceeding by way of expropriation, or by way of Order in Council under the War Measures Act, which is absolutely the same thing, the Government will find themselves in the position of having whatever railway property is situated in Canada, but they will be deprived of all the other holdings which the Grand Trunk Railway Company possess. The Government will not be able to bring about a liquidation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Those two companies have their head offices in London, and if the Government want to press for payment of the bonds for which the Grand Trunk Railway Company may be held responsible, that company will enter into a long drawn out litigation with the Government and probably the ultimate result will be that very grave danger which I pointed out during the last discussion which took place in this House, namely, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will win out in court. The Government advised us that they had taken all precautions in regard to the legal aspect of the question and that there was no danger whatever that, by the Government's acting as they did, by way of Order in Council, the Grand Trunk Railway Company would ipso facto be relieved of their obligations in connection with the bonds which they have guaranteed. I have consulted on this point with two of the most prominent lawyers in Canada, one in Toronto and the other in Montreal, and both of them are of opinion that the Government having failed to live up to the terms of the agreement of 1903, cannot compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company also to live up to that agreement. The Government, of course, may say that on any legal question wise men may differ, and

it is possible that my opinion, which is in accord with the legal opinion of these two prominent lawyers, may not be the one which the court may accept, but it is possible that it may. On questions of such importance the members of the highest tribunal often hold divergent views, and it is very imprudent on the part of the Government of this country to risk the whole matter on a question of ligitation. I do not anticipate that the Government will, on account of any argument that I may put forward, change their opinion on this point but if I might venture to offer the Government some advice, it would be not to force the matter to ligitation, but to come to an amicable arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, because if the Government fail to reach an agreement, it will be a very dangerous question on which the highest tribunal might differ, and even if they compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company to live up to their obligations and pay the bonds which they have guaranteed, I am very much afraid that the only thing the Government will have to sustain such a recourse will be the property which lies in Canada, deprived of all its foreign connections, particularly its American connections, and deprived of all the other holdings that these companies keep in London and which are not attachable by any action which the Government might take. This, I believe, will exemplify to the House the advisability of a careful study before committing the country to such a course; and, what a regrettable step the Government have taken in proceeding as they have done without defining their railway policy, and without making a further attempt to reach an agreement with the company. If the Government decide to force this matter to litigation and not come to an amicable arrangement with the company, they will be left only with the rails and rolling stock, and these, the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) described to us as a huge heap of scrap, or at least fifty per cent of it. This is what the Government will have in its possession to guarantee the immense indebtedness which their imprudent procedure has placed upon our shoulders, thereby relieving the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

SUPPLY.

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

[Mr. Vien.]

Civil Government—Department of Public Works—Salaries, including deputy minister at $6,000, assistant deputy minister at $4,500, and departmental solicitor at $3,500, $575,537.50.

Mr. BELAND: What is the explanation of the increases and decreases?

Mr. CARVELL: The first is an increase of $1,000 in the salary of the deputy minister; it has been decided as a matter of policy to increase the salaries of deputy ministers from $5,000 to $6,000. Then, the salary of the assistant deputy minister, Mr. St. Laurent, who is one of the most efficient men in the service, has been increased from $4,000 to $4,500. There is provision for 350 officials, but there are not that many in the department; in fact, the number is much less. Last year there were not 16 employees in the First Division, Subdivision A, although provision was made for that number. This year I am not sure whether there are 16 or not, but certain officials are to be advanced, largely through their annual increases, and brought up to the First Division, Subdivision A; we therefore estimate that it will take $9,000 more to pay the salaries of this class of clerks than it did last year. The same applies to the Second Division, Subdivision A: there were only 60 last year, and we are making provision for 80 this year, although I do not think there will be that number of clerks in that class. In the Second Division, Subdivision B, there was a decrease in the number of employees, from 88 to 65. That simply means that a number will be promoted from Subdivision B to Subdivision A of the Second Division. The same applies to Third Division, Subdivision A; there is an increase from 63 to 70, due not to an increase in the number of clerks, but to promotions. The total expected increase is about $600, but as all the positions may not be filled it is hard for me to tell the committee what the actual increase will be. In fact, there may be no increase at all.

During the past year very little work was done by the engineering branch of the department—such as dredging, the building of wharves and breakwaters and so on. I think I am safe in saying that not nearly as much has been done as hon. members would like to see done. Not nearly as much has been done as I myself would like to see. If there is one thing that I think the country should look after, it is the transportation around our sea coasts. The ordinary trade of the country cannot be carried on unless we provide the necessary means of handling transportation; unless we do certain dredging and build wharves and breakwaters. I am sorry that I have

not been able to put in the Estimates anything like as much as I would like to have put in for these works—and it is not because I do not realize their importance.

There has been some decrease in the engineering staff; not merely as much, perhaps, as there should have been. About a year ago all building operations carried on by the Government were put under the Public Works Department. Previously the different departments had carried on extensive building programmes of their own. The Militia Department had a building programme and a building staff. The Military Hospitals Commission had quite a programme and quite a large staff. The Marine and Fisheries Department did considerable building. Now this work is all done by the Public Works Department and that means quite an increase to our architectural staff. No department of the Government during the past year has been busier or has rendered more efficient service to the country than has the architectural branch of the Public Works Department. We have constructed all the military buildings that have been found necessary throughout the country; we are constructing all the buildings required by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Department of Marine and Fisheries —although of the latter there are but few. Our energies during the past year have been devoted chiefly to the construction of military buildings and buildings for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department.

Mr. McMASTER: Is this work done through contractors or by the department?

Mr. CARVELL: We prepare the plans and specifications. In practically all cases we call for tenders and the work is done by contract, which is invariably given to the lowest tenderer. During the past year only two works were not done by tender and contract. These were in Nova Scotia, one at North Sydney and the other at Dartmouth, opposite Halifax, and were in connection with the aerial service of the Naval Department.

During the latter part of the summer it became necessary to protect our coasts against submarine raids. The United States Government desired to assist us and very generously offered to send men and equipment to Canada, and the Naval Department of Canada was asked to provide accommodation. We realized that it was impossible to prepare plans and specifications, call for tenders and have the work completed before the ground froze, and therefore two works were let to local contractors—at least, one was a local contractor and the other a contractor now of Ottawa,—on the cost plus basis.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the amount involved, roughly speaking?

Mr. CARVELL: The estimated amount of the North Sydney and Dartmouth works was around $115,000 and $120,000. The work would have cost more than that had it been pushed to completion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it in connection with the war?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, absolutely. It was for the housing of the United States aerial forces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What will be done with those works now?

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid there will not be much use for them in the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were not completed?

Mr. CARVELL: No. In addition to the work at North Sydney and Dartmouth, extensive works were also necessary for the hydroplanes, which involved very extensive concrete structure running down into the sea, so that the planes could glide down and fly from the water. Not very much of this work had been started. The buildings were in process of completion when the armistice was signed, and it was then a question what should be done with them. There were a number of buildings constructed of wood which were in an unfinished condition; and rightly or wrongly, after serious consideration, not by the department but by the Government as a whole, it was decided to complete the buildings that were then under construction. There was one place in which certain concrete foundations were about two-thirds built, and we finished the work because it was considered that possibly some use might be made of the buildings. Speaking generally, however, work ceased the moment the armistice was signed. The buildings in the two places cost around $300,000. The North Sydney buildings were used to some extent for the housing of troops and will probably be used for the accommodation of Newfoundlanders returning home. Personally, I do not think there will be very much use for these buildings in the future and we must charge the cost up to the war. With these exceptions every building that has been erected in Canada has been built by public tender, contract

being let to the lowest tenderer, and a great many million dollars have been involved. There has been some fault finding, and criticisms may as well be disposed of at once. In one or two places we were criticised for exercising too much precaution. It was said that we lost valuable time in preparing the plans and specifications and in calling for tenders, but we kept pretty well in touch with the situation and had an idea how many wounded returned soldiers there would be—I am speaking more of the hospitals now than anything else—and there were always at least three beds for every two returned wounded men, while in many places there were two beds for each soldier.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did you build the Ste. Anne's hospital?

Mr. CARVELL: The Ste. Anne's hospital was under construction when this work was handed over to our department.

Mr. BELAND: Was the Militia Department building it?

Mr. CARVELL: No, the Military Hospitals Commission. They had given contracts amounting to about $300,000, and we have gone on and let various contracts aggregating over a million dollars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have the hospitals been built partly by the Hospitals Commission and partly by the Public Works Department?

Mr. CARVELL: Before April, 1918, it was called the Military Hospitals Commission, but we can treat it as the same organization as Sir James Lougheed's department. They were constructing hospitals for their department in many parts of Canada and the buildings were in course of construction when we took over the work. We carried out what arrangements they had made and if additional work was required it was done exclusively by the Public Works Department, and we are satisfied that we have saved the country money.

Mr. LEMIEUX: These buildings are now all under the Public Works Department?

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I mean the erection of them.

Mr. CARVELL: They are built by the Public Works Department. There are military hospitals administered by the Militia Department—one at Halifax, one at Fredericton—and there will be a large work at Kingston, and the St. Andrew's Hospital at Toronto, formerly St. Andrew's School. There is an Orthopædic hospital in Toronto which is complete and up to date in every respect. These will be administered by the Militia Department until the soldiers are handed over to the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department. After that, I presume that the great majority of the buildings will be handed over to the Civil Re-establishment Department. If I had had my way from the beginning, I think a very large amount of money expended in the erection of military hospitals would have been spent in making additions to various city and municipal hospitals in different places. Then, when they were not required by the Militia Department they could go over to the municipalities and public organizations and be of some economic value. But as to the buildings which we have erected, if they cannot be used by the Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Department I do not know that they will be of much use to the people of Canada generally.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As my hon. friend is referring to the buildings in connection with the aerial service at Dartmouth and North Sydney, may I express regret that the splendid buildings and equipment which we had at Toronto have been sold by the Imperial Munitions Board to an American gentleman or an American firm. I do not know what my hon. friend intends to do with the buildings that have been erected at Dartmouth and North Sydney but at all events, there is this to be considered: I believe in the future of the aerial service. We know what wonderful discoveries were made during the last years and what extraordinary help was rendered to the cause of the Allies by the aerial service. The response to the call by young Canadian aviators has been most remarkable during the war and I really believe that there is a splendid career opening up to our young men in that new service. It is a matter of every day occurrence that in Europe, for instance, the passenger service is performed to a limited extent, it is true, by the aeroplane. The postal service already exists in several countries through the air service. Contracts have been given by the Washington Government at some of the large centres in the United States for the transportation of mails from one point to another, and I believe that within a very limited period of time the aerial service will be a matter of course and will revolutionize the transportation system.

As we had an excellent groundwork for this aerial service in Canada, I was surprised to see that the Imperial Munitions

Board had sold that magnificent equipment which had been provided in Toronto. I hope that my hon. friend, before disposing of those buildings in the Maritime Provinces, will consult with his colleagues and ponder over this matter because I sincerely believe there is a great future for the aerial service.

Mr. CARVELL: We have no intention whatever of disposing of those buildings until we have more light upon the whole question than we have at the present time. The buildings there are for the hydro-aerial service consisting of hydroplanes which rise from the water. I cannot just say whether the buildings in Nova Scotia will be of much value from the aeroplane standpoint, but my hon. friend can rest assured that the buildings will be taken care of and that nothing will be done until the matter has been very thoroughly considered. I think he is a little in error in his remark about the buildings in Toronto having been disposed of. We have not disposed of any buildings which could be used, in any general sense, for the aeroplane service. Of course, the Government of Canada, as such, had nothing to do with any of these. They were built and owned by the Imperial Munitions Board. The Government purchased practically all the buildings which the Imperial Munitions Board had at Camp Borden, and that was really the centre of their activities. There was a building in North Toronto owned by the Canadian Aeroplanes Limited. It was put up to the Government to see if we would not buy it. Our department had a very careful investigation made by appraisers, but considering the structure and everything else together with the amount they required, we did not think it was good business to purchase it. It was a building in which they constructed aeroplanes, and it had nothing to do with the flying

4 p.m.

of the machines themselves. The Imperial Munitions Board got a price which was more attractive to them, and the building was sold to a gentleman who purchased a great many of the aeroplanes. We have retained twenty of the aeroplanes at Camp Borden. A staff of engineers and mechanics has been kept there to look after them, and I can assure my hon. friend that, in so far as this will be of any benefit to the aerial business in Canada we have not lost touch with it. My hon. friend must realize that the aeroplanes that have been built by the Imperial Munitions Board have been built for a special purpose. They only carry one or possibly two men. They were all right enough for the purpose for which they were constructed, but they were of practically no use from the commercial standpoint or for the carrying of mails. They would, however, be of very great value from the educational standpoint, for teaching men to handle them and imparting instructions along the general lines of aerial business. We have kept twenty of those, we have the whole plant at Camp Borden, but we did not consider that it was good business to spend money on the building at North Toronto when somebody else was willing to buy it, especially as it did not appear that it would be of very great advantage to the country as a whole.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My point is that this had developed into a very efficient Canadian industry, and now it has gone into the hands of a foreigner who has control of everything.

Mr. CARVELL: I am old enough to remember that at one time the ambition of my life was to own and drive an automobile and I thought that possibly I could reach that point some day. I do not know but that possibly I may be able some day to own and manage an aeroplane. But I think it will be some time before the Dominion of Canada will be justified in going into the business of manufacturing aeroplanes. The only object in getting that building would be to go into the business of manufacturing aeroplanes. I do not think the time has arrived when we would be justified in going into that particular form of Government ownership.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend does not want to be up in the air.

Mr. CARVELL: Not in that particular sense. For that reason I think we pursued good business methods in allowing that particular establishment to be sold elsewhere. But I think we exercised good judgment too in maintaining the plant, and the aeroplane buildings at Camp Borden. We have there the nucleus of a Canadian service, not that these machines will be of very much value from a commerical standpoint but they can be used for educational purposes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister not know anything about the large number of aeroplanes that were assembled at North Sydney and as I am told, passed over to the Government of Canada? Has the Department of Public Works had anything to do with that?

Mr. CARVELL: We had nothing to do with that. I understand that some were

assembled and are there yet. That did not go through my department but I know the American Government were very generous, that they have donated some of these machines to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

My hon. friends will realize that those were hydroplanes, and are used purely for coast defence purposes. We have the buildings and plant, and some machines, forming the nucleus of a hydro service from an educational standpoint. To what extent we can avail ourselves of that plant later on I do not know; I can only hope that in the future it will be of some service to Canada.

Mr. McCREA: The minister is asking for about a thousand dollars more than last year. He will remember that when he took charge of the Public Works Department he announced that he found that department terribly overloaded, and intimated that he was going to use the broad-axe very freely, and going to cut out all unnecessary expense and unnecessary help. I am surprised to find, after that promise of the minister, that his Estimates have been increased and not reduced. Speaking with one of the employees of the Department of Public Works last summer, with whom I am on very friendly terms, I asked him was he very busy. He replied, no, that he was staying at home just as much as he could. I said to him, "If you have nothing to do I should think you would be frequenting some of the places of amusement" He replied, "If I did that too many people would be asking the same question as your are, and wanting to know what I am doing; I think the best way to avoid embarrassment is for me to remain at home and keep out of sight." I would like to know from the minister how many men he has in the service who are keeping out of sight and drawing their pay?

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend was not present earlier in the sitting when I spoke about the number of clerks for whose salaries I am asking a vote. I then said we had not got the number of clerks in our department that is mentioned here, and we do not expect to have them. Without doubt, in the Public Works Department in Ottawa to-day a great number of clerks who are not required and who are giving very little value for the money they are receiving——

Mr. McCREA: Put them out.

Mr. CARVELL: —I will explain to my hon. friend the situation in which I find myself. These are mostly old men, and some old women, who have been very long in the service, and would probably be objects of charity if we turned them out. Unfortunately there is no provision in the law to-day for the superannuation of people of this class. I have no means of providing for these old people, if I turn them out, except by giving them two months' salary. Probably there is no man who wants to cut the expenses of his department down any more than I do, but I have not reached the point where I can discharge people of sixty, sixty-five, seventy, and seventy-five years of age, and leave them dependent upon charity and upon their friends for sustenance. A year ago legislation was brought down to provide a fund by which we could retire very many people in this class in Ottawa. For some reason or other that Bill did not pass and the result is that I find myself unable to get rid of these people except by the method I have described. I do not want to do it, I don't think it is right, and I do not think my hon. friend would do it if he were in my position. However, we hope to bring in legislation this year enabling us to retire on something like a competence which will keep them from becoming objects of charity, those old servants who have been efficient in their day, but now on account of old age, are not able to render efficient service, and I believe the House will grant that legislation willingly. There are something like twenty-four such employees in our department, and we are asking the Civil Service Commission to make some provision by which we can accomplish their retirement without letting them feel that the country is kicking them out into the cold. That is true of the Inside Service. Naturally, in the case of a staff of two hundred or two hundred and fifty, a great many changes take place annually; girls get married and people die off. I am satisfied there must have been twelve or fifteen of such cases last year, but not a single addition has been made to the staff as a result of those changes. Nevertheless we are carrying on the work quite efficiently, and I do not think it will take very many years, if we succeed in getting the legislation for which we are asking, before we get our staff down to a real business basis, and so long as I remain at the head of this department it is my intention to aim at that standard.

So far as the Outside Service in concerned, I must confess that I am not on nearly as solid ground. There are a great many in the Outside Service of the Public

Works Department during the past year who have not given very much value for the salaries they are drawing. That, however, is not the fault of the officials; we were not able to provide work on account of the war. We have not been spending money in the engineering branches, and hence there was not the same amount of work available for the outside employees as usual. I believe that some of these offices are overloaded, and I have already got rid of some employees, although not nearly as many as I should like to. But again let me say that I have a little humanity about me, and it is a pretty hard thing to take a person who occupies a Government position, who is willing to perform all the services you ask of him and wants to be an efficient servant, practically by the throat and say: Go and find a job elsewhere. I have done that in some cases, and it is not a pleasant occupation. I would have done it to a greater extent had it not been that a little less than a year ago legislation was passed by which the burden was thrown upon the Civil Service Commission of classifying and reporting upon the whole service of the country, which report is now practically ready.

We were promised that report two months ago, but I realize the tremendous amount of labour which that commission is carrying on and I am finding no fault at its not being ready. When that report comes down it will contain certain recommendations for the re-organization of the different services. And rest assured, that if the Civil Service Commission report that at any place there are officials who are not earning their money, or whose services should be dispensed with, then notwithstanding my dislike of taking positions away from people, I shall carry out the recommendations of the commission. I may tell my hon. friend frankly that in the Engineering Department of the Outside Service there are a good many who are not working very hard at the present time and whose services I think could be dispensed with without any serious detriment to the country, and just as soon as the classification report is in my hands I shall act on it. Maybe I will have to go further than I have indicated, but I cannot say until I get the report.

I want my hon. friend to realize that I have not changed my views at all on the Civil Service of Canada. I have not tried to give to our Civil Servants more than I think they are entitled to, but I have tried to use them fairly as far as my department is concerned.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Who is making that report?

Mr. CARVELL: The Civil Service Commission. That was the burden cast upon them by the legislation passed here less than a year ago.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I saw by the newspapers that some American firm was classifying the Civil Service. Will the hon. minister tell us if that is the case, and what that firm is doing?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. I do not know that I can give very much information. Mr. Myers, who has been employed by the Civil Service Commission, is simply acting as one of their employees for the purpose of assisting them in making a classification of the Service. There are two other gentlemen engaged with him, but I do not remember their names. Mr. Myers comes from Chicago. Those gentlemen are not making the classification any more than the Civil Service Commission are, but they are simply a part of the machinery by which the commission are trying to arrive at a real business basis for the Service. We have had the Civil Service Commission and some of these gentlemen before us in Council and have discussed a great many questions of policy and the lines upon which they are attempting to work out their report, and I think if my hon. friend could have listened to those gentlemen he would have come to the conclusion that they are men who know their business.. They are taking a standard for everything. They say that certain people performing a certain grade of work requiring certain qualifications and abilities should receive a certain salary, and then they are putting all the staff in the different departments in appropriate classifications. There is no getting away from the fact that our Civil Service has been a very unbusinesslike organization ever since Confederation. We are all sinners; perhaps some of the new members are not, but most of the hon. gentlemen facing me are sinners, and I confess I am one as well, for in the past we have asked particular Governments to place particular men in service, simply because those men wanted jobs. It was not a question whether they were particularly fitted for the jobs, or that the department needed their services; it was a question of getting jobs for the applicants, and they got them, with the result that the service has been overloaded—

An hon. MEMBER: And glutted.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and glutted, in very many cases. But the Civil Service

Commission are honestly endeavouring to arrive at some business basis upon which the service can be reorganized. I may as well state here that they are recommending a scale of salaries on practically a pre-war basis, not a scale based upon the present high cost of living, the latter being taken care of by bonuses. I believe, when the report is received, it will be found to be based upon purely business methods. Then it will be a question for the Government of the day to implement, if necessary, the scale of salaries by bonuses until such time as things get back to a normal condition, as we all hope that they will in the very near future. Whether that be a year or two years, the Government will have to take care of that interim period just as business men have to take care of the wages paid to their employees.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Are the experts high class men, and how much are they being paid?

Mr. CARVELL: I am satisfied that they are high-class men, because I have had an opportunity on a number of occasions of discussing these questions with them. Only a week ago we discussed with them the Printing Bureau—of which we have heard something in this House—and I think they have some job on their hands to get the Bureau down to a business basis. We got their views, they got ours, and also the views of the Bureau officials, and the Civil Service Commission are now grappling with that subject. I am not able to answer my hon. friend as to how much these experts are being paid as it is not under my department, but there is no objection to giving the information to the House, and we will get it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysboro): I understand that my hon. friend is inclined to return to the system of pensions for employees who are past the working age. That is not a new system; it was in force many years ago, and, if I remember rightly, it was abandoned and we went back to the position where civil servants, like other men, had to look after themselves and put something by for old age. For my part I object to any system of pensioning unless it is extended to all old people irrespective of whether they are civil servants or not. Old age pensions is a big question and there is a great deal to be said in favour of it, but I cannot see any reason why a man who is working for the Government should be put in a better position than any other good citizen who is working as best he can from day to day and in his old age is not able to take care of himself. There is no real distinction between the two classes, and there cannot be any distinction drawn between the Inside and Outside Service so far as that is concerned. I would like to know from the hon. minister, because that is the impression he left on my mind, if it is the policy of the Government to return to the old plan of pensioning civil servants of the Inside Service?

Mr. CARVELL: I never knew that there was a pension law in this country. There was a superannuation law which existed for a great many years and was repealed in 1897 or 1898, but that is very different from the question of pensions. In the case of superannuation, it was based upon the length of service. I think after ten years a man was entitled to superannuation, and after thirty-five years he received thirty-five fiftieths of his average salary for the last three years, but that was the maximum. After he had been thirty-five years in the service he had a right to retire and take his full retiring allowance. That law was repealed. Most of the people who were in the service at that time and were entitled to take advantage of that law have passed away. But that superannuation law did not apply to all the different clerks in the service because there were those who were classed as temporary, and I do not think it applied to messengers and the lower grades. So the result is we have in all the departments a number of these old people who never would have been entitled to superannuation if the superannuation law had not been repealed.

It is therefore, a question whether we shall continue to keep these people in the Government employ or not. There are, in the service, many people who are able to perform in a perfunctory manner the services which they are called upon to render. For instance, a man may be a little old and perhaps cannot do his work as efficiently as one would like him to, but he will do it, and the question arises: Will you turn that man out into the cold or will you give him some kind of a retiring allowance by the way of pension? There is a great deal in what the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) says as to the distinction between the status of civil servants and that of people in the ordinary avocations of life. But an old man in the Civil Service may say: I want to continue to perform the duties which you impose upon me; and that being the case, the Government is confronted with this proposition: Shall you keep in your employ a man who, because of old

age, has become inefficient, or shall you retire him on a small pension? Speaking for my department, I could have the business of my department carried on and save a lot of money to the country, and yet pay these old servants a reasonable pension, because in many cases their services are really not required. In ordinary commercial life, one can say to a man: You are not fit to run my sawmill and, therefore, I do not want you any longer. And you can put him out and that is the end of it; his friends or some one else must take care of him if he has not been able to lay up a competence for himself. But the Government of Canada is not the only organization in the world that makes some provision for old and trusted employees. There is a good deal of humanity in the world and many organizations are taking care of their old employees. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company provides a superannuation fund for practically every employee who has reached the age of sixty years, after having been a certain number of years in its service. The superannuation is not very large, but it is something to tide a man over the declining years of his life. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Government railways, and the banks have similar superannuation funds. The Bank of Montreal is much more generous to its old employees than is the Government of Canada either in the legislation which we introduced last year or in the legislation which we purpose introducing this year. The method I have advocated of pensioning of these old men is not new; it is practised by practically all the big employers of labour in this country. It seems hardly logical that a man in the employ of the Government should be placed in a better position than a man who earns his living by some other method, but nevertheless I hope the time is coming in this world when a better relation will exist between employers and employees than has existed in the past, and I hope the Government of Canada will not be the first to adopt a policy of casting adrift every old man who has become unable to perform his duties as economically or profitably to his employer as he did when he was younger. This war has, I think, taught us that a better relationship must exist between employers and employees in the future, and the Government would set an example to other employers of labour if it would adopt some scheme of pensions to provide for these people in their declining years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Has not the Civil Service Commission power to transfer employees from one department to another? I was under the impression that that was the case, and I am sure, in view of the scarcity of labour in this country, it will be a surprise to many of us to learn that some of the departments have been greatly overmanned while others have been greatly undermanned. The minister told us that in the engineering branch of the Department of Public Works there were many men for whom there was no work. I think the Civil Service Commission have been advertising for men with engineering qualifications to fill certain positions. I would imagine that as 16,000 appointments have been made during the past year by the Civil Service Commission, some of those idle employees in the various departments might have been utilized in some of the other services. I rather thought that, with the power conferred upon the Civil Service Commission, no particular branch of the Government would have exclusive jurisdiction over its employees, but that all would come under the control of the Civil Service Commission.

During the last year or two we have been hearing a great deal about pensions, and for a good reason, namely, that men have given up their health and been crippled and maimed in rendering a great public service to the country, but I do not see that men, who have grown old in the service of the country and who have been protected as well as it is possible to protect any class of the community, should have special rights over the average citizen who is not in the public service. The minister told us that there were in his department about 24 men who were of an age that they were not competent to render efficient service. What is their average age?

Mr. CARVELL: It is true that the Civil Service Commission have power to transfer employees from one branch to the other, and it may interest my hon. friend to know that more than a year ago we offered these 24 employees to the Civil Service Commission for disposal, but we did not have any bids, the trouble being that their average age was at least 65 years.

Mr. EDWARDS: What are their salaries?

Mr. CARVELL: As a rule, they would be the lower grades from $1,000 to $1,200, although perhaps some of these men might have more than that. A number of employees in the Department of Public Works have been transferred to another department in which their services are capable of being utilized. My hon. friend must be in

error as to the Civil Service Commission advertising for engineers. I have not been following the advertisements, but I think he will find the advertisements are mostly for architects. I do not know whether we could employ any more architects to-day, but I believe we could. During the past year we have been driven right to the wall for architects. We had to make arrangements with some of our architects to work three nights a week up to eleven o'clock, and we had, of course, to give them additional pay. We had to get public buildings ready for the soldiers. Early in the summer we had to have barracks; then we had to have military hospitals and hospitals for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department, and we had to have architectural assistance. There may, of course, have been a case or two of applications for engineers.

If the Civil Service Commission will apply to me for engineers I shall be happy to furnish them with quite a number of splendid men whose services in the Department of Public Works could be dispensed with. I assume it is correct that the Civil Service Commission handled 14,000 appointments last year, but a large number of these would be temporary appointments. The Civil Service Commission appoint officials in the Customs and Inland Revenue offices all over the country; they appoint caretakers, country postmasters, engineers. They appoint all the officials of the Public Works Department. Since I became Minister of Public Works in October, 1917, I have had something to say about the appointment of a governor, a judge, a senator, and a director of the Canadian National Railways, and that has been the extent of my patronage since that time. I have nothing to say about the appointment of engineers, foremen, or any of the employees connected with the public works of Canada.

Mr. COPP: What about your departmental solicitor?

Mr. CARVELL: My departmental solicitor was appointed by the Civil Service Commission. They called for applications, of which they received about forty-six. I do not know who formed the committee to decide upon the appointment, but in some way the commission went over the matter and decided upon Mr. T. J. Carter, a barrister of New Brunswick. Mr. Carter has lived in my constituency; he was a lawyer before I was. We have had a good many fights, political and professional. He is the best man in Canada for the position. I wanted a man who could attend the Exchequer Court all over Canada when necessary and watch the interests of the Public Works Department in expropriation cases—besides, of course, advising the officials of the department in ordinary matters. As long as I am Minister of Public Works and Mr. Carter is solicitor the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) will not have any more Belanger cases to discuss in the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I saved the country quite a lot.

Mr. CARVELL: I saved it before my hon. friend did.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who called the minister's attention to it?

Mr. CARVELL: I heard about it, anyway. Mr. Carter has had forty or fifty cases in the Exchequer Court during the last five or six years; he has also had arbitration and expropriation cases in New Brunswick. I have been his opponent in nearly every one of them; therefore I am a pretty good judge as to whether he is the proper man for the position. While I had nothing to do with his appointment, I am entirely satisfied with the selection made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CROWE: Is it the intention of the Government to establish any of these hydroplane stations in British Columbia for the protection of the Pacific coast?

Mr. CARVELL: I am not able to state the policy of the Government on such an important matter. During the war, in conjunction with the United States authorities, it was decided to establish these two stations on the Atlantic coast and they were in course of construction when the armistice was signed. We did not consider that there was any danger at that time on the Pacific coast.

Mr. McCREA: The minister says that the service is composed of a number of old men, and he is so tender-hearted that he cannot bring himself to dispense with their services. The man I referred to a moment ago is not an old man.

Mr. CARVELL: Is he in the Inside or the Outside Service?

Mr. McCREA: I will ask the minister a question. Is it not a fact that in certain localities the salaries of the men who are supervising certain public works are greater than the amount of money to be expended in the works under supervision?

Mr. CARVELL: I could not answer that off-hand. In some cases that would be true; Sault Ste. Marie is one case.

Mr. McCREA: Will my hon. friend get the information?

Mr. CARVELL: I shall be glad to get the information. I have not tried to conceal the fact that in the engineering branch of the outside service there are more officials than are needed under present conditions. On the other hand, if, now that the war is over, we could see our way clear to vote sufficient money to start the works that ought to be started, there would be work enough for practically all these people. I think the leader of the Opposition could put his finger on three or four persons whose services could be dispensed with without any injustice to the country. He knows the position that I am facing. No doubt Sherbrooke is another place where there is not enough work for all employees. We have transferred men from one part of the country to another with a view to overcoming this difficulty. Last month we closed up one of the engineering districts because there was no work for it to do. While I do not say that we could close up many more, there is no doubt that a reduction in the interests of economy could be made and the service still be maintained.

Mr. McCREA: Are you going to remedy that?

Mr. CARVELL: As soon as the Civil Service Commision make their report I shall know what to do. I am awaiting that report, and I assure my hon. friend that I intend to act as soon as I get it.

Mr. McCREA: The minister tells us that the Civil Service is practically composed of old people.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not make any such statement. I said that in my department we had 24 old people whose services could be dispensed with.

Mr. McCREA: I had always thought that the only fossils that were connected with Parliament were in the Senate, but evidently they are in the Civil Service too, and I begin to wonder if they are not in the Government. I am afraid the people will come to think that the Government is composed to some extent of men of that sort unless something is done to remedy matters. If we are going to have an old age pension fund we should have one uniform system, because if every department had a system of its own there would be about twenty different Cabinet ministers all controlling different schemes. I think it would be far better for the Government to establish a Pension Branch for old age which would include every one.

Mr. CARVELL: I never intimated that there would be a Pension Branch in the Public Works Department. The Bill that was introduced a year ago covered the whole Civil Service. We are collecting data, and I hope we shall be able to get some such legislation through during the coming year. Every department will, of course, take advantage of the fund in so far as they come within its provisions.

Mr. McMASTER: It is always difficult to criticise the hon. minister when he is passing his Estimates, because his entire frankness disarms criticism. However, one of the reasons for the somewhat critical attitude of the country towards the Estimates is the fact that the Union Government displayed such a rosy programme before the people. I remember the hon. minister making a speech down in his native province, where he said that something new was going to happen every week, and some fresh step taken in the path of progress. To-day, however, the minister informs us that he has been unable to effect these reforms, and it is evident that the millennium has not yet arrived. When there were new departments being formed almost every day, when the Cabinet was increased from about 14 to about 24, when there was such a demand for help that he was enabled to conveniently place in other departments those for whom he had no use in his own, it is a sad condition of affairs that all the predictions of the minister have not been fulfilled. We never asked that people should be appointed to public office, and I wish to dissociate myself entirely from that school of political thought represented on the other side of the House which would reinstate in Canada the patronage system. We have absolutely no sympathy with that system but I think that this country can progress only on the basis of sincerity. One of our great griefs is that this Government, notwithstanding its pretensions about the elimination of patronage, has not in fact abolished it. The minister said he had nothing to do with appointing engineers or wharfingers, etc., the only appointments he had anything to do with being that of a judge and some other high officials. I contend that since this Government came into power they have appointed practically no one to high and important office who was not one of their supporters; and their pretension that

they eliminated patronage—an announcement which received the blessing of one of the prominent Protestant churches in this country in solemn conclave assembled —has no foundation whatever. We should be sincere, and the minister will find us on this side of the House prepared to co-operate with him in every step that will tend to an efficient and economical administration of the country's affairs. But we do think it would be well for him and those associated with him to avoid making these claims to peculiar and superior political virtue. I cannot help calling to mind the most amazing avowal made by the Minister of Railways and Canals last year when, in reply to a letter addressed to him by our departed friend, the late member for Prince Edward Island, he wrote that supporters of the Union Government, whether they were Liberal-Unionist, or Conservative-Unionist, would receive the same treatment at the hands of the Government. I submit these remarks merely in the hope that what I have said may tend to greater sincerity in the conduct of public affairs.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend thinks I have not been sincere—

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want the hon. minister to misunderstand me. I do not accuse him of any greater insincerity than the whole Unionist party. He is just one of them, and I would not state for a moment that he was personally insincere.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not accept that explanation for a moment, and I might as well tell my hon. friend so. I have not played any of the games he has been talking about; I have observed law. I have not dealt in the patronage business, and have never interfered with any one in the appointments to positions except the four I have mentioned.

Mr. McMASTER: Why should these four men be excepted?

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend read the law he would know that the Civil Service Commission has not the right to nominate judges, nor governors, nor senators, and therefore the burden is cast upon me to give my recommendation to the Prime Minister. Of course, the hon. member is at liberty to use the word "insincerity" if he thinks fit.

Mr. McMASTER: I must make myself clear. I never inferred for an instant that the Minister of Public Works had interfered with any offices of a subordinate character. What I said was, that he and his colleagues in the Union Government made great pretensions that they had abolished the patronage system, when in fact they have not done so. Surely patronage has reference to the appointment of a judge or a governor as much as it has to the appointment of a wharfinger.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. member tell me how in the world a judge can be appointed if the Government does not assume the responsibility of appointing him?

Mr. McMASTER: Of course the responsibility is on the Government, but the Government should not make any pretensions—

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is talking through his hat.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not wear my hat in the House, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman's language is not parliamentary.

Mr. BUTTS: I have been trying to speak all evening just for the purpose of putting down all this war of words that has come on. My reason for speaking at all was that the matter that begun it was a matter appertaining to the particular part of the country from which I come—these aeroplanes, or, as we call them in our country, humming-birds. They were buzzing around our ears last summer. I would like to ask the minister if he would be good enough, at some time in the near future, to lend a little bit of information to this House as to some of the contracts that were let down there with respect to the aeroplane plant on what we call Indian Beach at North Sydney and with respect to hydroplanes on Kelly's Beach, North Sydney.

Mr. CARVELL: I will be very glad to give the information now if my hon. friend wants it.

Mr. BUTTS: I would like the House to have it.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall only be too happy to give it.

Mr. BUTTS: I know all about it myself. I would like to know how it was that Captain Dickson, who was an undertaker in Louisburg, got a very large contract on Kelly's Beach for the construction of hydroplanes on force contract. This is what we were told down home—an undertaker building aeroplanes on force contract! I might almost go farther and insinuate that perhaps I might get as much information in regard to this matter from the leader of

the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) as I would from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. However, perhaps I might go a little farther and say that Mr. George Kyte might have told us the whole thing about it. I will not speak of the dead; there is one of these who has passed away and I hope he is in a better world, but I might have gone a little bit farther and spoken of partners of members of this House knowing something about that areoplane and hydroplane business, if it is required that this House should know a little more about it than appears on the outside. I have had too many of these aeroplanes buzzing around my ears and I would like to know how it was that these things happened. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) spoke about patronage. Let me ask the minister how it was that in connection with this matter in North Sydney we find Captain Dickson, an undertaker, Dan Louis McDonald, Luke Day, Bob Musgrave, George Kyte, Freeman O'Neil, Walter Crowe, not one Tory in the outfit. Patronage? Yes, there was patronage, but I have sent men there for jobs with the ordinary pick and shovel and because they were recommended by Butts they could not get jobs as they were supposed to be Tories.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend only recommend Tories?

Mr. BUTTS: No, but they were supposed to be Tories

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to be obliged to interrupt the hon. member.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will not decide this is out of order because I want to have the privilege of answering it before we pass on.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I do not want my remarks to be considered as referring to him particularly because they are addressed to the committee in general. But the debate has wandered very far from the item under consideration. Old age pensions and aeroplane posts both on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are certainly far from the item under consideration which has to do with salaries in the Inside Service of the Public Works Department.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The discussion about the undertaker is appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member (Mr. Butts) has brought up a matter that the minister desires to answer before this item is adopted. I think that, with the unanimous consent of the committee, the minister should be permitted to answer, but I shall then ask the committee to return to the item under discussion.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think the hon. member (Mr. Butts) has a right to finish his argument if you are going to allow the minister to reply.

Mr. BUTTS: I bow in all fullness to your ruling but really it seems to be my misfortune to be always out of order. Now, when there is some talk about patronage it will surely not be my misfortune to be the only one to be closed off. There was a lot of talk about patronage this afternoon. Is it not true that Allan J. Cameron, a returned soldier, of the village of Arichat, in the county of Richmond, applied for a situation as departmental solicitor and was he not the only lawyer who was a returned soldier who did apply? He went overseas as a private. I am going to ask the minister further: How many flying machines were there at Sydney Harbour; what did each cost; are there any records of any particular flights of any one of these fliers? Last fall when this Kelly's Beach hydroplant station was dismantled a large number of buildings were sold. And the peculiar thing about it—I speak on my own personal responsibility—is that these buildings were sold for $1,100—a five, ten, fifteen cent store price—before they were advertised, and that George Burchall of the Toronto mine bought them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: How much did they cost?

Mr. BUTTS: They must have cost at least five times that amount.

Mr. CARVELL: Speaking to the last point first, it is something I never heard of before. If there were buildings sold I do not know anything about it. If they were sold by the Public Works Department I can easily find out all about it, and I will be only too happy to do so and give the information to my hon. friend. It is the first news that has come to me that any buildings were sold at all. If there were buildings sold I would assume they were possibly buildings that were on the land that was expropriated, because, mind you, we could not buy this land at the price we thought was right, and we therefore went to the Exchequer Court with the case.

As for the number of flights made at Sydney Harbour, I do not know anything about it; I do not even know what the hydroplanes cost. I understand they were

donated by the American Government, but that is a matter entirely with the Marine and Fisheries Department, who will know more about it than does my hon. friend. Although it has nothing to do with my department, I will look the information up for my hon. friend's benefit and give it to him.

As to the departmental solicitor, it may be that Mr. Cameron made application to the Civil Service Commission; I do not know as to that. After the solicitor was appointed, I am not sure, but I think I saw the list. However, my hon. friend does not have to bother me about the matter, because I did not have anything to do with it. Let him go to the Civil Service Commission and he will get all the information he wants. He will get the names of all the men who applied, together with their occupations, and he can find out how many were returned soldiers. I understand there were ten or eleven of them, but I do not know. I do not know the name of one of them. I could not tell my hon. friend the name of a solitary man who applied for the position, only the name of the man who was successful, and another man in my own department whom I happen to know made an application. That is all I know about the matter of the appointment of a departmental solicitor. I want to tell my hon. friend that I have no apologies to make in regard to this matter. I will go further and say that if the Civil Service Commission had not given me a man in whom I had confidence as a lawyer I would not have accepted him. Because there come times that when you want a thing you want it, and you don't want something that is no good to you. I do not say that Mr. Cameron was a good lawyer or a poor lawyer; I do not know anything about him, I never heard a word about him before. But I wanted a lawyer and I have got one. I am quite prepared to stand by everything I did, and if the Civil Service Commission had not given me a lawyer who could go into court and look after the interests of the Public Works Department I would not have accepted him. I want to get back now to the question that is really under discussion, and that is the construction of hydroplane stations. When my hon. friend (Mr. Butts) gets the facts perhaps he will have to revise some of the opinions that he was so willing to give to the House. The whole trouble is that the man who got this contract happens to be a Liberal. That is the explanation of the whole trouble, we may as well have it out now as any other time; he was a man whom I am told now did not vote for the Union candidates in the last general election.

Mr. McCREA: He was a wise man.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not know anything at the time as to what his politics were. It turns out now that those are the facts of the case. I am prepared for a thorough discussion and we will see whether my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is right in his statement that we will not give a Liberal anything at all.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to make a contradiction? With all due respect to the minister, I never said anything of the sort. As a mattter of fact the subject of these hydroplane stations was never in my mind at all when I was speaking. I was referring to a much larger question, that of the claim of the Government to have abolished patronage when I believed that the ministers had chosen very important officials from among their own political friends. I do not want to be accused unjustly, and I know that the minister would not accuse me unjustly.

Mr. CARVELL: I would not want to accuse my hon. friend unjustly. The trouble with the hon. gentleman is, is he says himself, that he is a new member, but he talks a good deal and says some things perhaps that he really does not mean. I am going to show the hon. gentleman that he evidently was not well informed or he would not have made the sweeping statement which he did. I narrated earlier to the committee that sometime in the autumn a demand was made upon the Public Works Department for the construction of two of these seaplane stations. They consisted in each case, as I said before, of a number of buildings. I suppose, perhaps, there would be half a dozen large buildings, and also some sort of a concrete slide which went down into the water, and which latter was a very large affair. The cost of the buildings was estimated at a certain amount, the exact sum I have forgotten. We found, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was most insistent, that this work must be done at once; no matter how it was done it must be done at once, because the cold weather was coming on and the minister contended, and he was right, that if we resorted to the ordinary course of preparing plans and specifications, calling for tenders, and letting the contract, it would take a month. If a month were to elapse the buildings would not be finished during the autumn, and in that case they could not be finished at all. That is what I was advised.

However, I protested, and probably must have lost four days' time in doing so, and refused to go on by force account because I do not believe in the Government of this country constructing any works by force account unless there are very strong reasons for doing so. Doubtless there are times when work by force account must be resorted to. I commenced to look around then for contractors. It was well known around Sydney and North Sydney and in Halifax that this work was going on. A Mr. O'Neil, a man whom I had known before, came here and spoke to me about who was going to do the work at North Sydney and I told him that I had not made up my mind. My hon. friend has mentioned a number of names in this connection. The only man that I ever met in the transaction, until after the contract was drawn, was Mr. O'Neil, and another gentleman who was with him. I do not remember the name of the latter, or that I could say who it was even if the name was recalled to me. He had a letter from Mr. Dickson. I knew Mr. Dickson before, and when the hon. gentleman talks about him being an undertaker he is not giving the House—

Mr. BUTTS: He is.

Mr. CARVELL: He may be, I am not saying he is not, but he is also a contractor, a wrecker, a man who has done big business on the coast. I say this and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. BUTTS: So do I.

Mr. CARVELL: I would not make this statement if I did not know what I am talking about. I made inquiry as to who this man was from confidential sources in the province of Nova Scotia before I gave a contract, and I did not ask whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative either—that question never arose at all.

Then there was the matter of the Halifax work. The firm of Bate, McMahon and Company had done some work I believe for the department——

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: Would the minister tell me if this Mr. O'Neil that he refers to was not a former employee of the Public Works Department who was dismissed from his position for offensive partisanship?

Mr. CARVELL: I never heard of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Was he not employed in some department?

Mr. CARVELL: I tell my hon. friend I never heard of it.

Mr. BUTTS: You have heard of it.

Mr. CARVELL: I am going to thrash this matter out, and I am delighted it has come up. I want things like this to be brought forward because I want the House to know how I have run this department during the last year. I knew this matter was coming up because I have heard a great deal about it in the last six or eight months, and I am delighted my hon. friend has taken this opportunity of giving me a chance to explain it. Mr. O'Neil was in the employ of the Government, and came here——

Mr. McKENZIE: Let me tell my hon. friend he was never in the employ of the Public Works Department.

Mr. CARVELL: I can only say that if he was I never knew it.

Mr. McKENZIE: He never was.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: Dickson. who received the contract, was in the service of the Public Works Department and was dismissed for offensive partisanship. O'Neil, who was employed by another department, was also dismissed for offensive partisanship.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know that. I know that he was in uniform and he told me that he was in the Government service at Sydney—I think in one of the hospitals there. Now, as to Mr. Dickson, if he ever was in the employ of the Government I never knew it. I knew he had been a contractor with the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am as familiar with Cape Breton county as either of the hon. members, and I never heard of his being in the service of the Government in any shape or form.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: I will be glad to give my hon. friend the title of the position he held. He was in the Government telegraph service at Louisburg as general line repairer.

Mr. CARVELL: Even if he had been in the employ of the Government, and had been dismissed for partisanship, that is no reason why he should not work for the Government if he works honestly and uprightly. I had the Halifax situation and the North Sydney situation on my hands and time was pressing. I went to Colonel Low to see if he could take the work. He represented Bate, McMahon and Company who were doing work at Sydney and also at Halifax. He said: Yes, he could take on the Halifax work. I gave him the con-

tract for the Halifax work, and I want to tell my hon. friend that I did not do this without taking the whole thing to council where it was thoroughly thrashed out. I canvassed the whole situation with a number of men in the contracting business in the province of New Brunswick, and I could not find a single man who was in a position to take this contract. I know the contractors in my province and I could pick out every man who ordinarily would be in a position to undertake this work, but everybody was busy down there last year. The Valley railway, as we call it, was under construction, and practically every contractor in New Brunswick was employed upon that, as well as some of the principal contractors in Nova Scotia; the Government was carrying on tremendously big works at Halifax and Sydney, and practically every Nova Scotia firm that I knew anything about was engaged there. I want to say here that Mr. George W. Kyte never came to me and I never spoke to him until recently. The leader of the Opposition has been referred to, but I never heard from him, and he had no more to do with the matter than a man in Saskatoon. I inquired of a certain man who happened to be here—and I will give my hon. friend his name in confidence—a large employer of labour in the province of Nova Scotia, probably the largest there, a man who knows every workman in Cape Breton Island, about the situation. He told me that Mr. Dickson was well qualified to carry on the work. I sent for Mr. Dickson, and he convinced me of his ability to undertake the work. I gave him the contract on force account, and the work was inspected as no other work was inspected in my department last year because the contract had not been given until my friends had come to me with stories that they had got in Sydney and they said, "You are employing a Grit to do this work," and asked me to rescind the contract. I would not do so and I never yet have done so. I could not believe that because a man happened to be a Liberal he could not work for this department honestly and uprightly, that is no part of my political faith. I have given my hon. friend the facts as I understand them.

Mr. BUTTS: Had the hon. minister any inquiries or communications of any kind from any such firms as Rhodes, Currie & Co., or Chapple Bros., Sydney?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think so. Rhodes, Currie & Co. at that time had just entered into a contract for work at Halifax to cost half a million dollars, in addition to the Camp Hill hospital, which they had under construction. I have no recollection of ever having heard from Chapple Bros. at all. I do not think I had a solitary application from any person to do that work except from Mr. Dickson. I may be in error about this, but my recollection is pretty good.

Mr. BUTTS: It was not advertised?

Mr. CARVELL: Of course it was not. That is what I have been telling my hon. friend. It was a matter of such urgency that I could not advertise it. That is why I had to have it done by force account. That contract was only for the construction of cheap wooden buildings. I presume that every hon. member of this committee has seen a similar class of buildings. There is no plastering; I think there is no foundation except some posts, and the buildings are sheathed with shiplap I think it is called—

An hon. MEMBER: Clapboard.

Mr. CARVELL—or tongue and groove material. The inside work is purely of wood with a layer of tar paper between the boards. Even the roofs are not covered with shingles, but with a ready roofing material. It is the cheapest kind of work you could imagine. Any man capable of handling a saw and hammer could qualify as a carpenter on it. It did not require a man of great ability, it only required a man who could employ men and who would be honest and not pay higher wages or higher prices for material than he should pay, and who would rush the work and get the best out of the men.

Mr. CROWE: This work was carried out under inspection?

Mr. CARVELL: Absolutely; not only under local inspectors, but I utilized the officials of the Engineering Department both from Sydney and Antigonish for the purpose. In addition, Mr. Fuller, the Assistant Chief Architect in this city, made trip after trip to North Sydney and Halifax, and he reported to me personally, not through any of the officials. And I want to tell this committee that there was nothing constructed in the Public Works Department during the past year which I personally investigated and looked after so closely as I did that work at North Sydney. At the time I thought I was carrying on an ordinary business transaction. A man had applied to me, I had found out that he was

well qualified for the work, and I gave him the contract. It was not until some of my colleagues joined me and I got the story, and I saw what I had to face, that I took a personal interest in the construction of that work, and I stand by it from A to Z. If there is anybody wants any investigation I hope he will come on with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was there any interference on the part of some members of Parliament to press the hon. minister to give that contract?

Mr. CARVELL: No, not from members of Parliament or members of the Government. I let the contract myself as Minister of Public Works, and I take full responsibility for everything done there.

An hon. MEMBER: What was the cost of these works?

Mr. CARVELL: Some $160,000.

An hon. MEMBER: Can you tell me the size of the buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: There were three large barracks—I suppose they would be a couple of hundred feet long and 40 or 50 feet wide, but I could not state the dimensions exactly. There is no question whatever, Mr. Chairman, that the buildings did not cost any more than they should have cost. That is not the question at issue at all. The question at issue is that I gave the contract to that particular man. Nobody would raise any question as to the character of the work. The contract was carried out to the letter, it was under forced account, and the contractor did as he was told to do.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And when the Minister of Naval Affairs was pressing for it?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, not merely pressing; he was demanding that I go on and do it by force account, and he was violently protesting against taking the time that would be necessary to prepare plans and specifications and call for tenders. It takes a month to do that, and he wanted it done in a day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was that work done in conjunction with the United States Government?

Mr. CARVELL: No; the next question that came up was as to the construction of these ramps running down into the sea, and that at North Sydney especially was a very serious proposition and a great deal of dredging would have been required. In fact, I have often wondered if it would not have been possible to locate the work at some other point, because the next part of the contract was going to run into some six or seven hundred thousand dollars before it was completed. There again, I wanted to call for tenders, but the same condition existed. On account of the objections I had had from Nova Scotia, I did not give this other work to Captain Dickson. I did not want to have any trouble over it and I was not sure that Captain Dickson had had the experience in heavy concrete work of that kind. I, therefore, gave that part of the work to Bate, McMahon and Company, and I did not know of any other party I could get and no other person applied to me. Bate, McMahon and Company started the work, and I think the day after the armistice was signed, we stopped the work. It was, of course, an easy matter to stop the concrete work and what is there speaks for itself. It would have been an absolute waste if we had gone on with the building, so we went on and completed, not all the buildings, but those that were under construction at the time.

I realize this matter does not come up under the Civil Government vote, but as my hon. friends wish it to be threshed out, I shall be only too happy to give them all the information wanted. The matter can be brought up in the Public Accounts Committee and Mr. Fuller, the architect, who made it his special business to investigate these matters as they went along, can, if required, be summoned and he will give all the information he can, and all the other officials of the department will be only too glad to give all the information possible. At the time I gave this contract, I had no knowledge as to what relations this man had with any person in Nova Scotia. He did the work well.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He did good work?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and he did it quickly, and if the war had gone on, the United States marines would have been properly and comfortably housed during the winter.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was what is now being criticized a part of war work?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. There is no criticism of the work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Of the man who did the work?

Mr. CARVELL: The criticism is of the man who got the contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was the work supervised by an engineer of the department?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly. There was one man all the time and two men most of the time the work was going on, and in addition to the local men who were supervising the work, I told the committee that I sent the assistant chief architect there on three or four occasions to supervise the work personally and see that it was properly done. I do not think there will be any criticism of the cost of the work nor of the manner in which it was carried out. Probably my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) will have to admit that an apology is due.

Mr. McMASTER: I must protest against the minister's endeavouring to give the House the impression that any remarks of mine were made in connection with this contract in Nova Scotia. I knew absolutely nothing about it, and my remarks were made without reference to it. I want the minister to understand that, because it is true.

Mr. CARVELL: I accept that in toto. My hon. friend did state though in pretty plain words that this Government did not purpose giving contracts or anything else to any men except those who had voted for the Government. That is the last thought that has entered into my mind in anything I have done. I can only say in conclusion that this illustrates the wisdom of the Department of Public Works keeping to the tender and contract system, and that when one is expending public money, it is better to expend it in the open, so that any man, no matter who or what he may be, will have an opportunity of tendering on it and the Government will get the best and the cheapest work there is and there will be no cause for criticism.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. James): Under the heading "Contingencies, travelling expenses," the amount last year was $30,000. That is a big amount, but this year it is increased to $44,000, an increase of $14,000. Do some of the officials of the department intend to travel more this year, or what is this for?

Mr. CARVELL: Last year we used the whole $30,000. A few minutes ago I gave an illustration of the North Sydney question to show the committee that sometimes situations arise which are a little different from the ordinary. For instance, I sent the assistant chief architect all the way from Ottawa to North Sydney on three or four occasions to make a personal inspection of a particular work. With the tremendous amount of work we still have under way for hospitals for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the work we shall have under way for some of the big buildings that are being constructed and all the little harbours, breakwaters and so on, that are being constructed throughout Canada, I find that money spent in supervising engineers is a very good investment, and in a great many instances in the last year and a half I find it has paid me to send a man from Ottawa, possibly to British Columbia or any other part of Canada. I have adopted this policy, that whenever I have had any suspicion or any reasonable ground for suspicion, and I think it is for the benefit of the Department of Public Works to have a man make a personal investigation and report to me personally, to send one. Therefore, I presume it is going to require more money to carry on inspection work during this year than in the past, and for that reason, I am asking for a larger appropriation. If the money is not required, it will not be expended, but if it is necessary to send a man to any part of Canada to supervise any public work, and to come back and report to me personally, I want to have the funds to pay his expenses.

Mr. CANNON: When was the departmental solicitor appointed?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not the exact date, but I think some time in February, about five or six weeks ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have all the accounts of Dickson been settled?

Mr. CARVELL: No. Some small amount is, I think, still pending.

Mr. CANNON: I do not quite understand this item of $5,000 for a departmental solicitor. Apparently, all the departments of the Government have solicitors of their own. Why not have the legal business of the Government transacted by the Department of Justice? The Minister of Justice is there to advise all the other ministers, and the Minister of Public Works, according to the constitution of this country, if any legal question arises in his department, must refer the matter to the Department of Justice and ask for its opinions. Besides the Minister of Justice, we have, so as to complete the legal machinery of the Government, a Solicitor General. The functions of a Solicitor General, in the Federal Government as in the Imperial Government, are to appear before the courts and represent the interest of the Government, the interest of all the departments. The minister does not require the services of a departmental solicitor.

When the minister needs a solicitor let him apply to the Department of Justice. He talks about economy; here is an opportunity for him to practise it. The minister says that the solicitor appointed in his department is a good lawyer; let him go back to his practice and let the minister apply to the Department of Justice when he needs legal advice. If each department is to have a special solicitor in cases in which it is interested before the Exchequer Court, what is the use of having a Solicitor General? What is the use of having all the lawyers who are employed in the Department of Justice? What is the use of having Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister of that department?

Mr. CARVELL: In the first place, the salary is $3,500, not $5,000. But the solicitor for the department can save a good many times $5,000 each year. Everything my hon. friend says is constitutionally true and correct. If I want an opinion upon a matter of law or upon the construction of a contract involving a question of principle in my department, probably I should go to the Justice Department for it; I have been doing that in the past, and I will probably do so in the future. Since this solicitor has been in the department, however, we have kept him busy. Matters come up every day on which we get reports from him, and get them more quickly than we could get them from the Justice Department. I realize that the Justice Department has every department of the Government to attend to, and I cast no reflection upon it. But my hon. friend has forgotten the distinction that I attempted to draw. The duty of the Justice Department is to pass upon the validity of contracts, to interpret documents, to advise the departments what the law is on various points that come up. I am not attempting to take away from the Justice Department any of its functions. But it is not the business of the Justice Department to send its officials all over the country to attend the Exchequer Court when property is being expropriated by the Department of Public Works. Take the Belanger case. A piece of property in my hon. friend's own city was required by the department. The construction of a dam at the mouth of the St. Charles river would overflow some of the adjacent land; therefore it became necessary to expropriate that land. The department expropriated not only the land that would be overflowed, but also four or five times as much land below the dam that would not be overflowed at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who did that?

Mr. CARVELL: The Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Which Government?

Mr. CARVELL: The Government that preceded this one. It was done, I think, in 1914-15; I have not the exact date. A local solicitor was asked to represent the Justice Department. Now, I do not know anything about that gentleman and I want to be very careful to say nothing in derogation of him. But I have read the evidence; I have read the case very carefully, and my judgment is that this gentleman, although a good lawyer, had never had very much experience in the expropriation of land, either for the Government or for the railways. That is a class of litigation all by itself. A man might practise law for twenty-five years and not know much about that particular branch of the law unless he had had the necessary experience. The gentleman who represented the Justice Department in that case considered that it was not his business to hunt around and get witnesses—he told me so himself when I discussed the matter with him, although he said that in the end he had to get them. The witnesses who were brought before the court swore that the land was worth all the way from twenty to twenty-three and twenty-four cents a square foot. One witness said he was not sure; he would put it at from ten to fifteen cents a square foot. That was simply a voluntary statement. The judge of the Exchequer Court accepted the ten cents a square foot as being the value of the land, but stated—I do not think he used these words, but this is the substance of them—that in his judgment the case had not been properly tried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He used the word "reluctantly."

Mr. CARVELL: He gave that judgment reluctantly, taking the minimum amount mentioned by any witness—and it was mentioned only by one witness. At ten cents a square foot the value came to something like $120,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: $225,000.

Mr. CARVELL: $225,000; and then the ten per cent was added, bringing it up to about $240,000. Had the Public Works Department been represented in that case by such a counsel as we now have—a man who has had much greater experience in such cases than many men in Canada have had—I do not think we should have had that verdict. Fortunately, we have got around that particular transaction. I know

something about the law of expropriation; I have had a few cases in my experience. We appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court gave us a new trial. We abandoned practically all the land below the dam.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did my hon. friend visit the premises?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and it did not take me long to see the whole thing, either. We have abandoned all the land below the dam which we do not want, and we shall have to settle in some way with the owner of the land for what we have taken. If we cannot settle amicably, we will go to the Exchequer Court, and the departmental solicitor will be there to represent the department. We call him "Departmental Solicitor" but he is really a counsel. His duty is to go over the country and act as counsel for the Public Works Department and for the Government. He takes nothing out of the hands of the Justice Department or of the Solicitor General; he goes before the Exchequer Court representing the department with a waiting brief, or an active brief, if necessary, in order to see that the interests of the department are protected. Let me give the committee another illustration. We have a case in the city of Victoria now involving about $200,000. A firm of contractors have brought action against the Government claiming that they have been improperly dealt with. I knew something about the case before I became minister and as a lawyer I came to the conclusion that this firm had not been unfairly dealt with. Accordingly, I decided to contest this case. I have spent a night and part of a day discussing it with the Department of Justice, the Solicitor General, and the Departmental Solicitor. I have taken many occasions during the last month to go over the evidence with the Departmental Solicitor and I think he knows the case now nearly as well as I do. If it goes to trial he will be there to represent the Public Works Department.

Mr. CANNON: What will be the status of the departmental solicitor before the court?

Mr. CARVELL: He will have status in the court. There need be no fear about that, and if he has not we will see that he gets it. Now the Government is expropriating a dry-dock in Halifax.

Mr. CANNON: The minister has not answered my question.

Mr. CARVELL: I have told my hon. friend that the solicitor will have a proper status before the court. I am not charged with the conduct of the court and am not the judge; therefore I cannot say exactly what the solicitor will do. But I know he will be there and will have a status and be heard. I was going to say that we are expropriating a dry-dock in Halifax involving $1,250,000. In connection with this, I will go over the whole matter with the departmental solicitor and together we will work up the case so that when he goes before the court he will be possessed of all the knowledge which the Public Works Department can give him. I have no apologies to make for asking for this $3,500 for a departmental solicitor, neither have I any apologies to offer for the gentleman who happens to occupy the position at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: You provided last year $574,995. You employed about 350 persons and I think you made the statement last year that it was quite possible that that number of employees would be required in the department. What is the unexpended balance of this sum of money?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot give the exact figures but I am informed that there are 63 vacancies, or about 287 employees, instead of 350.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I asked for the unexpended balance.

Mr. CARVELL: It would be around $60,000 to $70,000.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Is there over $300,000 unexpended?

Mr. CARVELL: No, about $60,000 to $70,000. There are 63 clerks with an average of $1,000 each or about $63,000.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Would it not be well to give the unexpended balance for each individual item, so that we can see the saving there is?

Mr. CARVELL: The reason we prepared the estimates this year in the old way is because we have not the report of the Civil Service Commission. Another year if I occupy this position I shall certainly ask Parliament to vote only the amount of money we expect to expend. You cannot always state the number of officials with exact precision because you can never foresee any contingency, such, for instance, as there was last year in the Architectural Branch.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: You have provided for that in the Estimates under "sundries."

Mr. CARVELL: We provide for a certain number of clerks and if it becomes necessary to appoint special clerks, as we found in the Architect's Department during the past year, we have provision here, and ask the Civil Service Commission to appoint them, the money having been voted for their salaries. A lump sum might be voted for things of this kind, but I think it would be better to vote the money in this way.

Mr. CANNON: I do not quite understand the explanation as regards the solicitor. The minister said he wanted to have a man whose special duty it would be to attend the courts whenever the interests of the department might be involved. This officer is either necessary or unnecessary, and if he is necessary it must be because the Department of Justice is not doing its duty as it should. I do not think the minister intends to imply that the Department of Justice is not performing its duty.

Mr. CARVELL: The Department of Justice of necessity appoints a man in the locality as their solicitor and entrusts to him the conduct of the case. The department cannot send their man out to Vancouver to argue a case before the Exchequer Court there.

Mr. CANNON: Will it be possible for this solicitor to do it?

Mr. CARVELL: He will do it.

Mr. CANNON: How can one man do it?

Mr. CARVELL: Because the Exchequer only sits in one place at a time.

Mr. CANNON: And can he attend to all these cases?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly. I have given illustrations of cases in different parts of the country. A man is appointed by the Department of Justice, in Quebec, say. He never comes near the Public Works Department, but takes the file handed him by the department. I want a man who belongs to the department and knows all about it and can discuss matters with the deputy minister, the chief engineer, the chief architect and myself, so that we may know exactly what we are going to do in court. A man in Levis or Halifax cannot come here to get his information, sitting night after night, and consulting with the minister the same as the departmental solicitor can. No disrespect is intended to the Department of Justice or its solicitors throughout the country, but we want a man who will be in court armed with all the facts.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: What becomes of the unexpended balance at the end of the year?

Mr. CARVELL: It lapses.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: In regard to the matter of aerial work——

The CHAIRMAN: A discussion on that matter is out of order. The question can be brought up and fully discussed when the special items concerning the outside service are under consideration.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS: I understand the minister is prepared to give the correspondence in order that the matter may be discussed, and I assume that the committee are all agreed that it calls for discussion. What I wanted to ask the minister was that the papers be brought down in connection with the matter as soon as possible.

Mr. CARVELL: I will gladly see that they are brought down and if, before they are brought down, my hon. friend will go to the chief architect's department, he may have access to them in any way he wants to. I shall have copies made as soon as I can and give them to my hon. friend. There are no closed books in the Public Works Department. I have never refused information to any man whether he happened to be a member of Parliament or outside citizen. I take the ground that the Department of Public Works is a public department, the country is paying the bills and any man or woman in Canada who wants information has only to write and ask for it.

Mr. FIELDING: In connection with the services of solicitors, I might mention a matter of very considerable interest: the expropriation proceedings in connection with the Halifax dry dock. It has caused some discussion in the press. A gentleman representing the owners of the dock has written letters which convey the impression that the company have not been fairly treated. I mention that as his own statement, not mine. At a convenient time I think it would be desirable if the minister would just state what the facts are from the point of view of the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I will be very glad to do so on the very first occasion possible. I hope to get into Supply again on Thursday and I shall then be very glad to furnish that information.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that there is a Civil Service war vote which is given

generally to the Civil Service. There has been a complaint that officers of this House, who are to all intents and purposes civil servants, who as messengers come here for a certain season and who have been engaged for years and years, some for twenty or twenty-five years, have been left out of this provision. I would like the minister, not to give any answer now, but to think this matter over and see if it is not proper that these men should share in this bonus as well as other servants of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have waited here for two hours while hon. members were discussing aeroplanes and other things to say a word in regard to this item. It refers to increases of salaries. I notice increases to the deputy minister, the assistant deputy minister, and several other increases which I do not feel like allowing to go through without expressing my opinion about them and therefore I object to the item carrying at present.

Mr. CARVELL: I have no objection to the item standing. I unfortunately cannot be here this evening. I would like to have got it through to-day. My hon. friend might bring the question up on some other item or we can allow it to stand. Perhaps it had better stand.

The CHAIRMAN: You might allow the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) to bring it up on the outside service vote.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think the minister will be as far ahead if he allows the item to stand.

Item allowed to stand.

The committee rose, and the House resumed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 43, for the relief of John Edwin Scott.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 44, for the relief of Claudius Henry Sherk.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 47, for the relief of Annie Prodderick.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 48, for the relief of Samuel David McElroy.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 49, for the relief of Mary Jane McCulloch.—Mr. Green.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Bill No. 50, for the relief of Mary Garland Lewis.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 51, for the relief of William Canham.—Mr. Fripp.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply. Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, $1,000,000.

Mr. DUFF: Last year this vote was $400,000. What is the reason for the increase of $600,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The smallness of last year's vote was due to knowledge of the fact that we were unable to obtain steamers to carry on the mail service, and the department felt certain that that amount would be ample for any mail service that could be carried out during that fiscal year. Now that the war is over it is hoped that we shall be able to re-establish the former mail service across the Atlantic, and the vote now corresponds to the amount asked for prior to the war. However, it may prove impossible, even during the current year, to obtain the necessary steamships to carry the mail according to the terms of the contract which was in force prior to the war. In that event the full amount will not be expended. We merely wish to have authority to enter into a mail service contract, and we anticipate that the services as a whole will probably require the amount of money asked for. This, of course, is purely a mail service and not a freight service.

Mr. DUFF: Does the minister mean that the steamships do not carry any freight?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They carry freight, but this vote is for a mail service.

Mr. DUFF: In view of the prevailing high freight and passenger rates, which greatly exceed those in force before the war, and of the fact that so many steamers are now being released for ordinary transportation purposes, it seems to me the Government should be able to make contracts with the steamship companies to carry mails at a much lower subsidy than that paid in pre-war times.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member's suggestion is a proper one, and will be considered; but as a matter of fact I think the steamship companies would rather carry freight than mails, because the compensation is much less remunerative for the carriage of mails.

Mr. McMASTER: Is this steamship subvention on a basis of so much per ton of mail carried, or is it given in the form of a subsidy?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The contractors are paid for two round voyages each week, but the service has not been completely performed during the last two years. The subsidy amounts to $5,292 per round trip, and of course if the voyages are not performed the money is not paid.

Mr. McMASTER: Any payment is made irrespective of the amount of mail carried on each voyage?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: With what steamship line is the contract made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The contract was with the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services Limited, but during the past two years the Government was obliged to utilize the services of any steamship that was available for this purpose.

Steam service or services between Canada and Newfoundland, $70,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is the nature of this service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This service is carried on between the port of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, and Port aux Basques, Newfoundland, and is operated by the Reid Newfoundland Railway Company. It calls for one trip each day, excepting Sunday, between the ports mentioned. There is no change whatever in the service.

Mr. CAHILL: Was the whole of the $70,000 spent on the service last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The sum of $57,000 was expended for the last fiscal year.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: This service was very well performed indeed by the Reid Newfoundland Company, but since the war began they have not been able to give us as good a service as formerly, principally, I presume, because they could not get the steamers. Will the hon. minister be able to give us the names of the steamers for the present season, and state if the company will have the necessary complement of boats to perform the daily service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: So far as the department are advised, the steamers at present in service are the Kyle, the Sagona, and the Glencoe. No contract has been made for the present year, so of course we do not know at the moment what steamers they will offer for that service, but we assume that those steamers are likely to be offered for the service.

Steam service or services between Canada and the West Indies or South America, or both, $340,666.66.

Mr. STEVENS: Does this provide solely for mail service, or is it partially for freight service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is principally freight service. However, the contractors are obliged to carry mails.

Mr. STEVENS: Is any provision made in this item for the possible opening up of trade with the Pacific coast ports via the Panama canal?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, this service would not include that route.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the desirability of providing for the promotion of that trade. Only a day or two ago I was advised of a case from the coast where a firm had 1,500 tons of freight to be handled. On the Pacific coast we are importing large quantities of goods from the West Indies—spices, coffee, and such like, and a very valuable trade can be developed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree with my hon. friend that a service of this kind would be of great benefit to those on the Pacific coast. I had a very interesting conversation this morning with Mr. Robert Dollar, who by the way in his early days lived in Canada, but for the last thirty or forty years has been in the United States. He is known throughout the world for his interest in Pacific coast steamship services. He informed me that he has in mind the opening of a service between Vancouver and New York. I spent a little time trying to induce him to include a Canadian Atlantic port.

An hon. MEMBER: Preferably Halifax.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There might be more unsuitable places. I think Mr. Dollar will establish the service immediately if he can obtain a steamer, and he is at the present moment negotiating in Great Britain for the purchase or construction of one. I have also this to add, that he did not want a steamship subsidy from the Government, and would not take one.

Mr. DUFF: What line is this subsidy paid to?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This service is performed by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, of London, England. The Canadian termini are St. John and Halifax. The West India Islands called at are Bermuda, St. Kitts, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Barbados, Trinidad, and some others.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many boats have they in the service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Four, usually. Two of them were requisitioned by the British Ministry of Shipping during the war, and were returned to the service only recently.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are they very good boats?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think so. The service has been very satisfactory. I understand.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the speed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Eleven knots.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Did they make any money last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think they made a small profit. Of course, as might be expected, they complain that they lost heavily by having two of their steamers requisitioned by the British Ministry of Shipping. At the present moment they are asking for an increase in the passenger and freight rates on the ground that the service is not giving them sufficient revenue. However, I do not mean to say that that statement is correct.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the hon. minister aware that shipmasters and ship owners very seldom admit making any money?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have discovered that during the last few days.

Mr. DUFF: The minister informed the committee that this amount was paid to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. I think that part of this amount is paid to that company, but is it not a fact that part of it is paid to Pickford & Black, whose boats ply between Halifax, Jamaica and Cuba?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it is all paid to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company.

Mr. DUFF: Do not the Jamaica boats get any subsidy?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. DUFF: These boats are loaded to the hatches every trip and cannot take all the freight that is offered; a lot of freight is left at Halifax every time the boats leave. If these boats can ply between Halifax, Jamaica and Cuba without a subsidy, the Royal Mail Steam Packet boats ought to be able to do likewise.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may be quite true that during the last year or two the contractors were not able to carry all the freight that was offering, but my hon. friend must remember that the service was being performed with two steamers only. It may be that during certain seasons of the year when sugar is moving the steamers have quite sufficient freight; but it is also true that at other seasons the boats both in and out are short of cargo. Although the service between Halifax and Jamaica is performed by Messrs Pickford & Black without any subsidy, it must be remembered that they have no passenger accommodation on their boats and those boats would hardly be regarded as sufficient for a subsidized service.

Mr. DUFF: The Jamaica boats carry passengers.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not to any extent. Under the arrangement made with the West India Islands at the time of the tariff arrangement, Canada agreed to establish an improved service, and the contract made with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company was the result of that agreement.

Mr. DUFF: I notice that this item also calls for service between Canada and South America. What boats perform that service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The service is continued from the West India Islands down to Georgetown, British Guiana.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The hon. minister seems to be in doubt as to the amount of money this company made during the past year. I regard it as very important that he should insist on a statement of the earnings of these boats, for only so can we have an intelligent idea as to whether we should continue these subsidies or not. They will always take the money from you if you will give it to them, but they are always loath to give you their figures. When we are subsidizing a line which does not carry our mails we ought to be very strict about getting such information. As the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) says, these companies may be able to carry on the services without this assistance, and the only way in which that can be ascertained is by getting a complete and accurate statement of their earnings. That is difficult to procure; it would take a clever, expert accountant to tell from the books of a

ship-owning company whether they were making money or not. I would ask the minister to look into this question and see if we are not allowing this to drift a little too much, and if, each year before the Estimates come before the House, he could find out the standing of the different companies and what they earned during the previous year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend means that it takes a steamship man to catch a steamship man. Perhaps his advice may be worth something. The matter of granting subsidies to steamship companies, particularly in connection with services to other countries, is, I must admit, a very doubtful one, and it may be, in view of the changed conditions brought about by the war, that many of those services which are to-day receiving subsidies might get along very well without them. That is a matter deserving investigation by the Government. And only to-day I have received such a recommendation from some of the officers of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and probably I shall recommend that some investigation be made as to the necessity of continuing those steamship subsidies. In many cases, we would develop trade much more rapidly by leaving the operation of such services to private parties. There are, however, many cases, particularly of a local nature, where it is, perhaps, quite difficult to avoid granting a subsidy.

As regards the item "steam service between Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand," in answering a question put by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) the other night, I omitted to tell him that this subsidy is paid upon the basis of an export service only. That is, a contract in that particular case is made with a New Zealand or an Australian shipping company which, under the contract, is to perform four trips per month, and not with any specified steamship. When their steamships reach New Zealand they pick up a cargo and proceed to any other part of the world where business may carry them, and the next month the service may be performed by other steamers altogether, but belonging to the same steamship line. Therefore, that particular subsidy is paid towards the development of our export trade with Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. PEDLOW: If those steamships could pick up a return cargo the necessity of paying them a subsidy would be obviated, because they would be able to earn freight rates both going to and coming. If there was not the barrier of protection to get over when they arrived at a Canadian port, no doubt they would be able to obtain sufficient cargo to warrant their returning to Canada, and consequently they would not need the subsidy.

Mr. DUFF: How much money was paid to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company last year for subsidies?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The amount was $209,640.

Mr. DUFF: How many trips were made?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Sixteen.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the reason for the increase in this item?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Last year, as two boats were off the service, it was not necessary to appropriate the full amount as required by the contract. Now that the four steamships are back performing the service under the contract, we can approximate quite accurately what the maximum amount required will be.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: If we take the first six items under the heading "Atlantic Ocean," there is an increase of $853,000 over last year. On what does the minister base his estimate of the amount of subsidies that will be earned by the different companies—on the average subsidies granted during the past three or four years, or on the subsidies granted last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Under the contract with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for a certain service we contract to pay them £70,000, or $340,666, per annum, based on payments of £2,692 6s, or $13,102, per round voyage. If they make all the voyages monthly required by the contract the full amount of the vote will be required for that service.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are these annual contracts?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The first contract with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company covered a period of five years. The contract expired last year, and it was renewed by Order in Council until October next. I suppose, at the end of that time, a new contract will be entered into with the company, or some other arrangements will be made.

Mr. COPP: Does the Department of Trade and Commerce have anything to do with fixing the freight rates in these services?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In every case where a subsidy is granted to a steamship company the freight rates must be approved by the department before they become effective.

Mr. COPP: I understand that this year two additional boats are to be put on the service or services between Canada and the West Indies or South America.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They were put on in February of this year.

Mr. COPP: Last year only two boats were running?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There were only two, although the contract provides for four. Two were requisitioned by the Minister of Shipping for war purposes.

Mr. COPP: When there is a surplus quantity of freight to be shipped from any Atlantic port to the West Indies, who has control of what freight shall be taken and what freight left?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The steamship companies, I should think. They probably accept the freight as it is offered.

Mr. COPP: An exporter in my county sent a shipment of hay to one of the Atlantic ports, and six months passed before he could get space for it; in fact, the shipment was taken care of only about ten days ago. During all that time it has been lying at the port—I think it was Halifax, I am not sure—the steamship companies refusing to accept it. Is there no arrangement under which freight like that can be taken care of?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I assume that the misfortune of this shipper was due to the war. It would be hardly fair to attach all the blame to the steamship company.

Mr. COPP: The war was pretty well over six months ago.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: During the war the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company had only two steamships for the service and were unable to carry all the freight that was moving between the West Indies and Canada. I imagine that during that period a great deal of freight was handled by schooners. A great many of our imports came via New York; sugar was railed from New York to the refineries at St. John and Halifax. I have no explanation to offer as to why this shipment of hay was delayed so long. I imagine that the steamers performing the service would carry the cargo which was deemed to be most essential to the interests of the people of the West Indies at that time, and possibly hay was not regarded as absolutely essential.

Mr. McKENZIE: This proposed vote is a large one, and the people would like to know whether they are going to get value for it. When did this vote begin? Has there been any appreciable increase in the trade between the West Indies and Canada? Have imports and exports increased by reason of the grant of this large sum of money for the encouragement of trade?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand that trade between Canada and the West Indies has increased very considerably in recent years, and in that connection the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company is entitled to some credit. In 1909 the freight carried—I do not know whether by this particular service or by the steamship company which operated prior to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company—amounted to 63,000 tons weight and 54,000 tons measurement. The following are some further figures:

Year	Tons Weight.	Tons Measurement.
1910	66,000	
1911	69,000	
1912	65,000	
1915	78,000	94,000
1916	100,000	127,000
1917	94,000	99,000

There has been a gradual increase.

Mr. McKENZIE: It fluctuates.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. I suppose the figures for the last few years are not a sure indication of the actual development in trade. This service between Canada and the West Indies is a very important one. The present contract was the outcome of negotiations between the Governments of the British West Indies and Canada which took place in Ottawa some years ago.

Mr. COPP: I am informed that the case I cited a few moments ago was taken up with the Department of Trade and Commerce, but that the department appeared to take very little interest in the matter. The department should be willing to give consideration to matters affecting the shipment of freight to be carried by this subsidized steamship service. In view of the fact that freight rates are now very high, is it necessary to subsidize this steamship service as largely now as it was subsidized when freights were low? Owners of steamers or sailing vessels are anxious to get as large a subsidy as possible. The Minister of Trade and Commerce should find out whether the company can make its service sufficiently remunerative as not to require

the payment of these large subsidies by the Government. I am surprised that the minister asks Parliament for an increase of nearly a million dollars in subsidies, in view of the fact that freight rates have been high during the last few years. The Trade and Commerce Department is simply going to seed; we are getting very little advantage from the money spent by it.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The minister says that the department control the freight rates. I understand they issue schedules. If these schedules are not adhered to what will the department do—for instance, if there is any overcharging?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If a subsidized steamship company charged greater freight rates than those approved of by the department the department would, of course, be obliged to inquire into the matter and, if the offence were very serious and not adequately explained, consider the cancellation of the subsidy.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the schedule part of the contract?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it is not.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then you could not break the contract?

Mr. CHISHOLM: That is the point.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The contract states that the freight rates shall be subject to the approval of the department. As regards the hay referred to by my hon. friend, I never heard of any complaint about this particular shipment, and am very sorry if the matter has not received attention. I shall look into the question and write my hon. friend.

Mr. LOGGIE: If Cuba and Porto Rico were included in the call ports of this line, trade with the West Indies would be very much fostered. At the present time shippers of dried fish require to use the Havana market. They must ship their goods via Boston or New York. If the minister will make inquiries he will find that there are considerable imports of codfish into Cuba from the Pacific coast cities of the United States, via Panama canal. It seems to me that the Canadian Atlantic coast is the natural source of supply for that market, but the exporters are handicapped by the fact that there is no steamer sailing from any Canadian port touching at Havana or Porto Rico. One of the boats, I think, calls once a month at Santiago, Cuba. I am not sure whether it is the boat that goes to Jamaica and Georgetown in Demerara or the subsidized line. At any rate, a boat calls at Santiago, but it is on the opposite side of the island. I suggest that the minister might take the matter up with the steamship line when the contract is being renewed, as it would be in the interests of the industry as a whole.

Mr. TWEEDIE: At the present time there is about 35,000,000 pounds of frozen beef that was left on hand when the war closed; in the West the quantity being about 20,000,000 pounds. It has not been possible to secure accommodation on the ocean-going boats. Has the Government undertaken to arrange for space in these ships?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter to which my hon. friend refers is hardly relevant to the subject before the committee, but it is true that at present there is in Canada about 40,000,000 pounds of frozen beef which would have been readily marketed were the war still on. This quantity of beef is now in the hands of Canadian packers, not because of any lack of shipping but because there are no purchasers.

Mr. McMASTER: If the price were reduced, some might be willing to buy even in this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt very much whether it could be marketed in this country even at a much reduced price. Advices received from the British Government seem to indicate that they will purchase this frozen beef provided they are given leave to sell it in other countries—Greece, Roumania, Italy and one or two other countries, and it seems probable that this large quantity of frozen beef will be marketed very shortly.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Most of this beef was slaughtered in this country and cured and stored for Great Britain, and at the close of the war they refused to take it. I understand that British and Canadian ships are carrying across frozen beef which was purchased from the United States under contract, with the result that this beef is being left on the hands of the Canadian packers. The British Government have evidently released the ships but have commandeered sixty per cent or seventy per cent of the space in them, and if I am correctly informed they are using the ships to transport supplies from the United States to Great Britain and France instead of providing space for the accommodation of those in this country who produced on the good faith of the Imperial Government.

Mr. FIELDING: This item contemplates a service either to the West Indies or South America. or both. I know that the line hitherto has not gone further south than Demerara. Is that still the fact?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is.

Mr. FIELDING: We have therefore no provision for trade with ports further south. In view of this fact, is the Government contemplating the opening up of South American markets? This is a large field, and as our products will no doubt be looking for new markets the matter is an important one. Perhaps it has already engaged the attention of the department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is a shipping firm in Montreal, MacLean, Kennedy and Company, who are now considering the matter of establishing a steamship service between Canada and South America. There are many inquiries regarding such a service, and I have no doubt that during the year one will be established.

Mr. DUFF: With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland in regard to the service to Cuba, I might say we have between one or two ports in Nova Scotia and Porto Rico a fairly good service that does not cost the people of this country one dollar, and is not performed by steamers. There are a number of clipper ships in Nova Scotia, owned in Lunenburg, sailing each fortnight for Porto Rico from Lunenburg, while ships also sail from Halifax to Havana. These are schooners of about 125 tons. If they can do this business without a subsidy the big steamship companies should do the same.

Mr. LOGGIE: What the hon. gentleman says is quite true, but that does not convenience the public who, if they want to ship to the ports named, must do so at present via Boston and New York. I quite realize that full cargoes go from Lunenburg but that does not in any way affect the case I am endeavouring to present to the minister. I would like to tell the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) that during the past winter practically all the refrigeration space of the ocean steamers was used for carrying frozen beef to the United Kingdom.

Mr. McCREA: I think these subsidies should be voted with the distinct understanding that the department will ascertain whether it is necessary to grant subsidies or not. I am not very well versed in shipping by water except that, as a shipper, I have had occasion to note what the rates were before the war and to know something about what they are now. You would be surprised to know that there has been an increase of as much as a thousand per cent over what they were in normal times. I have been shipping some goods to the United Kingdom and the freight has been three times the value of the goods when they left this port. If the carrying trade is getting the same rates as it has been getting in the last two years I do not believe it needs any assistance from this Government. The minister should promise this committee that before any of the subsidies are paid he will have a proper accounting made to see what amount of money these ships are making and if they are in need of this money from the Government in order to give the necessary service. Our rates by rail have been increased by about forty per cent, but that is nowhere with the increase in the water rates. We want these services continued, but we want to know, before the Government is called upon to subsidize a service, whether that subsidy is necessary or not.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I agree with my hon. friend that the Government should not enter into any contract to pay subsidies unless they are assured it is necessary to the performance of the service. The accounts of the steamship companies are always submitted to the department before a contract is entered into. It is true that freight rates have been very much higher in the last two or three years than prior to the war, but it is also true that it costs a great deal more to operate a steamship to-day than it did then. Every day applications are made to the Department of Trade and Commerce for an increase in the subsidies paid particularly for local services. Pretty nearly all of the steamers engaged in local services in Eastern Canada and on the Pacific coast complain that the subsidy they are receiving does not enable them to earn even dividends upon the money invested in the service.

Mr. LOGGIE: May I mention, in reply to the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea), that recently a contract was entered into to carry goods from St. John to the United Kingdom at four and a half cents a pound, and before the goods left this side the rate was reduced to one cent per pound.

Mr. DUFF: What kind of goods?

Mr. LOGGIE: Boneless codfish.

Mr. CANNON: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to two items of news which reached this country from the Peace Conference and which will affect this year's Budget. We have been told by the newspapers that the German merchant fleet has been surendered to the Allies and that a division of the ships has been made among the different allied nations. We have had expression of views from different members of the Government since the opening of the session to the effect that Canada at the Peace Conference has to-day the status of a nation. Therefore, as a nation Canada must have received part of that German fleet. I would like to know from the minister the number of ships that Canada has received, if any, and where these ships will be placed. As regards the particular item that we are discussing now—Steam service between Canada and the West Indies—I have also seen in some of the papers, sent by the official representative of the press at Paris, a statement to the effect that Canada would receive as compensation for her war activities either Greenland or the West Indies. I prefer the West Indies, and if we are to receive the West Indies, would the minister be kind enough to tell us if this subsidy will be discontinued?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) is not contributing very much to the peace of the House and that he wishes to provoke a little discussion.

Mr. CANNON: Not at all; this is quite relevant.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am unable to inform my hon. friend as to whether or not any distribution of enemy shipping will be made and if so whether any will come to Canada. I understand that the German shipping that is being distributed now is for the purpose of carrying foodstuffs to certain countries, and in that event I would imagine that the shipping would be placed in the hands of some of the powers which are able to handle it. I am unable to apprehend the point of my hon. friend's question as to the West Indies. I would like to remind him that the West India Islands are not owned by Germany, and they cannot hand them over to Canada.

Mr CANNON: I know that, and I mentioned this because I found this correspondent sending most extraordinary news. I do not know why he is kept there at all.

Steam service between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Mr. McMASTER: How much of the $73,000 voted last year was spent?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There were only three sailings on this service last year, and the amount spent was $36,000.

Mr. McMASTER: Then you contemplate a more extended programme of sailings this year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, we hope to resume the sailings which were carried on prior to the war.

Mr. PARENT: Who is receiving this subsidy?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Elder-Dempster Company. It is a monthly service and the steamers leave a St. Lawrence port—Montreal, I think—in the summer, and St. John or Halifax, at the option of the contractors, during the winter.

Mr. COPP: Is this $146,000 the same subsidy that was granted before the war?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. LOGGIE: What class of commodities are sent from Canada to South Africa?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In 1918, Canadian goods to the value of $2,714,000 were transported to South Africa by this service, and the principal items of Canadian origin included flour, agricultural machinery, calcium carbide, binder twine, automobiles, butter, cattle, lumber, wax, cereal goods, egg-fillers, woodenware, wheat and furniture.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister states that only one-half of the $73,000 voted last year was expended. Now he is asking for a vote of double that amount. What is the increase due to? Is it because the minister expects to pay bigger subsidies, or does he anticipate having more ships plying between Canada and South Africa? If the latter is the reason, has he made any inquiries to see what ships are available for the service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As I have already stated, the contractors are to perform a monthly service. Last year, owing to the lack of shipping and the commandeering of vessels by the British Admiralty, only three sailings were carried out. This year it is expected that the contract will be carried out in its entirety, which will mean twelve sailings, and will involve a payment of $146,000 for the year in subsidies. We are assured that the company will be able shortly to fully carry out the contract.

Mr. BUREAU: Has the subsidy been increased?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. CAHILL: Why should we pay seven per cent of the value of the goods we shipped to South Africa in the way of subsidy in order to get our goods into that market? It seems an extraordinary amount of money to pay for that purpose.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know what my hon. friend means by paying seven per cent.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister said about $2,000,000 worth of goods were shipped, and the subsidies amount to $146,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Whether the policy of subsidizing this service is sound in principle or not, it gave a start to Canadian trade to South Africa. I think possibly it is a very practical question to inquire whether it should be continued very much longer. Possibly if there was more individual effort on the part of Canadian exporters and producers they might be able to find a market there without the aid of a subsidized steamship service. However, in recent months it would have been almost impossible, I think, for private shipping to have engaged in the Canadian-South African trade. Whatever shipping facilities our Canadian producers have enjoyed during the last two years were due to the fact that we had this contract. It might be interesting to give the Committee a few figures showing how our trade with South Africa has increassed:

Year.	Exports to South Africa.
1911	$2,295,000
1912	2,411,000
1913	3,332,000
1914	3,831,000
1915	4,585,000
1916	5,456,000
1917	4,447,000
1918	5,000,000

For eleven months of the present fiscal year the exports amounted to over $11,000,000, but I have not the information which would disclose the principal reason for that increase. I imagine, however, it was due to flour exports. Of course, that volume of trade was not all carried by these subsidized steamers.

Mr. McMASTER: I gather from the minister's statement that he has not altogether decided in his own mind as to the imperative necessity of these subsidies. If he is not absolutely convinced that they are imperatively necessary, is it right that he should ask for these subsidies to be voted when, according to the figures given by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) the other day, there is an apparent deficit on ordinary account of something like $100,000,000? It seems to me it is not putting the committee in a fair position to ask us to accord our approval and take the responsibility of voting subsidies amounting altogether to about $2,500,000, unless the minister is able either to assure us that they are absolutely necessary, or assure us in the most formal fashion that we are merely voting these subsidies subject to his making the most searching inquiry as to the necessity for them. Because I take it that a most serious financial condition confronts this country unless every possible means are adopted to cut down the expenditure. I would like to impress that fact upon this committee, I think we should all take it to heart, that the financial situation of this country is such as it has never faced before, and the whole of the appropriation for the public service should be regarded in the light of that fact.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can only repeat that before the contracts are entered into, searching inquiry will be made in each case to ascertain if there is any necessity for the subsidy. There is this to say concerning steamship services to South Africa, Australia and New Zealand during the present year—and I think I am perfectly accurate in making the statement—that it would be practically impossible to have an established steamship service between this country and the other Dominions mentioned without a subsidy during the present year. It must also be remembered further, that the freight rates are, or will be, more favourable to those countries from Canada than if we were relying upon free shipping for our service. My hon. friend knows that steamship freight rates to-day are very excessive, in fact a steamship owner can get almost anything in the way of freight rates, although, of course, those rates are not as high as they were two or three years ago. For the time being, however, I think the subsidized steamship service to distant countries like South Africa and Australia is in the interest of Canadian trade. If we are to collect a revenue we must develop our trade, both domestic and foreign, and I do not think that any very substantial objection can be made to the granting of subsidies for the time being. When shipping is freer and trade restrictions are removed, I admit, it will then be

very proper to inquire as to whether or not these subsidies should be continued.

Mr. BELAND: I agree with a good deal of what the hon. minister has just said, but in rapidly glancing through these items I fail to see any reference to a direct service between Canada and France. It may be due to my inadequate knowledge of the Budget, and that possibly elsewhere in the Estimates an amount is provided as a subsidy. Perhaps the hon. minister has some information in this regard, and also as to a direct service between Canada and Belgium, for which country I have naturally a tender spot in my heart. Has any company to the knowledge of the Government undertaken a free service, that is, as far as we are concerned as a Government, between the two countries, or has any application been made to the Government for a subsidy for a service between France and Canada, for instance; and, if so, has it been refused; and, if refused, why? France and Belgium at the present moment are going through an era which in my humble opinion is most propitious not only for the resumption of the old trade relations, but for the establishment of a new service. These two countries to-day, at the very moment when peace is about to be signed, are entering a period of virile activity in reconstruction, and they will need not only the raw materials of this country but our manufactured articles in large quantity. I should be indeed very sorry if the Government and this committee were not disposed to subsidize such a service, especially this year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend will notice that in the Atlantic ocean subsidies there is no provision for a subsidy for any service between Canada and European ports. A great many subsidies formerly were paid for such services, but as during the past four years it was impossible for such services to be performed these items were struck out. I did not think it was necessary to reinstate them in the Estimates, because I am satisfied that any steamships operating between Europe and Canada during the present year will be able to obtain all the freight they can handle at very satisfactory rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are you not authorized by statute?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We were authorized to pay $200,000 to steamship services between France and Canada; I think, however, that that statute has lapsed. During the later years when it was available, during the war, of course no steamship company applied for the subsidy, and there has been no inquiry this year. I was informed to-day that a steamship service is to be established between France and Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER: Is it the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, La Cie Générale Transatlantique.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was approached to-day by some representatives of that company in connection with this proposed service. It is expected that the service will be in operation by the first of May. This is a service we are getting without a subsidy, and I really do not think it is necessary to pay any subsidy between Canada and any European ports during the present year. For instance, if we sell to Belgium under the credits which we give to her $25,000,000 of goods, we are assured that there will be $25,000,000 of goods for ships to carry to that country; and if $50,000,000 worth of credits are extended to France, and she avails herself of those credits, there will be goods of that value to carry to France. So I do not think there will be any necessity at present to subsidize a service between Canada and France or Belgium or any other European ports.

Mr. BELAND: The hon. minister means continental ports?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes. However, at a later date, on some other item, I have promised the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) an opportunity of discussing the matter of trade between Canada and France, and when we reach that item I shall be very glad indeed to hear from him in relation to the development of Franco-Canadian trade.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I understood the hon. minister to say that of the $73,000 voted for the Canada-South Africa service last year, there was only $36,000 expended. What becomes of the remaining $37,000? Will it be added to the $146,000 asked this year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, that vote lapses.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to corroborate the statement made a moment ago in regard to the service between Canada and France. I think by next month we shall have between Montreal and Havre, and perhaps another French port, a first-class service. La Cie Générale Transatlantique is one of the big steamship lines of the world, and it maintains between New

York and some of the French ports a most excellent service. The other day I met M. de la Touche, the president of the company, who was in Montreal as the guest of honour at a luncheon given by some of the business men. He there declared that his company is ready to put in commission two or three, and perhaps four, big steamers between Canada and France; so we shall have an excellent service. However, if there is to be any subsidy paid to any line established between Canada and France, I would say, give it to that company, because you will be sure of getting the ships and the service. They are not claiming any subsidy, but I do not think they would refuse it if offered to them. It is a great pity, however, that this statute should have been allowed to lapse. My hon. friend should reinstate it, because it took so many years before we were in a position to obtain that subsidy from the Government.

The Allan line struggled along for many years with a second-class service, and finally, I think, they succeeded in building up quite a business between Havre and Halifax in winter and Quebec in summer. I would be very sorry to see this item of $200,000 for a subsidy for a steamship service between Canada and France lapse, because it forms part, so to speak, of the Treaty of Commerce which exists between the two countries. I see that that treaty has been denounced by the French Government. That is to say, notice has been given to all nations having treaties with France that she will, after a certain period of time, reconsider those treaties. Now that Canada, France and Great Britain are so closely allied after this great war, and when we are so much interested in the prosperity of France and in bettering the good relations which exist between that country and ours, I sincerely hope that Canada will renew as favourable a treaty as possible with France. Of course, the news has spread throughout France of late that, Canada becoming bone-dry, part of the trade which existed between the two countries in former years will be cut off. If we do not import the excellent French wines, I do not see what we may well import from France with the exception of masterpieces of painting, sculpture and the arts generally, but a referendum will take place in a few days in Quebec and I am quite sure that province will be favourable to light wines and light beer. And I hope the other provinces of the Dominion will follow suit, and then the Dominion Government will do the sensible thing and give to moderate people an opportunity of using in moderation the good French wines and light beer, so that there will be a raison d'être for the old steamship service which existed in former years between Canada and France.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a phase of these subsidies which it is our duty to bring to the notice of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The high cost of living in this country is a subject that should receive the attention of that department and of the Government as a whole. The condition of trade and commerce in Canada has to do with articles of food, and I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that the ordinary consumers should not be called upon to furnish money to send foodstuffs out of Canada while prices are sky-high as they are to-day.

The large masses of the Canadian people who are consumers have to pay enormous prices for butter, beef, fish and other articles that enter largely into our everyday production. The price of butter to-day throughout this country is from 64 to 65 cents per pound, and if those people who have to pay 65 cents per pound for butter are called upon to pay duty on the shoes and clothing that their children wear, in order to furnish subsidies for steamships to take foodstuffs out of the country to be sold at a cheaper rate in some foreign part of the world, that is not good governmental management. The price of beef in Canada to-day is enormously high. The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), very properly in the interest of his constituency and his city, asked about space to carry frozen or chilled beef from Canada across the Atlantic or somewhere else out of this country. Before we grant subsidies for carrying beef out of this country, the home market should be something like normal. There are some things that should be plentiful and cheap in Canada. I can understand the price of tea, or tobacco, or cotton, or other articles which we do not produce ourselves, getting dear in this country, but I never could understand, nor have I any right to understand, why flour or beef should be dear in Canada. Flour and beef should be plentiful in this country because we produce enormous quantities of both. I would point out to the minister and every other member of the Government that the big question of the day is to get back to normal as regards our foodstuffs, because the people cannot, with very high prices which they have to pay, support their families in comfort upon the wages they

are now getting. Neither the Minister of Trade and Commerce, nor any other minister has a right to go down into the pockets of poor people for millions of dollars to pay subsidies to boats to enable the producer to charge too much for his product. Far be it from me to say or do anything detrimental to good and natural trade in foodstuffs, and if we produce enough of those articles here, the producer can surely make a fair, honest profit without being bolstered up in this way by the granting of large subsidies to take foodstuffs out of this country, thus enabling the producers to charge prices above normal. Nothing that the Government can do to-day is more important than to give their attention to making living comfortable and reasonable for the people.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister give me the figures as to the value of goods carried in 1915, 1916, or 1917 by ships which are subsidized? I want to find out in what way there is a benefit to trade between Canada and South Africa by subsidizing ships if they are carrying only a small proportion of the trade. What does the minister think would be the outcome if he were not to subsidize those ships? Would that be a detriment to the trade of this country, or shall we still have to pay a premium of seven per cent on goods we are exporting to induce people to buy them, in addition to actually furnishing the purchaser with credit for the whole amount? Are we going to continue to pay part of the freight charged for delivering those goods and yet get nothing back except somebody's note?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend goes very far when he says that these subsidized steamship services have done nothing to develop trade in far-off countries.

Mr. CAHILL: I did not say any such thing. I was asking the minister what they had done in that direction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot speak with exactness as to that; I imagine nobody could. I believe that the subsidies paid to these steamship lines plying regularly between Canada and South Africa contribute something to the building up of Canadian trade. There will come a time—perhaps it is fairly reached now—when that trade shall have received sufficient help by way of subsidies from Canada and will operate without Government aid. But I do think that these subsidized services have done a great deal toward the development of trade. The leader of the Opposition opened up the important subject of the high cost of living. Prices are not normal; shipping is not normal; shipping rates are not normal; the producing countries of the world are not producing in normal quantities. Nothing in this world is normal; we are obliged to face unusual conditions. Canada imports largely, particularly from the United States, and we must have some way of paying for the things we import. We cannot pay for them in money. No country can pay for its imports except by exporting. Therefore it is important that we have an export trade. It is true that the price of flour is very high to-day, but the farmer of the West will tell you that, owing to the increased cost of production, he is not making very much out of the wheat which he is producing. The wheat that we export is our surplus product; that is true of almost everything that we export. However, I do not wish to engage in a discussion of that subject to-night; I am hopeful that some other item in the Estimates will afford a more appropriate opportunity of doing so.

Mr. ROSS: The minister explained that trade with South Africa increased from $2,300,000 in 1911 to over $11,000,000 in 1918. What proportion of the amount carried in this period was carried by non-subsidized lines and what amount by subsidized lines?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In 1912 the value of goods carried by subsidized service to South Africa was $4,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. ROSS: What subsidy was granted that year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was $146,000. In 1913 the value of the goods carried was $5,860,000, and in the following year an amount slightly in excess of $4,000,000.

Mr. ROSS: Was this subsidy the same?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, and in these earlier years I think it was fully earned. In 1915 the value of the goods exported was over $5,000,000; in 1916, nearly $5,000,000, and in 1917 about the same amount.

Mr. ROSS: Was that all carried by subsidized steamers?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: Can the minister give the value of the goods carried by non-subsidized lines?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have given our total exports to South Africa covering the period which I have just mentioned. Prior

to and in the early days of the war the greater part of our trade to South Africa was carried by our subsidized steamers. During the war our exports were abnormal, as is evident from the figures of 1911. Some of these exports, I imagine, found their way to South Africa through American ports. A great deal of our exports during the last two years was carried by sailing ships from Canadian ports. This is particularly true of lumber.

Mr. ROSS: Can the minister give us the amount carried by non-subsidized lines during the years that he has mentioned?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not the figures at hand.

Mr. LEDUC: The minister says that we have subsidized steamship lines to create overseas trade with South Africa and elsewhere and to get rid of our surplus foodstuffs. But we have not sufficient to feed our own people, why should we continue to subsidize these steamers to take away the foodstuffs that we ourselves require? For instance, there is not a sufficient quantity of butter this year to supply our own people.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Outside of flour, not very many foodstuffs were exported to South Africa. Does my hon. friend say that we should prohibit the export of wheat from Canada which we produce in abundance? The other articles exported are agricultural machinery, binder twine, automobiles, paper, lumber, carriage ware, chairs woodenware, furniture.

Mr. CAHILL: The things that are shipped by subsidized ships are apparently all manufactured goods, so that the manufacturer is not satisfied to get protective tariff here, and thereby rob the people of the country directly, but he must also have a subsidy to ship his goods out of the country. Is that the position the Government are taking?

Steam services between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Liverpool, $20,000.

Mr. DUFF: What steamship line is this?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is a service that has been subsidized for a number of years, and which was not performed last year. The contractors were Furness Withy Company who have an office at Halifax. The ports of call are Halifax, St. John's, Nfld., and Liverpool. It is a service which, the contractors claim, has never paid them. The company, taking their entire shipping, which is widely scattered throughout the world, doubtless earned handsome profits, but the representations to the department have always been that this service did not pay.

Mr. DUFF: This service, I understand, is only for freight.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Freight alone.

Mr. DUFF: I will ask the minister not to request the committee to pass this amount, it is absolutely unnecessary. The company have made large sums of money in the past few years in this and other services, and I would point out that there is no subsidy for a service between St. John's, Nfld., Halifax and New York, which is far more important to the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The minister will remember that a few years ago this service was performed by the Red Cross Line which operated the Stephano which was torpedoed, and the Florizel, which was lost off Cape Race. After these ships were lost the line did not operate but, to their credit, the business men of Halifax purchased two or three steamers and operated them between St. John's, Nfld., Halifax and New York.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is the hon. member advocating a subsidy between Halifax and New York? If so he will give the railroads an excuse for raising their rates as there is competition between the boats and railroads. Across the ocean there is no rail competition.

Mr. DUFF: I do not say that any money should be voted, but if any amount is granted I do not think it should go to the Furness Withy Company. It is more in the interest of the minister himself and of the country that the subsidy should be granted to the Halifax people operating the line between Halifax, St. John's, Nfld., and New York.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would not like to drop this item, but I can only say about it what I have said in regard to other items, that inquiry will be made before any contract is entered into. There is a great deal of uncertainty as to what our shipping service will be during the present year, and I simply want to make provision for the subsidies in the event of ships being available and it being deemed advisable to establish the services. I appreciate the remarks of my hon. friend respecting the Halifax, St. John's, Nfld., and Liverpool service, but this particular service is quite a factor in Canadian-Newfoundland trade and it has been deemed desirable to con-

tinue it in the interests not only of Canadian trade but of Newfoundland trade as well. I agree that the matter should be investigated before any contract is made, but I should like the committee to allow the sum to be voted. Our chief exports of Canadian origin, are lumber, box boards, canned apples, canned lobsters, canned beef, fish, seal oil, cod oil, tallow, oats, cheese, furs, machinery, lawn mowers, wire fencing, etc.

Mr. DUFF: I cannot agree with the minister in his statement that the Furness Withy Company has not been remunerative, and I would like him to inform the committee where he got the information. With regard to the trade between Canada and St. John's, Newfoundland, I think we should give the subsidy to our own people, who are constituents of the minister, and his own friends in Halifax who operate a line of boats rather than give the subsidy to the Furness Withy people who are millionaires. I am merely speaking on behalf of the minister's own people as a matter of courtesy and kindness seeing that he can hardly speak for them in this matter himself as he is in charge of the Estimates. If there is any subsidy I think it should go to the concern represented by Mr. J. W. Regan, who is not a political friend of mine. This service extends from Halifax to New York as well as St. John's, Newfoundland. It is very important in view of the exchange situation that we should have a service between Nova Scotia and New York. The business men of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will do more business if they can get connection with New York. Last year when that connection was cut off we were worried a good deal because we could not ship goods to our New York customers. The Government should do everything possible to see that the connection which we now have is continued. I am going to ask the Minister not to make this contract with the Furness Withy and also to submit to us in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for a Halifax-Newfoundland and Halifax-New York service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This money is not being voted to any particular company. It is open to any person at all. With respect to the matter of a subsidy for a steamship service to New York, all I can say is that the matter shall have the very best consideration. In only one instance are we paying any subsidy for a service to an American port, and that is for a service from a British Columbia port to a port on the Pacific coast in the United States. I think that is carried out in pursuance of an agreement made with British Columbia at the time she entered into Confederation. However, I shall be glad to give consideration to my hon. friend's suggestion. I do not think that any application has ever been made for a subsidy for a service to an American port.

Mr. McKENZIE: This service strikes three countries, Canada, Newfoundland and Great Britain. Have either of the other two countries paid any subsidy?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I do not think so.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see no good reason why Canada alone should subsidize this service. It is certainly more important to the colony of Newfoundland than to us, because, if this steamer touches at St. John's going direct to the Old Country, she naturally will have a considerable trade between St. John's and Liverpool. If they are not subsidizing her and the English Government are not subsidizing her, why should the Canadian people be called upon to pay $20,000 for this service? The minister says that this is not for any particular company but be will find, on inquiry in his department, that this amount has for years and years gone to the same people. I remember this item ever since I came to this House quite a long time ago, and the money always goes to the same people. It is a very indifferent sort of a service. I remember having it up with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and it was then exactly as it is to-night just as a matter of course and nobody saying anything about it. As to granting subsidies to steamers going to American ports, if a subsidy is necessary to get the trade we want in those American ports, I would certainly say grant it. If we can get a good service without a subsidy, all right, but this traffic can be established between Canada and some American port with a good steamship service. There is a tremendous trade growing up between Nova Scotia and New York in fish, and this steamer that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) speaks about must be very important in that way. If we cannot get a service without a subsidy it would be well spent money to establish such a connection. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) talks about the dangers of establishing competition between steamers and railways. Competition is the only salvation that we have in my part of the country. When we have water competition we can always fight the rail-

ways but the moment they find that they have the field entirely to themselves they put up their rates.

Mr. FIELDING: Touching the point raised by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) as to the desirability of this subsidy being handed to a local company, if the records are examined it will be found that this subsidy was originally given to a local company in Halifax but the service which was established by the Halifax people turned out to be so unsatisfactory that after some years it was turned over to the Furness-Withy Company. It was not until after the local company had had a fair trial that the English company came into it. As to subsidizing a steamship service to New York, if the policy is entered upon of subsidizing steamers on the Atlantic to the United States, and the trade of that region may be considered as largely in that direction, I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that there are several points on the western shore of Nova Scotia which will be very glad to have assistance in the way of subsidies for a steamer plying between those ports and Portland and Boston. I have an idea that some applications of that kind may reach the minister, and if he decides to give a subsidy to New York I suppose we may then have a definite precedent for asking for one for a service to Portland and Boston.

Mr. EDWARDS: It would be just as reasonable to subsidize the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company to run their boats on lake Ontario in competition with the Grand Trunk and other railways as to subsidize a line from Halifax to New York.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If subsidies were necessary to give the people of Ontario a reduced rate I would say they should be given. But it is quite likely they are getting low rates on these boats as it is, because they can carry so much cheaper than the railways.

Mr. EDWARDS: Exactly.

Steamship service between Baddeck and Iona, $5,825.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a service I wish to bring to the notice of the minister. It is in my riding. It is the connection from Victoria county with the Intercolonial railway. It is the only connection we have between the main portion of my riding and the railway system of Canada. The people are threatened with a closing down altogether of the service. Last year and the year before, the owners of the boats did not make a cent, but, on the contrary, lost money, and they told me, and I think they told the minister, that unless something is done for the service they will have to close it, they cannot afford to run a service for the country without making more or less profit. Everything enters into the running of a steamer has gone up in price. They used to get their coal for $3 a ton, but now they have to pay $8 a ton for it. Everything else has gone up in proportion, and yet there has been no increase in the subsidy for steamers. It is nine or ten years I believe since there was any increase in the subsidy for this company. Now it is peculiarly a service in which the Government has an interest, by reason of a connection existing with the Intercolonial. The railway has built a wharf at Iona, where its service ends, and it has also built a wharf at Baddeck. Properly speaking the service should be owned by the Government, because the railway takes freight and passengers from all parts of Canada to Baddeck. The railway sells tickets for Baddeck and lands passengers there, but when those passengers get to Iona they have no connection except through the boat operated by this company. If the boat stops the Government will have to provide a conveyance of its own in order to carry out the transportation conditions of the tickets which they sell at points all over the world where they have connections. I am aware that some communications have reached the department from the owners of this steamer with respect to this matter—and I am urging upon the Government—I would like to bring it particularly to the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) if he were here—to take this service over, to purchase the boat of this company and thus own the connection between the railway and that side of the Bras d'Or Lakes. As the Minister of Railways is not present perhaps the acting Minister of Trade and Commerce is in a position to say whether or not the Government will carry out my suggestion. If not, let the Government try and keep the service going. Let it grant some material assistance so that this service can be maintained.

Mr. EULER: I have just been wondering what the basis of this system of subsidies is. When the previous items relating to subsidies for foreign steamship services were under discussion, I thought possibly those subsidies might be justifiable, but now we have arrived at the point where subsidies are being voted for local steamship services, and I am curious to know how long this policy has been in existence,

and what is the actual reason for adopting it. Those of us who do not live in the Maritime Provinces, and who have to depend upon railways for transportation, when the railway rates go up have to pay the increase without coming to the Dominion Government for assistance. For my part I do not see why any such discrimination should be practised.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend is in the backwoods, like myself.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps we agree in our views on this matter. I do not understand why this policy is being pursued, and I would like to know the reason for it. Possibly it is because the policy in question has been followed for a long time, and it is very difficult to make any change. Perhaps we are all conservative in that respect, but I, for one, think the policy is entirely unjustifiable, bearing in mind the reasons that have been given so far. It looks to me like the old system of bonuses that has prevailed in Ontario, where grants have been made to industries in order to induce them to locate in a particular locality, thus adopting a policy of helping private individuals to make money at the expense of the community. I think the bonus system is played out. This policy of subsidies seems to be exactly along the same lines, and in my opinion, a better reason should be advanced for voting the moneys of the people for this purpose than we have yet heard.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend comes from a section of the country where he cannot go very far without running into a railroad, and, therefore, he cannot quite appreciate the condition of other sections of the country which are not so happily situated. There are sections of Canada which to-day are not blessed with railroads, and where that public convenience does not exist. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that the people of those sections should get the benefit of small aids to steamships. My hon. friend says that in Ontario they do not go to the Government for assistance under such circumstances. There has never yet been a railroad built in Canada which did not apply to the Government for help, and therefore the sections of the country enjoying railway accommodation have been aided by the Government. There is no greater sin in aiding a steamship line than in aiding a line of railway. With respect to the Maritime Provinces, I happen to know the locality referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The county of Victoria which he represents, happens to be without a railroad at all, and there are very few counties in the Dominion of which you can say that. In the absence of any railroad, they have steamship communication, and I must say that under the circumstances the reasons for granting aid to a steamship line are just as strong as for subsidizing the construction of a railroad. I cannot see what difference there is.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not think the reason advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is any excuse whatever for the payment of subsidies to these steamship companies. He says, and says truly, that no railroad in Canada has ever been constructed without applying to the Dominion Parliament for aid.

Mr. EULER: That does not make the policy any more justifiable.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Not at all. In connection with railways we have pursued the most damnably insane policy that has ever been pursued in any country under the sun.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There has been a decision in the Supreme Court of Canada that "damn" is not a cuss word—at least so I understand—and on the strength of that decision I use the word advisedly. Why, the fool people of Canada have given to the railroad companies about three times the cost of the entire undertakings. Because they have been so foolish as to do that, members get up here and justify the continuation of subsidies in aid of the running of steamships. I am not criticising my good old friend, the member for Queens-Shelburne, for whom I have a sincere respect and admiration, he is merely giving expression to what seems to be in the public mind. For my part, I agree entirely with the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Euler), that it is just about time the people of Canada adopted a policy of right-about-face in regard to this matter of subsidies. The fact that we have continued pouring these subsidies into the maws, the insatiable maws, of railroad companies, and to help little steamships to run between certain ports, for so many years, is no justification for the continuation of that policy now. Indeed, in my judgment, it is a better justification for discarding it. Because we have been insane and foolish, and stupid for thirty, forty, or fifty years, is no reason under God's heaven why we should continue such a policy. Why should not the people of the Maritime Provinces provide their own steamships and look

after their own transportation? I want to say with reference to the Intercolonial Railway that has furnished the people of the Maritime Provinces with transportation for the last forty or fifty years, in fact almost since Confederation, that the rest of Canada has spent tens of millions for the upkeep of this railway in order that the people down there might have their freight carried at a rate that, I think, in the earlier days, was just about one-third of the rates charged by privately owned railways. It is all very well to talk about giving subsidies to railroads, but that is not done in other countries so far as I know. In the great republic to the south the railroads are built by private enterprise and made to pay by the same agency. But in our country it is the exploiters and the promoters of the railroads that have got all the millions. The people have had to continue to pour in these hundreds of millions into private channels in order to keep the railroads going. Is it not high time we put an effective stop to that kind of thing? If you are going to have privately owned railroads, in God's name let the people concerned build these railroads themselves and pay for them themselves, and not take the money of the country for the purpose, as has been done all these years. By our action we have tangled up the country so that it has involved Canada in a loss of from a billion to two billions of dollars. The Canadian Pacific Railway, as I told the House the other night, received in cash, lands, exemptions from taxation, and exemptions from duty, amounts that would suffice to build the road two or three times over. The syndicate and the men who were behind the construction of that road made their tens of millions out of the enterprise and went away to the Old Land to spend it, and we, the people, have been obliged to pay the piper. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for not calling me to time, but my indignation is aroused when I see all these petty subsidies being voted from year to year simply because it has been the policy pursued in the past. It is now time that we ended it.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I have to correct the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) when he would give the House to understand that railroads in the United States were built without subsidies.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Generally speaking.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not generally speaking.

Mr. McMASTER: As I understand it, all the Pacific roads in the United States were very heavily subsidized with grants of public land. That is merely by way of introduction, Mr. Chairman. What I would very earnestly commend to this committee is that we should have a clearly defined policy on this question of subsidies as well as on other questions which are now before the Canadian people. In order that we may vote money intelligently we should have a clearly defined statement from the Government—

Mr. DAVIDSON: May I ask the hon. gentleman whether it would not be a good idea for us to have a clearly defined policy from the Opposition, especially as the great majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite are at complete variance with the policy of their leader?

Mr. McMASTER: I would merely point out to the hon. member for—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Jerusalem.

Mr. McMASTER: I would merely suggest to him that it is for the Government to place before the people clearly defined policies, and it is for the Opposition to criticize those policies, and, if thought best, to advance alternative policies. We are voting large sums of money to-night without any declared statement of the Government that these subsidies are required. It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, how, when the province of Nova Scotia is—I won't say attacked; no one would attack such an amiable province—but if any of the rights of Nova Scotia—any of the perquisites which Nova Scotia has been enjoying for many years—

Mr. EDWARDS: "Perquisites" is a better word than "rights."

Mr. McMASTER: If they are merely approached we have from both sides of the House Nova Scotians rising to defend those perquisites with great enthusiasm. Now, I feel that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the proposition of the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). If we are going to try and adjust what benefits one part of the country rather than another from the public purse, we shall enter upon a long and difficult subject of inquiry. There are those in Eastern Canada who might suggest that the West has benefited very largely by the tremendous expenditure of public money on the railway systems through that country; and that might possibly be offset against the very considerable amount of public money expended upon the Intercolonial Railway and the cheap rates which the Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers

and others have enjoyed in shipping their goods to the West. I am not sure whether that would be at all a profitable subject for inquiry, but I do think that we might very properly investigate the question as to whether these subsidies should be granted at all, and it seems to me it is incumbent upon the Government of the day, on whom primarily the responsibility of directing the affairs of this country rests, to place their policy clearly and distinctly before the people. We all desire to do what is right and just and fair to all parts of the Dominion, but there is something to be said for those who feel that public money should not be placed in the hands of private interests without a very clear policy on the question, and without knowing as far as possible what public benefit is to result from such expenditure.

Mr. McKENZIE: These squalls do not touch me at all, Mr. Chairman. This is a public service of splendid merit and one that has been in existence for the last thirty years, and although I have been in this House nearly fifteen years I have never heard it attacked before. I do not see why there should be any opposition to it to-night. It is the policy of this Government, as it was the policy of every previous Government, to render public service. And if the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway by reason of this connection were before the House to-night, and it were found that large passenger and freight earnings had come to the Intercolonial and, through it, into the coffers of this country because of this connection, I do not think there would be any further criticism. I am sure that the benefit so derived more than pays the interest on any little subsidy that is given in this way, and I venture to say that it is a fairly profitable proposition for the Government, because the company that is receiving this subsidy has only a short haul of eleven miles, the Intercolonial gets the long haul on all freight, and the Intercolonial can afford to carry that freight, but it could not afford to carry it at all if it could not get it to its destination. This boat takes the traffic alongside the railway at Iona, the company have only an eleven-mile haul, and can not charge passengers more than a small sum for going across. It is necessary in the interests of the country that we should continue this connection.

I saw an item a few days ago in Maclean's Magazine suggesting satirically that when we came to talk about a cent we all got enthusiastic because that was within our financial conception. I observe that $1,000,000 was voted to-night and there was not a word said. But it appears that this item got within the financial grasp of some gentlemen and they woke up to discuss it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is hardly fair to charge these votes all to the province of Nova Scotia. The local service votes altogether amount to $240,000, and three or four of them exhaust more than one-half of that sum. There is the steamship service between the island of Grand Manan and the mainland of New Brunswick. I do not know what the population is, but I should think about two or three thousand. Perhaps my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) will tell me?

Mr. COPP: Twenty-five hundred.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would think that was an instance where we might very well sustain the service by voting this grant of money, particularly if the service is not self-supporting, and it is claimed that it is not self-supporting in this case. As a matter of fact, I would imagine that 90 per cent of all these steamship services never earn a dividend. There is another item of $10,000 for a service between Halifax and Newfoundland. That is not a provincial service. Then I notice one very small item for subsidizing a service between Pelee island and the mainland. I think that is in Ontario, and I am glad there is one item here chargeable to that province. Then, there is an appropriation of $70,000 for a steamship service between Montreal, river St. Lawrence points, Magdalen islands, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, which service is of interest to Ontario, Prince Edward Island and Quebec. There are other services of that nature, and hon. members, if they go through all the items, will observe that more than one-half of them are for steamship services which are not provincial. The same defence may be urged on behalf of all these items as was offered for the unbidden child, namely, it is very small, and the objection, therefore, is quite small. I wish I could say that it was my judgment that these subsidies did not perform a public service, and I really wish they could all be dropped. I hope they will be in a few years or in a very short time, and it may be true that some of them should be dropped now.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend from Manitoba can hardly appreciate the situation unless he knows the province of Nova Scotia. I have in mind a service for which a subsidy is to be voted in the county of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). Guysborough is practically without a mile of railway, the chief towns and seaports being accessible only by a steamship service betwen a point on the railway on the strait of Canso from which the particular points are served by subsidized boats.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the subsidy given?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is $5,500. I do not think it would be possible to maintain a service without some subsidy. Most of the local services are also subsidized by the Provincial Government and even now they contend that the subsidies granted by both Governments are, taken together, not sufficient, and requests have this year been made for additional subsidies. The operating accounts of these services are submitted to the department, and in hardly any case can it be shown that the companies have earned a dividend, and in a few cases we are informed that this year unless increased subsidies are given, the services will be abandoned. As the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) said, many of these services should be subsidized by the railways as they really operate as feeders to the railways. To hon. gentlemen who are interested in the applications of any of their constituents for increased subsidies, I can only say that these matters are now being considered by the department, and the Government will, some time during the present week, have to take action in the matter one way or the other. So far as the Main Estimates are concerned, no increases whatever in local subsidies have been granted. There is an apparent increase of $70,000 in item No. 173, but that is really a consolidation of several services which were performed separately in the past, and I do not think it represents any increase.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What are the services which were given before and which the minister says are consolidated in this item?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand it means first the service which was in existence for some years between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé, ports on the river St. Lawrence as far as Gaspé basin. The other, I think, is the service between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and Magdalen islands. I understand there was a third service between Sydney and some other ports, I forget which, but I would like to know from the minister if this service does not include the first two I have mentioned.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It includes the service on the north side of the river St. Lawrence, ports on the south side of the river St. Lawrence and Magdalen islands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand a reputable company have made arrangements with the department to perform this service, and have found steamers suitable for this service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand they have at last secured steamers suitable for the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: During the course of last year, in fact, since the beginning of the war, the services between Montreal and Gaspé and between Pictou and Magdalen islands have been very poor. The boats which were assigned to those routes previously were good boats, but at the beginning of the war they were sold to the Admiralty or to the Imperial Munitions Board, and the service suffered in consequence. Last year the service between Pictou and the Magdalen islands was very poor, the boats being not at all suitable for the service. The company had chartered a tug called the Enterprise, from Halifax, and the people of Magdalen islands complained very loudly about the inferior service which they obtained. Exporters to Magdalen islands and exporters to Gaspé were not satisfied with the service, and there was no passenger accommodation on either of the boats. This year, the Government has, I am informed, found a company which is backed by very large capital and they have found that they can secure the Lady Evelyn, which formerly was the mail packet at Rimouski, to perform the service between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen islands, and they have secured another excellent boat which was built at the Davey shipyard at Lévis for Spain. That boat will perform the service between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé ports. I understand the same company have obtained a subsidy for a service between Montreal and Newfoundland and they will also perform a service between Quebec and the north shore of the St. Lawrence where there is an excellent trade to look after.

Mr. EDWARDS: What is the nature of the trade between Gaspé and Magdalen islands?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Between Pictou and Magdalen islands there is a good and pay-

ing service in fish, flour and provisions generally, and timber. The people of the Magdalen islands are badly in need of this service and besides the Magdalen islands are isolated for several months of the year. The population of Magdalen islands is 7,000 people. The service between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé is an excellent one because all those ports on the coast ship their fish to the large centres. We must by all means give them the necessary transportation facilities, because more and more the people of central Canada will require fish. The department has been very generous in supplementing that service and I am pleased to know that a responsible company will perform it this year.

Steam service between Froude's Point and Lockeport, N.S., $600.

Mr. FIELDING: If the minister will look up and down the column and see the items running from $1,000,000 down to this vote of $600, he will want to apologize for the smallness of this item. It is for a service to connect the town of Lockeport with the nearest railway point. I want to assure the member from Brome (Mr. McMaster) that this subsidy is not going to make anybody rich, let alone any private corporation. The little steamer is operated very cheaply by the town of Lockeport. I think the town clerk is the purser; I do not know what other official is the master. At all events, they are trying to keep body and soul together, and the thing is losing money. Lockeport is one of the most important fishing settlements in Nova Scotia, and as it has not the good fortune to be on the main line of railway this little service is the means of communication between the railway station and that large growing town. I want to ask the minister, when he is considering the supplementary estimates, to see if he cannot make an addition to the subsidy to that little service. I give him the guarantee that it will not make anybody rich and that the subsidy will not go into the hands of a private corporation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is one of the items which is now having consideration.

Steam service between Grand Manan and the mainland, $10,000.

Mr. WIGMORE: I would urge on the minister the absolute necessity of increasing this subsidy in the Supplementary Estimates. I am familiar with the running of this steamship and I know that for a number of years the company have not declared a dividend. During the last four or five years they have not written anything off for depreciation. It is not possible to get in touch with Grand Manan and Deer islands except by means of this boat. Moreover, this line touches St. Andrews, St. Stephen and other places. The company have been offered $50,000 for the steamer that is running on that route, the Grand Manan, and unless some additional assistance is given to this line I am afraid that it will have to go out of business.

Mr. DUFF: How many trips a day does this steamer make between Grand Manan and the mainland?

Mr. WIGMORE: She visits Grand Manan, Deer Island, Eastport, Campo Bello, St. Andrews and St. Stephen on alternate days. She makes three trips a week to St. John in the summer and one trip a week in the winter, visiting the different islands in the meantime.

Mr. COPP: Is more than one steamer employed in that service?

Mr. WIGMORE: Only one.

Mr. COPP: Who is the owner?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: She is owned by the Grand Manan Steamboat Company, of Grand Manan, N.B. As the member for St. John has said, this boat serves quite a number of places. The company have asked for an increase of subsidy for the present fiscal year to the extent of $5,000. The matter is being considered; a decision will be made, favourably or otherwise, in the course of a few days.

Mr. WIGMORE: I hope that the decision will be favourable, because I know that these men have not made one dollar. Their statement of receipts and expenditures for the different years they have been in operation shows that they have gone behind every year.

Steam service between Halifax and West Coast Cape Breton, calling at way ports, $4,000.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What are the ports of call?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Halifax, Port Mulgrave, Port Hawkesbury, Port Hastings, Port Hood, Mabou, Margaree, Grand Etang, Cheticamp, and Eastern Harbour, calling once every two weeks at Havre au Bouche, Cape George and Pleasant Bay, and calling at Inverness, Broadcove Marsh and Margaree Island whenever there is a reasonable quantity of freight or number of passengers to be landed or embarked, weather permitting.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What is the name of the boat?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Strathlorne.

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is claimed by the company that there is not sufficient water to enable them to enter Margaree Harbour. I do not think that is correct; I believe that the boat can call there if the owners so desire. I would ask the minister to see to it that when the contract is being renewed the company be compelled to go into Margaree. The harbour has been considerably improved during the last two years, and I am sure that a boat can go in there. There may be a little trouble in doing so, but it is important and necessary that the boat should call at Margaree, because that would dispense with the necessity of lightering goods at that port. There is 13 feet of water in the harbour.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter is now being investigated by the Marine Department, who will make a report on the matter of the sufficiency of water in the harbour.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: A request comes from my constituency that this boat call at Ballantyne's Cove on the last trip of each year. This steamer sails from Halifax and goes through the state of Canso, and it involves the traversing of only a short distance to cross Bay St. George and reach the port of Ballantyne's Cove. They say it would be a great advantage to them to have one trip, and they would prefer the last trip of the season. The people in that village are some twenty miles away from railway communication and are served altogether by water, and that is about the only opportunity they would have for the transportation of goods in the winter.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall look into the matter.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: There are two services between Mulgrave and Canso, and between Mulgrave and Guysborough, which should be performed by the Intercolonial railway. I trust the minister will bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways. These services are really feeders to the Intercolonial railway, of which they are extensions. They collect freight for the Intercolonial railway, chiefly fish, and the trade has grown considerably. Several years ago, when these boats were first put on, there was no fresh fish industry in that vicinity. The people were compelled to cure their fish and sell it salt, but the opportunity of getting their fish shipped opened up the trade in fresh fish. I have obtained from the station agent at Mulgrave figures showing how the trade has grown. In 1898 the number of tons shipped was 1,415 the value being $99,050. The railway freight paid on these shipments amounted to $11,312. In 1908 the shipments had grown to 3,372 tons of the value of $235,900, and the amount paid to the railway for freight was $31,644.03. Last year, 1918, the number of tons was 13,000 of the value of $1,560,000, and the amount paid to the railway for forwarding that fish was $158,986.35. In addition to this large amount of freight these vessels have delivered thousands of passengers to the Intercolonial railway at Mulgrave. This is of great importance to the Government railway. The question may be asked if it is doing so well, why is the subsidy continued to be paid? The reason is that it is very difficult to keep these vessels in operation all the year round. The ice in the Strait of Canso is very heavy at present, and if you went to Mulgrave you would probably not see any clear water as far as the eye can reach down the Strait. These vessels during the winter months have to force their way through the ice, and no owner will put his vessel to that kind of work unless there is money in it. If you left it to the ordinary shipowner he would run his vessel in the summer and autumn but would not continue in the winter season. There would be no connection between these points and the railway at Mulgrave during that period unless we had these subsidized boats. I think the Railway Department should furnish good boats capable of going through the ice and making connection with the town of Canso and these places. There are over 2,000 people living at Canso and they are sixty miles from the railroad. It is the most important service in my county. This is about the only money paid in my constituency. Consult the items spent on public works for the present year, and you will not find $2,000 expended in the whole constituency of Guysborough. On 150 miles of coast you will find practically no expenditure by any department. I want to impress on the minister the fact that it would be a great deal better if the Railway Department took charge of this service and put suitable boats on the line. I am confident the result would be very satisfactory and would pay very well, because the trade would bring considerable business; and a small subsidy like this is very little com-

pared with the large amount of money the railway makes out of the traffic when it reaches Mulgrave.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am well acquainted with the locality served by the steamship services to which my hon. friend refers, and I agree with him that it is essential that that part of the country should have this or some other steamship service, as otherwise they would have no access to the railways, inasmuch as the whole coast line of Guysborough county is without railways. I have always been impressed with the view which my hon. friend puts forward, that at certain points these services might well be performed by the Intercolonial railway, and in the particular case to which he has just been referring I think a strong argument could be made for the adoption of such a policy. I assume my hon. friend has discussed the matter with the Railway Department at one time or another; but whether he has or not, I shall be very pleased to urge it upon the minister.

Steam service between Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, calling at intermediate points on the Miramichi River and Miramichi Bay, $2,500.

Mr. LOGGIE: The remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie) regarding the Baddeck-Iona service, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Wigmore) regarding the Halifax, Canso and Guysborough service, apply equally to this item. The situation is very much like that explained by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The steamship goes down to the outer and inner bay, gathers up the fish below and delivers it to the Intercolonial at a town known as Loggieville. The taking over of this service and operating it as a part of the Intercolonial would, I am sure, be very acceptable. This company is under financial stress. There is a deputation on the way, I think, at the present moment to make representation to the Government asking for an increased subsidy for this line. I expect the deputation will be here this week, and I take this opportunity of drawing attention to the situation and to the condition of the finances of the company, so that when the deputation reaches here the minister may favourably consider the overture.

Steam service between Petit de Grat and the Intercolonial railway terminus at Mulgrave, $7,000.

Mr. JOHN C. DOUGLAS (South Cape Breton): This is a service between Mulgrave and Island Madame in Richmond county. This island has a population of 5,000 or 6,000 people. It has no other connection with the railway, and the only way that freight can be brought in to the island is by this steamship service. This service is performed by a steamer called the Magdalene. This winter, as in the two preceding winters, this ship did not make any calls at Island Madame. They have no service at the present time, and the result is that the freight and supplies for the people of Island Madame are stored at Mulgrave and the people are suffering for the want of these goods. I would ask the minister, in view of this fact, to direct that some other steamer be obtained by his department and put on the service so that these people may not be further deprived of the supplies which are necessary to them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not had my attention called to this matter before. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the service has not been performed, or not properly performed. Last year I think the steamer was injured by fire and for some time was not available for the service. I understand now she has been restored and will be on the service again, or has been on the service recently. However, I shall be very glad to look into the remarks of my hon. friend, which I shall see in Hansard, and the matter will be made clearer to me by reading them there as I was not able to follow my hon. friend very closely. Before a contract is made with any particular company, the service will be carefully investigated. We must see that a proper steamer receives the contract.

Mr. CAHILL: Have any steamers called at any Nova Scotia ports that are not receiving subsidies?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, quite a number; very few are receiving subsidies.

Steam service on the Petitcodiac river between Moncton and way ports, and a port or ports on the west coast of Cumberland county, $2,500.

Mr. COPP: Is there any inspection or report made to the department whether these subsidized steamers have fulfilled their contracts and made regular calls at the different ports?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Tupper, the inspector of subsidized steamers, makes a report on every service to the department stating how the contracts are carried out.

Mr. COPP: Does he go to the different places to see how the services are performed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think he visits the boats every year.

Steam service between Pictou and Montague, calling at Murray Harbour and Georgetown, $5,000.

Mr. McISAAC: This amount of $5,000 is too small and those who have been performing the service find it very difficult to continue. Things have changed. The price of coal and wages are so much higher that they say it is impossible to carry on the service for this amount. It is an important service for those portions of Prince Edward Island, Montague, Georgetown and Murray Harbour, which are not touched by other steamship services. I should be extremely pleased if the minister could find it possible to make provision for an increase in this subsidy in the Supplementary Estimates, because it will be a great advantage to the entire community concerned.

Schooner service between Pictou, New Glasgow, Antigonish County ports and Mulgrave, $1,000.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The vessel which performs this service is improperly designated in the item as a "schooner," whereas it is an auxiliary boat with gasoline engines. I would like to have the word "schooner" struck out and a more suitable term substituted. I would also remind the minister that the department has received an application for an increase in the subsidy, all the details being set forth in the petition that came from the locality interested. There is a proposal that this boat shall collect some traffic at Pictou, coming from Prince Edward Island, which will make this an interprovincial service and a very important one to all that section of the coast. There are six or seven small ports on that coast where an ordinary steamer cannot call because the water is too shallow; there has to be a special type of boat in order to enter those places. The community interested engage in farming and fishing but are quite distant from any railway communication. This service is important as it enables the people to get their supplies in the spring, especially fertilizer which they require for the land, and to send away their fish and other produce to New Glasgow and Sydney. I do not think, however, that it can be carried out for the sum of $1,000. If the minister will refer to the correspondence and the petitions that have been received by the department he will find that a strong case has been made out for an increase in the subsidy, and I hope the matter will receive due attention.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am aware that the contractors have applied for an increase of $500, the matter having come before me personally.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I believe the increase asked for is $1,500.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the committee should rise after having passed this item. We are anxious to help the minister out, but it looks as if we shall be here until one o'clock if we go on as we are now doing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suggest that we pass the next two items.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1919 between Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, $7,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would suggest to the minister that the same observations which I made with respect to the service from Halifax to the west of Cape Breton Island would apply here also, as regards the service from Margaree Harbour.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does it relate to the same harbour?

Mr. CHISHOLM: The same harbour but there are two different services.

Mr. COPP: What is the reason for the wording of this and the next item wherein reference is made "to the closing of navigation in 1919"?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The next item, has reference to ports on the Bras d'Or lakes, which in the winter season are closed.

Mr. COPP: We have passed items relating to other ports which are also closed during the winter season, but the same phraseology was not followed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the explanation is that the service referred to is limited by winter conditions.

Mr. COPP: I quite agree, but what the minister says would be equally true of the steamship service between Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will not undertake to say how the difference in phraseology occurred, it may cover a period extending back for a great number of years, but I do not think it is of importance.

Mr. DUFF: The change in phraseology would not affect the subsidy?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1919, between Port Mulgrave, St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Marble Moun-

tain, and other ports on the Bras d'Or Lakes, $6,500.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Why has the vote for this purpose been reduced from what it was last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was increased last year on account of special services which will not be necessary this year. Part of the service will be performed by another steamer, which will be explained when we reach a later item.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The other service will take up the ports of call of this service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean the House adjourned at 11.13 p.m.

Wednesday, April 9, 1919.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Return of the number of bank mergers in Canada from October 1, 1911, to date, together with copy of all petitions and correspondence relating thereto—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ending March 31, 1918—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Report of the Canadian Registration Board for 1918—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House a message from His Excellency the Governor General signed by his own hand:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the Address moved in reply to my Speech at the opening of Parliament and thank you for it sincerely.

Devonshire.

Government House, Ottawa,
April 3rd, 1919.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 63, an Act respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company—Mr. Kennedy.

Bill No. 64, an Act respecting The High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company—Mr. Tweedie.

Bill No. 65, an Act to incorporate The Northwest Route, Limited—Mr. Boys.

COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—PERSONNEL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) submitted to the House the following Order in Council:

P. C. 704.

Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 9th April, 1919.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report dated 8th April, 1919, from the Minister of Labour, submitting that the personnel of the Royal Commission constituted by Order in Council of 4th April, 1919 (P. C. 670), to investigate industrial relations and submit a report as to how they may be improved, should consist of representatives of the public, as well as representatives of employers and employees.

The minister further submits that employers and employed should have equal representation upon the commission, and that the chairman should be a distinguished member of the Canadian Judiciary.

The minister therefore recommends that the following gentlemen be appointed as members of the said Royal Commission, for the purposes above indicated:—

The Honourable Chief Justice Mathers, of Manitoba, Chairman;

The Honourable Smeaton White, a Member of the Senate, and Managing Director Montreal Gazette Publishing Company, Montreal;

Charles Harrison, M.P., Railroad Conductor, North Bay, Ont., as representative of the public.

Mr. Carl Riordon, President, Riordon Pulp and Paper Company, Montreal, P.Q.;

Mr. F. Pauze, Lumberman, Montreal, P.Q., as representatives of the employers.

Mr. T. Moore, Ottawa, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada;

Mr. J. W. Bruce, of Toronto, Member of the Labour Appeal Board,
as representatives of the employees.

The minister further recommends that Mr. Thomas Bengough, of Toronto, who served as Secretary on the Technical Education Commission, be appointed as Secretary of the Commission.

The minister further recommends that the Commission proceed with its work as early as possible and render its report by June 1st, 1919, and that the compensation applicable to members of Boards of Conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act be applicable to this Commission except to the Honourable Mr. White and Mr. Harrison, who shall be paid their travelling expenses only.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

THANKSGIVING DAY ACT.

Mr. ISAAC E. PEDLOW (Renfrew South) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 66, an Act respecting Thanksgiving day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. PEDLOW: Mr. Speaker, the Bill as presented is self-explanatory, its main ob-

jects being twofold; first, to set aside Armistice day, the second Monday in November each year, as a perpetual memorial of the victorious conclusion of the recent war; second, to establish a set day each year as a permanent day of Thanksgiving. I purpose speaking at greater length on the second reading of the Bill, and I will therefore reserve any further remarks until that time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT OWNED FREIGHT VESSELS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

What number of freight vessels are owned by the Government?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Four.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—HULL.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. Has Dr. J. U. Archambault, of Hull, Quebec, acted in the position of medical examiner under the Miltary Service Act, 1917?
2. If so, for how long, and how much was paid him for his services?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. Employed as a medical examiner under the Military Service Act from October 8, 1917, to January 1, 1918, at a gross rate of $8.00 per diem, the payments being as follows:—8-31 October, 1917, $192; 1-30 November, 1917, $240; 1-31 December, 1917, $248; 1-12 January, 1918, $96.—$776.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. For how long was F. A. Labelle, notary of Hull, Quebec, employed as registrar for the counties of Hull, Pontiac and Labelle, under the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. Has the said F. A. Labelle been remunerated for his services? If so, how much has he received, and what amount is still due him?
3. What sums were paid the said F. A. Labelle on account of (a) travelling expenses; (b) office expenses?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. F. A. Labelle was appointed Deputy Registrar under the Military Service Act for that section of M.D. No. 3 lying in the province of Quebec on September 28, 1917, and is still in office.

2. September 28, 1917, to June 11, 1918, at $200 per month, $1,693.34; June 12, 1918, to March 31, 1919, at $250 per month, $2,408.34.

3. (a) $11; (b) None.

[Mr. Pedlow.]

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. Has Mr. L. Cousineau, advocate, of Hull, Quebec, been employed by the Government under the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. If so, what sums were paid the said L. Cousineau on account of (a) salary; (b) travelling expenses; (c) office expenses?
3. Has the said L. Cousineau been employed to represent the Department of Justice or the Military Service Council at the Hull Military Court of Appeal? If so, for how long?
4. Were the said L. Cousineau's services dispensed with before the 11th of November, 1918? If so, for what reasons, and by whom was he replaced?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. (a) For services as member of Tribunal No. 304, Hull, 53 days, $265, for professional services, $3,227.50; (b) None; (c) Typewriting and stationery, $20.40.

3. Yes, occasionally. From December 1917 to October 15, 1918.

4. Mr. Cousineau's services terminated in October, 1918, when such services were completed, or were no longer required.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What was the total expenditure in connection with National Service Registration for the counties of Terrebonne, Deux-Montagnes and Argenteuil?
2. What salary was paid to each person in charge of said registration in the said three counties?
3. What persons were employed by the Registrar of the county of Terrebonne, and how much was each of said persons paid?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Terrebonne, $1,710.36; Laval Deux-Montagnes, $1,104.77; Argenteuil, $1,946.

2. Terrebonne, J. V. Leonard, 49 days at $6, $294; Laval Deux-Montagnes, J. H. Langlois, 33 days at $6, $198; Argenteuil, H. Slater, 65 days at $6, $390.

3. J. A. Roberge, $16; Rose Simard, $4; Remi Arbour, $44; Theodule Arbour, $28; Paul Andre, $19.95; L. R. Archambault, $6.50; E. P. Belair, $28; M. R. Benoit, $6.50; E. Brosseau, $14; E. Boivin, $31.50; J. N. Brunet, M.D., $44; J. Chevalier, $33; J. Clavel, $21; A. Chauvin, $8; A. Carey, $21; J. B. D'Amour, $10; Docteur R. Daze, $59.50; G. Dury, $39.85; L. Dufresne, $20; A. Desjardins, $24.50; J. R. Desormeaux, $52.50; A. Emond, $6.50; J. G. Fauteux, $6; Jerome Fournelle, $30; Arthur Grenier, $6.40; D. Z. Guay, $19; F. X. Gaudette, $37; M. L. Guimont, $20.51; Joseph Gothier, $26.40; F. A. St. Louis, $16.30; C. L. Girard, $18.50; J. Marc Vermette, $7.50; Georges Harel, $5; Amedee Jasmin, $48.75; M. R. Leclair, $6.50; Florestine Leveillee, $12; F.

A. Lorrain, $9; Damase Lauzon, $9; Georges Liboiron, $40; Cyprien Lahaie, $16.15; Fernand Longpre, $12; P. E. Leveillee, $14; Raoul Labour, $6.50; Fernand Leduc, $15; Gustave Leonard, $48; Gerard Leonard, $42; Odilon Lortie, $12; Joseph Limoges, $15; Joseph Leonard, $32.20; Edmond Longpre, $18; G. E. MacLure, $4; Arthur Navert, $10.50; Theo. Grignon, $36; Rene Martin, $8; Ernest Prevost, $10.50; J. O. Renaud, $48.90; Joseph Renaud, $8; Bruno Rochon, $6.50; N. R. J. Wight, $29.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. What are the names of the persons to whom rent charges were paid by the Government, in the county of Bagot, for buildings occupied in connection with National Registration, in the month of June, 1918?

2. What was the amount paid as rental for each of said buildings?

3. Did the Government pay rent for school houses used in connection with National Registration, where the school boards refused to allow them to be occupied without rental?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. Charles Viens, Alp. Sicard, Louis Gauthier, T. Desrosiers, H. Auclair, A. Vadnais, Nap. Croteau, D. Auclair, A. Cousineau, Jos. Durand, E. Blanchet, T. Cabana, Antoine Sicard, G. D. Morris, T. Z. Descelles, L. G. Tetreault, Wilfred Melancon.

2. Two offices used by Chas. Viens, registrar, $20 in full. Registration booths, $5 each.

3. No.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. What was the amount allowed per day for each assistant registrar in the county of Bagot in connection with National Service Registration in June, 1918?

2. What amount was paid for rental for each building occupied for registration purposes?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $2.50.

2. Registrar's offices, $20 in full; registration booths, $5 each.

PENSION PAYMENTS.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. What is the total number of private soldiers drawing pension and what is the total amount paid to them?

2. How many are in each of the following classes and what is the total sum paid to each class, 0—10 per cent; 10—20 per cent; 20—30 per cent; 30—40 per cent; 40—50 per cent; 50—60 per cent; 60—70 per cent; 70—80 per cent; 80—90 per cent; 90—100 per cent?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The total number of former private soldiers drawing pensions is 32,371. Their pensions represent a yearly expenditure of $4,851,750. In addition to the foregoing, 2,499 former private soldiers whose disabilities due to war service are less than 4 per cent, have been awarded gratuities amounting in the aggregate to $109,756.08.

2.

Disability Classification.	Number of Ex-Private Soldiers.	Yearly Liability
5% to 9%	2,501	$ 75,030
10% to 19%	1,265	897,840
20% to 29%	8,288	1,068,960
30% to 39%	2,096	395,160
40% to 49%	2,177	529,770
50% to 59%	1,650	497,610
60% to 69%	1,003	369,600
70% to 79%	991	439,050
80% to 89%	204	98,310
90% to 99%	38	20,820
100%	766	459,600
	32,371	$4,851,750

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is there any unit or portion of unit of the Canadian Expeditionary Force stationed (a) in Syria or Palestine; (b) in the Balkans; and (c) in Egypt?

2. If so, what is the approximate number of men in each case?

3. Will these Canadian soldiers form part of the army of occupation or will they be demobilized? If the latter, when?

Major-General MEWBURN: This information is not available in Canada, but a cable has been sent to the Overseas Minister for the desired information.

P. P. C. L. I.

Mr. POWER:

1. Have any complaints been brought to the attention of the Government with regard to the treatment of men of the P.P.C.L.I. with reference to the accommodation provided for them when returning to their homes after demobilization in Ottawa?

2. Is it true that these men were furnished with second-class fare, and that no sleeping accommodations were provided?

3. If so, is it the Government's intention to remedy this state of affairs for the future?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No complaints have been received.

2 and 3. Officers were supplied with first-class accommodation, with standard sleeping car. Other ranks were supplied with second-class accommodation and second-class sleeping accommodation.

In some cases other ranks were supplied with second-class accommodation without second-class sleeping accommodation, due to the fact that regular train service had to

be utilized, but the men had the privilege of waiting until next day, when there would have been sufficient second-class accommodation on the regular train.

SELKIRK POSTMASTER.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Who is the postmaster in Selkirk, Man?
2. Does the same gentleman also run a drug store in a building some distance from the post office?
3. Is the post office in a government building?
4. What is the population of Selkirk, Man?
5. If the postmaster manages the post office in a government building, and a drug store some distance away in another building, why should not the post office be given to some competent returned soldier?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. R. H. Gilhuly.
2. The department has no information as to this.
3. Yes.
4. About 2,500.
5. See No. 2. The matter will be looked into.

PAYMENTS FOR WAR SERVICE TO PERSONS OTHER THAN SOLDIERS.

Mr. TOBIN:

What is the total number of persons other than soldiers who have seen active service during the present war and their dependents who are receiving wages, salary, allowance, indemnity or remuneration of any other kind from the Government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Stands as Order for Return. I suggest that the hon. member make this question a little more explicit. Does he intend all departments to be covered by the question? What is meant by the term "other than soldiers?" If the hon. gentleman will confine his question to a particular department and define these terms, it will be answered.

Mr. TOBIN: All right.

Question stands as Order for Return.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many attorneys residing and practising in the city of Montreal have been employed by the Government during the fiscal year which expired on March 31, 1919?
2. What are their names and how much was each one paid for service rendered?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BLAIR:

For a return showing (a) the number of officers and clerks employed on the permanent staff in classes 1A, 1B, and 2A, respectively, in each of the following branches of the public service: Public Works Department, Architects Branch; Public Works Department, Engineering Branch; Mines Department, Mines Branch; Mines Department Geological Surveys Branch; Interior Department, Geodetic Surveys Branch; Interior Department, Topographical Surveys Branch; Interior Department, International Boundary Branch; Interior Department, Astronomical Observatory. (b) The number of graduates of Canadian Universities employed in each of the above branches. (c) If the work performed by each branch is considered to be of a technical nature. (d) How many promotions (other than those made to fill vacancies caused by death, resignation or superannuation) have been made from class 2A to class 1B, and from class 1B to class 1A, between December 1, 1908, and November 30, 1915; also between December 1, 1915 and March 1, 1919, in each of the above branches. (e) How many officers and clerks were at the maximum of class 1B and class 2A on December 1, 1915, and how many of these officers and clerks were at the maximum of their present classes on March 1, 1919, in each of the above branches. (f) How many vacancies have been caused by death, resignation and superannuation between December 1, 1908, and March 1, 1919, in classes 1A, 1B, and 2A, respectively, in each of the above branches. (g) How many of these vacancies in each class and in each branch have been filled by officers or clerks employed in branches of the Public Service other than those in which the vacancy occurred.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

UNIFORMITY OF ADMINISTRATION AND OF PENALTIES.

On the Notice of Motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, a uniform system of administrating the law with uniform penalties in relation to defaulters, deserters, slackers, evaders and others amenable, is essential to the well-being and good government of the country, and is due to the soldiers who voluntarily marched so fearlessly to the Front and who fought so well in the great cause of human liberty.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I am prepared to go on with this motion to-day, but all I propose to do is to hear the Government's explanation of its position in the matter; I have no desire to take up the time of the House in going over what has happened in relation to these matters in the past. I therefore beg to move this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman desire to speak on the motion?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have no desire to speak now; I will close the debate, if necessary.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate the necessity of speaking to this motion until something had been said in its support by the mover or by other hon. gentlemen.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the minister wants anything said in support of it, I can get a

hundred men in the House to say something.

Mr. DENIS: That is a majority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The pleasure would be greater if I could have first heard the motion supported by the mover himself.

The terms of the resolution are to the effect that the House shall declare that a uniform system of administering the law with uniform penalties in relation to defaulters, deserters, slackers, evaders and others amenable is essential to the well-being and good government of the country and is due to the soldiers who went to the front and fought so well in the great cause of human liberty.

The first comment I have to make is that in essence the resolution calls merely for a uniform system of administering law. Fundamentally, under the constitution, the administration of law is in the provinces, not in the Dominion. The Dominion has jurisdiction in the matter of the framing of the law, the passing of statutes within the purview of its powers under the British North America Act, but the administering of the law is wholly for the Provinces. As my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) probably knows more intimately than I do, there is a measure of administration of punishments in the army which is under military law and carried out by courts martial. To that extent, of course, the administration of law may be said to be Federal, but I do not apprehend that the mover of the motion has reference to the sphere of jurisdiction exercised under military law. What he refers to rather is the area of legal administration which is in the hands of superior and district court judges and of magistrates, and in so far as it is a matter of administration, a matter of procedure and organization for carrying it out, it is for the provinces alone. It may be, however, that what the hon. member means is that by statute, wherein we enact the law, we also provide that the penalties open to magistrates and courts shall be in every case uniform, and that that uniformity shall extend to the punishment of all defaulters, slackers, evaders and others amenable. If I am right in my estimate of what the hon. member has in mind I fear that the resolution is too wide to commend itself to the favourable consideration of Parliament. If what the hon. gentleman intends to affirm is, that enacting legislation, whether adopted in this Parliament originally and now, or by Order in Council based on legislation passed by this Parliament, must provide that all penalties applicable to offenders of the classes named shall be alike, shall be uniform, I repeat that I do not think the resolution will commend itself to the good judgment of Parliament.

In the first place, the words "others amenable" would refer, of course, to all offenders of every character whatsoever. However, I have no doubt that the mover of the resolution has in mind merely offenders against the Military Act. But it could not be affirmed with any hope of success that Parliament, or the Government acting on the authority of Parliament, should adopt the policy of providing that all penalties must be alike for all offenders, whether the offence be of a serious or of a minor character or whether it be accompanied by mitigating circumstances or not. In all the history of our jurisprudence, legislation providing penalties provides at the same time a minimum and a maximum—at all events, a maximum—penalty. Within the orbit of these two extremes those administering the law are empowered to go, and the purpose and principle of such enactment is that in proportion to the grossness of the offence shall the punishment be. That is the principle which pervades the Military Service Act. It is the principle which actuated Parliament in affording latitude to magistrates in imposing punishments under that Act. In a word, it is the very same principle which pervades the whole Criminal Code, and which pervades many other statutes establishing penalties passed by this Parliament, as well as statutes establishing offences passed by provincial legislatures.

It will no doubt be complained by some that in the actual working out of this Act, as, indeed, is the case in the actual working out of all penal legislation, there has been a very great lack of uniformity in the disposition of individual cases by magistrates and judges. There can be no question that a survey of the operation of the Military Service Act would disclose that different attitudes were assumed by different magistrates, and that even judges differed widely, and some of them almost incomprehensibly, in their estimation of the degree of offence perpetrated by one who had violated the Military Service Act. But that is a phenomenon in no way singular to the operation of the Military Service Act; it is to be found in the history of the every day administration of law. Any one who has to do particularly with the administration of clemency under the Criminal Code,

which is vested, of course, in the Department of Justice, will be struck every hour of every day by the wide diversity of views, and the consequent wide diversity and lack of uniformity in punishment imposed by the various magistrates and judges of the land. That, to some degree, is taken care of by the exercise of clemency on the part of the Department of Justice—taken care of only by the mitigation of punishment, and never by an increase in the punishment of those who are let off lightly by the courts. The latter sphere of jurisdiction the Department of Justice does not have, the department's function being merely in clemency, and not in original punishment. This function of the Department of Justice operates, of course, in relation to the punishments inflicted under the Military Service Act, as in relation to all other punishments. In so far as its exercise is concerned, if it is intended that any complaint be levelled against it, that complaint would more properly be answered by the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) who from the commencement of the operation of the Act, has had that sphere within his jurisdiction.

It is true that there did occur instances of the apprehension of defaulters under the Military Service Act, where there was some shock to the public conscience by very minor penalties being inflicted. Those were in the main, if I mistake not, punishments inflicted on what were known as Group 3 defaulters; that is to say, defaulters who though they had registered and had not failed to report for medical examination, had nevertheless failed to report for duty. That class of defaulters was a very large one, and the regulations passed under the authority of the Military Service Act itself did not provide any option on the part of the magistrates or judges to impose merely a fine as a penalty for that offence. However, in various parts of Canada magistrates did exercise an option which they did not have of imposing fines. In some cases very large and appropriate fines were imposed and in others very small, trivial and inadequate fines. It was felt that it was not desirable to have these dispositions of cases by magistrates in every case open to be called in question in the courts of the country. For example, in cases where the magistrate had risen to a sense of his duty and had imposed a penalty commensurate with the offence, it was not desirable that that conviction should be open to be upset after the fine had been paid and the offender was free. Those were cases where the offender had suffered something not, at all events, incommensurate with the offence he had committed. Consequently, within the powers vested in the Governor in Council, an order was passed which ratified and confirmed convictions that had been followed by a fine where the fine was fixed at not less than $250 nor more than $5,000. That left other convictions where smaller fines had been imposed upon Group 3 defaulters open to be upset, and indeed, not recognized at all by the Department of Justice.

Sir SAM HUGHES:: I did not hear what disposition was made of the cases where men failed to report for medical examination or failed to observe the order of the tribunal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those who failed to register were known as Group 1 defaulters; those who, though they registered, failed to report for medical examination when ordered, were known as Group 2 defaulters; those who, though they did not fail in either of these two respects, failed to report for duty were known as Group 3 defaulters, and that is the large class to which the remarks I have just been making apply. As to the first two classes, those who failed to report, and those who, though they did not fail to register, failed to report for medical examination, my understanding is that the regulations provided under the authority of the Military Service Act enabled a fine to be imposed, but I think in each case a minimum and a maximum fine was fixed.

As to Group 3, the legislation did not, nor did the orders passed under the authority of the legislation, provide any option on the part of magistrates to impose a fine at all; but notwithstanding this, magistrates, some of them at all events believing they had that option, did impose a fine; and now by Order in Council these fines have been ratified provided the fine was not below a minimum of $250 nor above a maximum of $5,000.

Group 4 defaulters were those who, having reported for duty and donned the uniform, deserted. Group 5 defaulters were soldiers defaulting on the conditions of their leave of absence by failing to return at the required time. Group 6 defaulters were the nineteen- year old class who failed to report for registration. I am not discussing the first two or the latter three classes at the present time.

I was making some remarks in regard to the experience of the department in the lack of uniformity of sentences imposed on Group 3 defaulters and the action taken by the department to ensure that where convictions were obtained in those cases the

punishment should be adequate and fair. However, what I wish to impress upon the House is the fact that the administration of the law is essentially in the hands of provincial officials, that is to say, magistrates who are provincial officials, and, from them, judges, who, in the ordinary sense, are not provincial officials but exercise a function which is within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures as to procedure. There is another feature that I may refer to.

In the treatment of Group 3 defaulters it was discovered there were magistrates who persistently failed to appreciate the spirit and intent of the Military Service Act, and before whom men who had been found and apprehended, after a great deal of expense and trouble, would either be not convicted at all or, owing to a failure on the part of the magistrates to appreciate the magnitude of the offence, would have a very light penalty inflicted on them. In these cases the policy of the department was to instruct the officers in charge—that is, in so far as this work has been under the Department of Justice—to take no more apprehended men before such magistrates. That policy has been pursued consistently and the course adopted was to deliver such men to the military authorities to be tried by court martial. So that wherever magistrates were found who failed in this respect to appreciate their duties, and to act in pursuance of the letter and spirit of the Military Service Act, we took the only course open to us, and would bring no more offenders before them, instructing our officers, as I have said, to turn them over to the military authorities for trial by court martial. From January, I think, to the end of April, 1918, the police work under the Military Service Act was administered by the Military Service Branch of the Department of Justice; and from the end of April until about the middle or the first of January of this year, 1919, that work was taken over and administered by the Militia Department under the Provost Marshal. After the termination of actual war, and about the first of January, the work was again resumed by the Department of Justice and is now in charge of the Dominion Police. I believe that the principles which I have defined as actuating us in the administration of the duties of apprehension under the Act were virtually the same while under the Militia Department as under the Department of Justice. We have under consideration at the present time—but not sufficiently advanced to enable us to make any statement to Parliament—the question as to the entire disposition of this subject of the treatment of deserters and defaulters; but at present the administration of the law is just as I have defined. So far as we have it within our power to bring about some degree of uniformity in the treatment of offenders we have done so, but our power in this regard is necessarily limited by the constitutional restrictions to which I have briefly referred.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I would like to ask a question of the Acting Minister of Justice. Were not instructions issued by the Department of Justice to the magistrates or justices of the peace—instructions published in booklet form— advising them to be very lenient with the men brought before them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No such instructions were ever issued. Booklets were given to our own officers for their own guidance, but the Department of Justice has never presumed to give instructions or even advice to magistrates or judges, who are in no sense officers of the Department of Justice; nor can I understand the attitude of mind of any magistrate or judge who could think that he was subject to instructions or advice from the Department of Justice. Justice is best administered by the department when it refrains from attempting any jurisdiction in that regard over magistrates or judges. The hon. gentleman has reference, I think, to a statement issued by a magistrate in the city of Quebec—I think he is a magistrate, but he is generally known as Judge Langelier— to the effect that he received instructions from the department. Such is not, and never was the case; and nothing was further from the mind of the department than to attempt to instruct magistrates in Quebec or in any other province. It appears that an officer of the department, Colonel Whitehead, according to his report to us, in going over his papers in a case read a paper which he had prepared on his own authority, which did not come from the Department of Justice and was merely for the guidance of his officers as he himself said. He was requested by the judge for a copy, and having received it the judge proceeded afterwards to proclaim that he had been instructed in such an such a manner by the Department of Justice. I do not think I need say anything further. I have heard the matter referred to in the House on previous occasions, but the whole point is answered when I say that no instructions

of any kind were ever issued to judges or magistrates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I gathered from the remarks of the minister that he referred to what had taken place before the court presided over by Mr. Justice Langelier in Quebec. I have followed that discussion in the press. I know Mr. Justice Langelier—an ex-member of this House—and he is a man who enjoys the confidence and respect of the bar and of the public of Quebec. He has always been a faithful and impartial administrator of justice. Some months ago when the deserters were brought before his court he received instructions from Colonel Whitehead, a Dominion Police officer, in which he was presumably authorized, to act leniently towards the men brought before him. However, the Department of Justice, through Mr. Newcombe, said that he should not be satisfied with very small fines but should be more severe towards the deserters and evaders.

Mr. Justice Langelier was somewhat shocked when he received that news not personally but through the public press. He at once wrote back to the officer in the Justice Department, I think Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister, that he had received his instructions from the Government. A discussion arose and finally Mr. Justice Langelier published those instructions verbatim. If I am well informed, and I think my memory does not fail me, an apology came from the Department of Justice. I think it was sent by Mr. Newcombe himself when it was proven that Mr. Justice Langelier had received through the regular channel his directions from the authorities to act leniently with deserters. I have seen the correspondence which has been published in the press. I only rose because, in the remarks of the Acting Minister of Justice, I detected the tendency to put the blame upon Mr. Justice Langelier. As I have read that correspondence and as I understand it, I think I am justified in stating that Mr. Justice Langelier did his duty fearlessly and that he acted under the directions which he had received from the authorities in Ottawa.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I want to confirm what the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) has said and I will confirm it by stating what happened in my own office at Riviere du Loup. One morning I was visited by Mr. Harmon who is an official, I think, of the Justice Department. He came to me, not because I was the member for the riding but because it happens that I am the editor of a newspaper. He wanted to tell the defaulters in my riding that if they would come down, report to him and plead guilty he could promise them, because he had the promise of his own department, that the magistrate would impose only a very small fine. Then I took my poor pen and, as a newspaper man, wrote the article and asked all the defaulters to appear before Mr. Harmon, or before the magistrate. The defaulters came in. They were ready to appear before a magistrate but at that very time there was a dispute going on between Mr. Justice Langelier and the department. After that we had the famous Order in Council which imposed a fine of $250 minimum and now young men unable to pay are obliged to go to jail.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it not a fact that there was an apology sent to Mr. Justice Langelier?

Mr. GAUVREAU: Yes, an apology has been published in the newspapers and it has never been denied by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I rise to a question of privilege. I think so far as the department is concerned the denial that that department issued an apology must be accepted. If not I insist that the actual correspondence be read. It will speak for itself and I who cannot speak again will see my word supported and vindicated.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I think the quality of mercy will not be unduly strained if the Department of Justice will try and define more clearly the different penalties under the Act for the guidance of magistrates in the province of Ontario at least. I know that even in Ontario there is a wide range of opinion as to the degrees of punishment that should obtain for various groups of defaulters. For instance in the western part of Ontario, surrounding the city of London, I am informed on authority that I do not desire to question, that defaulters are being allowed off with a penalty of two months' guard duty in the barracks. For men of the same class in eastern Ontario the minimum penalty in Ottawa is a fine of $500 or twelve months in jail. I have appealed to the Department of Justice in vain for a modification of that penalty. I have endeavoured to the best of my ability as a representative of my constituency, to find in the constituency certain instances which will qualify for the minimum penalty without success. There must be something wrong with the administration of justice in the police courts

of Ontario when men of average intelligence will vary to such an extent in imposing penalties for offences of this kind. The groups are so well defined that the variations cannot exist to such an extent as will justify magistrates in varying their decisions so widely as they do. I claim that it is the duty of the Department of Justice to interfere in the decisions arrived at. I understand that there is a disposition on the part of the department to interfere with the penalty of imprisonment but not with that of a fine. I would like to know why it is that if they are disposed to interfere with one class of penalties they are not disposed to interfere with the other also. If a prisoner is entitled to consideration in the matter of imprisonment I think he is also entitled to consideration as to the amount of the money penalty inflicted. I know of a case where a young man had reported twice voluntarily for service and was turned down by the military authorities as physically unfit because he had the fingers of one hand amputated. That young man, having been turned down when he volunteered twice, was ordered to report for service and, possibly owing to lack of intelligence, he may have figured that having been turned down when he volunteered there must be some mistake in ordering him to report for service. Sometime during the last two weeks he was arrested and brought before a magistrate who figured that he was justified in inflicting the minimum penalty $250. That man having shown his willingness twice to serve his country notwithstanding his deformities, and having been refused twice by the military authorities, should have been entitled to the minimum penalty, or should have been discharged immediately.

Now, Sir, the position taken by the Department of Justice at the present time amounts to this: That notwithstanding the fact that this young man should be entitled to consideration, he cannot now obtain redress from that department because he has been fined and has paid the penalty of $250. As I said before, I have endeavoured to find a case that in my judgment should qualify for the minimum fine, but it is utterly impossible. I find that even for the same offence two magistrates will each mete out a different degree of penalty. In the North riding of Renfrew men are being penalized with six months' imprisonment or $250 fine. In the South riding they are being penalized to the extent of $500, or twelve months' imprisonment. Now, I submit that there should be some attempt made towards uniformity in these judgments, and if such a disparity obtains in the imposition of sentences such as I have explained; then I claim that the Minister of Justice should intervene. I understand that he has already stated on the floor of the House to-day that in cases where magistrates impose too light a penalty, the convicted persons instantly become offenders before a court martial for trial. If it is held that there is a right to interfere in one class of cases connected with the administration of justice, in my opinion interference should also be permitted in such cases as I have called attention to.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: The motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) is a very important one, and deals with a very important subject. I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that we have no right to ask any court to mete out uniform penalties. On the other hand, I agree with the wording of the resolution in saying that we should have as much as possible a uniform system of administration of the law. It is highly desirable in dealing with a question of this kind,—having reference to the military system which is uniform all over Canada, the service being as much as possible uniform and the men called out being of uniform class and qualifications,—when we come to deal with deserters or defaulters, that some court which has a general and proper conception of all the circumstances relating to the matter to be tried, should have jurisdiction to deal with the case as far as that can possibly be done. I have no desire to reflect in the slightest upon any magistrates. It is marvellous to me how well magistrates do in the matter of the administration of justice; and if we apply the duties that we impose upon magistrates in another way we will better understand, perhaps, the difficulties that they have to contend with. Supposing for a moment we asked laymen to start the practice of medicine, and said to half a dozen in every town, "You are doctors, go out and treat the people of this district; prescribe medicine, treat surgical cases, and do all that pertains thereto." Hon. members can readily understand what an awfully murderous condition of things would exist if such men were let loose to engage in the practice of medicine in this country. Well, we who are lawyers claim that the profession of law is just as scientific as the profession of medicine, and that it is just as necessary to have a scientific knowledge of law as it is to have a scien-

tific knowledge of medicine. When we ask laymen who have not a scientific knowledge of the law to administer a complicated statute of the kind in question here, together with a number of Orders in Council that have to be interpreted in connection therewith, it is marvellous that these men are doing as well as they are doing. But when that condition of things can be avoided, when we have courts in this country composed of first class judges, when we have capable lawyers to whom the necessary duties can be assigned, I think the mover of this resolution is quite right, and has given us a subject of the highest importance to deal with, when he says that there should be uniformity in the administration of justice. I hope that that phase of the matter, at all events, will receive consideration from the Department of Justice.

I do not know what saintly men you may have in Ontario as magistrates, but in the province that I come from any constable who goes round with a batch of informations in his pocket, looking for a magistrate to prosecute, can always find the sort of man that he wants. A man of that type will just convict as that officer suggests to him, and will mete out the kind of sentence that the officer wants. This may be a reflection on the good people of my province, but I must tell the truth, and I know that there are such magistrates. I am not saying whether you have such justices in the province of Ontario or not, but we have them, and we have them pretty much all over the country, and it does not take an officer who is engaged upon the business to
3 p.m. which I referred long to find out where that sort of magistrate is. The magistrate in Nova Scotia is paid by the fees he derives from these magisterial proceedings, and the constable is also paid out of the fees. That, of course, to the ordinary individual is an inducement for securing heavy fines and getting heavy fees. So much for the necessity of lifting this matter above the ordinary petty courts of this class, and putting it on a footing where it will be given the serious consideration that such important proceedings merit.

I wish further to bring to the notice of the Minister of Justice, and more, especially to the notice of the Acting Prime Minister, that the condition existing in Canada to-day of, I suppose, thousands of young men being liable to be called up for punishment, is a condition of things that should continue only for the shortest possible time. This country of ours was not used to the business of war. It had no training by reason of ancestral heredity in military matters. In this country we were timid in the matter of this military business, and many of our young men who were absolutely honest—thousands of them in fact—did not have the nerve to go up against it. Consequently, they are not criminals at all; it was simply that many of them did not have the real fibre necessary in such a crisis. Now our old law books, and our best authorities on criminal law, tell us, and we believe it, that before there is a criminal action there must be a criminal intent. If you apply that test of criminal intent to many of these poor fellows, who were really afraid, who were timid in this matter, it is obvious that they did not contemplate committing any wrong, but now they find themselves in their present condition. I think we should bring this nightmare, which has followed the war, to an end as quickly as possible. The House will readily understand the feelings of fathers and mothers in this country having sons in such a situation. These are good honest people, who have in many ways contributed towards helping on the war and bringing it to a successful issue, but now that their boys are in this plight: the mother cannot sleep at night, the father cannot do his work by reason of the shadow of the trial that is hanging over his son, the boy is perhaps keeping out of the way, and yet no doubt the offence that was committed was really of a very slight character. Now if there is to be a trial I would certainly suggest that this threat should be removed as quickly as possible, and that whatever trials are to be held should take place as soon as possible. I do not want to be regarded as having sympathy with any one who did not do his full duty in connection with this war; but I want hon. gentlemen, particularly the Government, to bear in mind that this country was not educated to the war idea. Canada in my opinion did remarkably well when for the first time in its history she had to face such a serious condition of affairs.

Even if we find after two hundred years of peace that men without any war blood in their veins were timid in answering the call of their country, it is wise for us to consider carefully what scars we are going to leave because of the war. There are many wounds that can never be healed, and it is for the Government to be very careful that they do not create any more heart burnings in connection with these prosecutions unless it is found to be absolutely necessary for the laying broad and deep the foundations of our national life. After the

Americal civil war nobody was punished as a military defaulter. Surely the poor boy who may have been frightened away from this war is not a worse citizen than the man who shouldered his musket in the Southern States and shot perhaps hundreds of his neighbours. President Lincoln said to him:—"Go home to your wife and children and be a good man after this, and you will have no more trouble." I submit that that is the spirit which should prevail in this country, and that we should get back to peace, harmony and order as quickly as possible. We are glad that the war is over, and if there are sore spots here and there it should be the policy of this Government to prevent further irritation and get back to pre-war conditions. In this morning's papers we have an example of clemency in matters of this kind which I think it well to bring to the notice of this House. I find that although the criminal who shot at the Premier of France was sentenced to death, the Premier intervened and the sentence has been commuted to ten years' imprisonment, and probably that term will be reduced eventually. Here is something for us to think about. The Premier of France, who did so much for his country and for the world, says that the man who attempted to assassinate him shall not suffer the extreme penalty, but shall be dealt with leniently because of the prevailing conditions in his country, because in his opinion under circumstances of this kind we should thank God for the great victory and show that we have no vindictiveness. These are matters, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to submit for the careful consideration of the Government.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor-General): I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had the advantage of hearing the discussion which has taken place this afternoon. I was under the impression that the House to-day met at three o'clock instead of two o'clock; consequently I have not been present during the past hour. The question as to what punishment should be meted out to military defaulters is one which has occupied a good deal of my attention, particularly since the armistice was signed. Shortly after that event the Government, realizing the position in which many men, ordinarilly good citizens, were placed, decided that some effort should be made to produce uniformity in regard to the various sentences which were being imposed upon military defaulters throughout Canada, and early in February a committee was appointed to consider the subject not only of ordinary military defaulters, but also of conscientious objectors. That committee made a report to the Government, which report was adopted early in the month of February, and since that time I have been endeavouring, so far as in my power was possible, to carry out its terms.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did that include all six classes?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The report made by the committee dealt with six classes, and its substance is merely this: that if the records show that the default was not wilful and deliberate, but was occasioned rather by ignorance, oversight or the like, the prisoner should undergo a minimum sentence of from one to two months, and should then be liberated; but where the default was wilful and there are no extenuating circumstances, he should serve a sentence of from one to two years, according to the circumstances in each case. The report dealt with the following classes of military defaulters:

1. Men liable for service under the Military Service Act who neither registered nor reported;
2. Men who registered but did not report when ordered to do so;
3. Men who registered and reported, and afterwards deserted;
4. Men who registered and reported and were given leave, and remained absent after their leave had expired;
5. Men who were on harvest leave or compassionate leave without pay who failed to report for discharge or who failed to sign a form of release at the time the armistice was signed;

And in regard to the last class the report finds:

It is to be noted that after the armistice was signed on November 11th last, the idea became prevalent throughout Canada that further military service would not be required. Articles appeared in various newspaers to the effect that men would not be required to report unless specially notified to do so. Under these circumstances, in our opinion it would be well to obviate the necessity of men reporting merely for discharge or being required to sign forms of release. We recommend that an Order in Council be passed granting discharges in all such cases and obviating the necessity of a release in all cases in which releases have not already been obtained. We do not consider any penalty should be imposed upon defaulters in such cases.

Since that report was adopted by the Government, all cases have been dealt with by me upon the lines suggested.

Mr. BUREAU: Would the hon. minister object to telling the House who the report was signed by?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Committee consisted of myself, the Deputy Minister of Justice,

and the Judge advocate General, representing the Militia Department.

Mr. BUREAU: Who is that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Colonel McFarland. There is a great variety not only in the cases themselves, but also in the penalties imposed. There is to some extent a similarity in the excuses which are offered. I am satisfied that a great many men who became deserters became so by reason of the fact that their parents or other members of their families deliberately withheld from them the official military notices which were sent ordering them to report. There have been a great number of cases of that kind, where the default has been more or less technical, and, in accordance with the recommendation made in the report of the circumstances, such defaulters have been allowed their liberty after serving from one to two months, or even shorter periods. We have endeavoured to obtain as far as possible in each case a satisfactory report of the circumstances from the trial magistrate or from the records of the military tribunal which dealt with the case. In many cases where these records were not definite, we have relied on the reports of the member of the constituency in which the defaulter happened to reside. The recommendations made by members in such cases, giving the necessary particulars, have invariably been acted upon; we asked no further evidence than the mere letter of the member.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I point out that in one case a member of Parliament, the member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) recommended that a man go before a tribunal, thinking that he would get a week or a month, or something of that kind, whereas he got a lifetime.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These long sentences have been uniformly reduced. A great many life sentences and ten year sentences were imposed, chiefly by military court martial. In England the sentences were very much more severe. I am informed that a number of our Canadians were executed for desertion; others received penalties running from twenty to thirty years when on foreign service. It is very doubtful whether this Government or this Parliament has anything to do with these sentences.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No doubt in the world.

Mr. McMASTER: Does the Solicitor General suggest that we have nothing to do with our soldiers when they are across the seas?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, that is not the suggestion; I do not think my hon. friend thought it was the suggestion. If while our men are overseas they commit offences against British law they are under the jurisdiction of the British authorities, just as a man who comes here from Great Britain and commits an offence against our law is under our authority.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were these men soldiers?

Mr. GUTHRIE: What men?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Those men who have been imprisoned and shot.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I assume they were; and there was a great variety of offences with which they were charged and for which they were convicted. But an effort is being made to have something done which will bring about uniformity even in regard to sentences which were imposed by the British military or civil authorities while the troops were overseas.

In a great many cases, as I said, the default has been more or less technical. Then, in quite a large number of cases the default has been deliberate, but committed under rather peculiar circumstances. Men have refrained from registering or reporting on account of illness in the family—in many cases serious illness—when great hardship would have resulted to the men and to their families had they reported. My recommendation has been most lenient in every such case. But in other cases men have not only deliberately deserted, but have resisted arrest, in some cases with the use of firearms and other like weapons. Those cases are not dealt with quite as leniently. The object has been, so far as possible, to give something like uniformity to the sentences which have been imposed upon military defaulters from one end of Canada to the other. A very serious and difficult question arises in regard to the fines that have been imposed by the magistrates.

Mr. DEVLIN: The hon. gentleman has made a most serious statement, which, I assume, is official, about the shooting of Canadian soldiers in England. Will he state to the House how many Canadian soldiers were shot in England?

Sir SAM HUGHES: At the front, too. I understood the statement to be that men were tried by court martial and shot for desertion both in England and at the front.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know that my information is official, but certainly I have been under the impression that some Canadians—for some kind of offence; desertion, I would assume—have been tried by court martial and that the death penalty has been imposed and carried out.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understood it to be an official statement on the part of the minister.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh, no. I have heard the statement from military men and I think I have seen it in the newspapers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were any returns made to the Government of Canada concerning courts martial in England?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I assume there have been returns.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I mean, before the sentences were carried out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not in a position to give that information. These cases never come before me unless on an appeal for clemency. I would not have any record or any knowledge on the subject of my hon. friend's question.

The greatest difficulty in getting uniform treatment of defaulters arises in regard to the fines which have been imposed. Many of these fines, running from $500 up to $1,000 in some cases, have been paid, some of them long ago. Other magistrates feel bound to impose as a minimum fine $250, and it is within the knowledge of the House that a merely nominal fine has been imposed in many cases in the province of Quebec. I have no power to deal with the fines; in any case I do not think any fines have been remitted. A great difficulty arises if one attempts to remit them when you consider the number who have paid the higher amounts and the number that that have been let off with merely a nominal fine. But where the penalty has been fine and imprisonment, or fine or imprisonment, in dealing with the question of imprisonment from the standpoint of clemency I have disregarded the amount of the fine and considered merely the question of the term served by the offender in confinement. Having regard to the reasons for which these men were confined and to the fact that the war is now over, the House will agree that the penalties which are now exacted and which have been exacted since the armistice so far as imprisonment is concerned, could not in any way be considered severe.

Mr. DEVLIN: In what cases does the minister suggest that a court martial should take place instead of a trial before a magistrate, and in what cases does he suggest that men should be taken out of the jurisdiction of the courts of one province and be brought before a court martial in another?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not make any suggestion of that kind; I have not considered it.

Mr. DEVLIN: There are cases——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The questions that come before me are merely questions of clemency, appeals for release. Those are the only ones I have considered.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): The debate appears to me to have gone slightly away in recent minutes from the subject matter of the resolution of my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes). There seems to be a degree of horror struck in certain quarters in this House at the idea of a man being shot for desertion when in the presence of the German army—which was really trying to kill all of us. I agree with General Sherman that war is hell, but when I am at war and in hell I want to give the other fellow the most of it, and it would be a fatal method of looking at national duty if we got a false sense of proportion on even that subject. A man, after all, up against the foe in France who, when his call comes to go over the top, is late by being absent through getting drunk, or by deserting, when the other men are going straight into action with their lives in their hands, is guilty of an offence which is not a light offence, because he is endangering the lives of all the men who are associated with him in the war, at the hands of the enemy. I think we should look at this other side of the case before we give expression to horror at the very idea which has been suggested that possibly a deserter from Canada was shot. I do not want to pursue that question any further than just to say that much.

My object in this war, and I think the object of every sane man connected with the Allies, was to get hold of the chief murderer in Europe, and if any man has any doubt about the ability of the Allies to conduct the war, bitter and black and bad as it was for many of us, to a successful conclusion, I would recommend him to apply to the Kaiser if they can find him. He will tell him whether England and the Allies know how to conduct war or not.

With regard to the resolution of my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) it appears to call for what would be a very desirable thing in the opinion of the great majority of the people in this country, as far as I know the majority of the people of this country. I did not hear the whole speech of my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), and I do not know very much about the legal aspects of this question, but I think there will be a broad sentiment in the country in favour of getting as far as possible equality of sentence. One does not need much law, one only needs to be a level-minded citizen, to see the desirability of such a result being brought about, and to that extent I think the resolution has not been altogether inadvisedly brought before the House. If we could give these defaulters something like equality of treatment I think it would bring general satisfaction in Canada, and would be in accordance with the rough common sense of Canadian citizenship.

I listened with interest to the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). I do not always agree with my hon. friend in toto. Very frequently, I do not agree with what he says at all, but to-day I had a very large sympathy with his conclusions, and with his evident object in rising, without being carried by the arguments by which he supported his contention. I have not gone as deeply as he seems to have done into the psychology of those who have defaulted; I do not know whether they and their friends would thank him for having concluded that the principal cause of their defaulting was lack of fibre. I think that was his word, or lack of nerve. However, that explanation of the psychology of these particular citizens I leave to my hon. friend and to those particular citizens. Neither did I think that his analogy taken from the United States and President Lincoln was a good one. In that case there was a civil war in which one-half of the country had been doing its best against the other half, and in which the supreme power in the state had been disputed by blood, and I cannot conceive of a statesman with even an average degree of wisdom—and Lincoln had far more than the average—taking any different course from that taken by him. However, I do agree in the main with the advice that my hon. friend gave the Government. We have had too many sorrows and heart-burnings and acute disputes over this war—and I distinguish sharply between the cases to which I referred when I first arose, which happened during the war when everything had to be in to win the war—to keep up animosities after the war is over. Mr. Speaker, I may be misunderstood and disagreed with by many who surround me, for whom I have the highest regard from the fact, at any rate, that we were together in the stress and storm of the war, but I must say now that the war is over, British tradition, I think, would lead us to weigh very carefully the advice which has been given to the House and to the Government by the leader of the Opposition. I do not suggest that criminals should be let off without punishment. That would never do in a civilized country. There is no liberty anywhere except the liberty which is protected by law, and I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will agree with that sentiment. Our very liberties depend upon respect for law, and it is the outstanding characteristic of the British Empire that within its bounds more than anywhere else in the world you have the almost perfect combination of respect for law and order, on the one hand, and the greatest possible freedom on the other. Now that the war is won, and well won, I think that we might very well go as far as we can in the direction of casting a large measure of blessed oblivion over the small differences that divided us while the war was on. I hold that view very strongly. I think the progress of the months will lead the Government to see the force of that course, and indeed, from what has fallen from my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) I think that these instincts are guiding the Government at the present moment. There is really no essential difference between the two sides of this House, I should hope, in regard to the fundamental characteristics of the British Empire and of British justice and of British government in this respect. Why, Sir, what do we see at the present moment? We have seen the British Government recently let the Sinn Feiners out of prison in Ireland. What did we see in South Africa? We saw a course of leniency taken to the point of giving self-government to the Boers in South Africa within a very brief time after the termination of the war, and with the best possible results. I am often struck with this fact, and am rather charmed by it too, that sometimes the sentiments of loyalty in this country, and especially amongst my friends around me, go much farther than they do in Hyde Park, London. I am perfectly sure that every Sunday afternoon in Hyde Park, London, you hear sentiments uttered at public meetings there about monarchy and all conceiv-

able subjects which would speedily get a man a ducking in many parts of the good old province of Ontario, so Ontario is even more loyal than they are in the city of London in this particular.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I am glad my hon. friends opposite applaud that sentiment. They evidently recognize, as I do, that it is well to err in a good cause. Well, the result of that clemency and that application of British principles in South Africa was very admirable, and just in a general way I wanted to endorse, as I am always anxious to endorse when I can, any sentiments that fall from the lips of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). He does his best to utter sentiments from time to time which, unfortunately, I cannot agree with, but I am not like him, a Highland Scotchman; my memory is shorter than his, and I am always looking out for good things even in the most unexpected places. I do think we have our hands pretty full in Canada at the present time in reconstructing the country. I know something about the sentiments of the returned men, and I want to say this for a large number of them with whom I have talked, that they are not at all revengefully inclined. The majority of them know what they were up against, and the returned soldiers, I believe, would in public meeting assembled endorse by a majority the sentiments which I have just been uttering. I may be wrong in that respect, but I have endeavoured to get their sentiments and to learn what they think upon these things, and I feel very strongly that that is their attitude. Let me repeat that I should be very much misunderstood if any one thought I looked lightly upon the crime of desertion or upon any breach of law. But war is an abnormal condition, fortunately, in the affairs of this world, and certainly very abnormal in the affairs of Canada, and on the broad principles of British precedent and justice and the kind of sentiment that has animated that old country, with which we are all proud to be connected, in dealing with those who have been at variance with her in times of stress and struggle, I think the Government would do well, in a large number of these questions upon which I do not want to dwell to-day, to think twice, aye, to think three times before they keep heart burnings of irritations and harassments alive amongst our people.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): I shall say only a few words on this question, Mr. Speaker. The remarks of one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, in reference to a statement made by the Soliciton General (Mr. Guthrie), might create the impression that a large number of our Canadian soldiers have been shot. As far as I am aware, there were very few such cases. I think I am safe in saying that during the regime of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) there were one or two cases where Canadian soldiers had been tried by field general court martial at the front for desertion in the face of the enemy, and did pay that penalty. These cases were very few, however, and certainly there have been no reports of any during my term of office. Therefore, I would not like to have it go abroad that there were many such cases. In regard to the question of uniform penalties,—as I stated in the House the other day,—immediately after the armistice, on November 11th, it was quite apparent that we did not require any more of these defaulters as soldiers, and the question was, what was to be done with them? Under the statute they were liable as deserters and defaulters, and personally I never considered that they should be allowed to go scot-free. I do not believe that it is possible in this country,—unless we are going to engage in that work for the rest of our natural lives,—to attempt to arrest all the men of these various classes; but I would like to see some machinery quickly put into operation whereby all the classes mentioned by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) should be disfranchised and deprived of certain civil rights for a period of years. This, I think would be approved of by all good people in this country. Those who were defaulters would be thereby penalized.

In view of a question which has been asked in the House in regard to prisoners generally, I cabled some weeks ago to ascertain what policy was in force overseas regarding Canadian prisoners undergoing punishment for military offences in England and France, and what was to be done with them. In connection with the subject I may read this statement:

Policy Regarding the Disposal on Demobilization of Canadian Soldiers Undergoing Penal Servitude, Imprisonment or Detention.

1. Those undergoing sentence for purely military offences will be returned to Canada under arrangements to be completed later, some time prior to the final completion of demobilization. Their sentences will be remitted with effect from the date of sailing. Each soldier will be

left, as far as possible, to complete his sentence before embarkation, but existing powers of remission, etc., will, in the meantime continue to be exercised in special cases.

Each case falling within this class will at the time of final disposal be made the subject of special consideration, and where it appears that existing military conditions due to demobilization render it desirable to make an exception such soldier will be held to complete his sentence.

It is thought that cases of serious insubordination during demobilization might be dealt with in this manner.

2. Those undergoing sentence imposed by the civil power in England will be left in this country to complete their sentences should they not expire before demobilization has been concluded, but such cases will be reviewed individually prior to the final completion of demobilization with a view to determining whether any of them present such extenuating circumstances as would justify an application to the Home Secretary for a special release. It is not anticipated that many cases of this nature will be encountered.

3. Soldiers undergoing sentence of imprisonment or penal servitude imposed by military courts, either in this country or in France, for offences of a criminal, as distinguished from a military nature, will be committed to (or left in) civil prisons in England to serve out their sentences. Such cases also will, however, be reviewed prior to the completion of demobilization with a view to determining whether any of them present such extenuating circumstances as would justify remission.

The following additional provisions are applicable to soldiers undergoing sentence in France:—

1. The general policy outlined above will be followed, but soldiers who are undergoing sentence for offences not of a serious nature will be released from prison on the recommendation of the corps commander and returned with their units to England for demobilization in the usual way. Others, whose offences were of a more serious nature but who are considered to be eligible for release prior to the final completion of demobilization, will be retained in prison to serve as much of their sentence as possible before the conclusion of demobilization.

2. Those falling under Class (3) above, will be returned to England and committed to prison here to complete their sentences.

It is proposed, upon the final completion of demobilization to carry out the discharge of all Canadian soldiers left in prison in this country, who have not already been discharged or sentenced to be discharged with ignominy. Nominal rolls will then be prepared and left with the War Office and the High Commissioner for Canada, copies also being forwarded to Militia Headquarters, Ottawa. Upon completion of their sentences the men will be dealt with and, if eligible, repatriated on instructions from the High Commissioner.

Suspended Sentences.

(1) In France.

Such sentences are being remitted prior to the return of the soldier's unit to England.

(2) In England.

All such sentences are being remitted prior to the embarkation of the soldier's unit for Canada.

Where a soldier, under suspended sentence, is despatched to Canada in error without his case having been submitted for special consideration, the sentence is subsequently remitted with effect from the date of sailing.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were the Kinmel Park rioters tried by a civil judge, or before a military court?

Major General MEWBURN: I do not know as a matter of fact whether they have been actually tried or not, but I understand —this is not official—that they are being tried by court martial.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do we understand that no Canadian soldiers have had the penalty of death imposed upon them in England or Canada during the war?

Major General MEWBURN: I have never heard of any such case at all.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, while not wishing to prolong this debate, there are one or two points in connection with the discussion that I would like to touch upon, more especially as I was brought into immediate contact with some of the problems during last summer when I had the responsibility of taking the place of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major General Mewburn) at a very trying time during June, July and August. I do not wish to refer particularly to the resolution except to agree with what my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) has said in pointing out the extraordinary difficulty of equalizing penalties in connection with the administration of justice for infractions of the Criminal Code or for any crimes whatever. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that in so far as it is humanly possible with crimes of this kind, it is well to have equality of punishment. But I think it is quite obvious to anybody who has studied this question at all that the variations and degrees of guilt are, and must be, extraordinarily wide and that there must be a corresponding variation in the penalties imposed.

I wish more particularly to speak of another phase of this matter before the resolution is put through the House, or is dealt with, because I do not think that this House, or the country, should overlook the gravity of the offence that we have been dealing with, from a national point of view. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) pleaded, and I am not complaining in any way about his plea for clemency, for a generous way of looking at this whole matter and, practically, for the abolition of punishment, or at all events,

an early cessation of any rigorous or harsh measures. In the main we would all agree to that. My hon. friend stated that many parents were kept awake at night sorrowing for their boys who had been punished or who had been defaulters. May I point out to him that I took charge of the Militia Department last summer at a most critical phase of the war, when nobody in this country, or amongst the Allies, could face with anything but the deepest anxiety the progress of the various battles going on in Europe and certainly when no man could predict with anything like assurance what the issue might be. Canada was straining every nerve to get every man possible to do his duty to the state whose very existence was in danger, and to send reinforcements to those men who were literally fighting and dying in defence of our own liberty.

When I took charge of the department I found the condition of things practically this. There was scarcely a household in Canada, and in that part of it that I know more especially well, the far West, that had not provided one or more of its members to go and fight in the war and provided them early and voluntarily at a great sacrifice. I found that a great many thousands of men—I would not like to give the exact figures—subject to the call of the state in the very same way as all those other men who had gone had failed to respond and were allowing those others to fight the battle at the risk of their lives while they stayed in safety at home. It seemed to me that at that critical time in our history when everything was in hazard, it was an absolutely impossible thing for us to make a call for more sacrifices from the homes in Canada which had already provided these people to go to the war and allow to go scot-free thousands of those who were making no effort to do their duty to the state. It became necessary to do one of two things; either to insist that the most severe and harsh punishment should be meted out to those who were deliberately ignoring the call, and violating their first duty to the state, or to make a strong appeal to them in order that they might, before it was too late, recognize their duty, and, in the event of that recognition, to treat them with a generosity which I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition would have been in entire sympathy with.

Having discussed the matter very thoroughly from every angle, I recommended to my colleagues that we proclaim a general amnesty. While this matter is under discussion I would like to direct the attention of members of the House to the terms of that amnesty, and I would like to put those terms on Hansard for the very reason I have indicated. The amnesty was issued on August 2, 1918, and it was inspired by the belief that nothing short of a measure of this sort would drive home to the thousands of people who were neglecting their duty a realization of what they owed to the state. We put it in such broad and generous terms because we believed that there were thousands of defaulters at that time who had defaulted simply through sheer ignorance or because they had been misled by people in the country who knew a great deal better than they did. Without quoting the whole of the proclamation, I would like to read just two or three paragraphs:

> Whereas considerable numbers of men belonging to Class I. under our Military Service Act, 1917, called out on active service in our Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada under Our Proclamation of 13th October, 1917, although they have thus become by law soldiers enlisted in the military service of Canada,
>
> Have failed to report for duty as lawfully required of them under the said Military Service Act and the regulations thereunder, including the Order in Council duly passed on April 20 last,
>
> Or have deserted,
>
> Or absented themselves without leave from our Canadian Expeditionary Force,
>
> And it is represented that the very serious and unfortunate situation in which these men find themselves is due in many cases to the fact that, notwithstanding the information and warning contained in Our Proclamation aforesaid, they have misunderstood their duty or obligation, or have been misled by the advice of ill-disposed, disloyal or seditious persons.
>
> And whereas we desire, if possible, to avoid the infliction of the heavy penalties which the law imposes for the offences of which these soldiers have thus been guilty, and to afford them an opportunity within a limited time to report and make their services available in our Canadian Expeditionary Force as is by law their bounden duty, and as is necessary for the defence of Our Dominion of Canada,
>
> Now know ye that we in the exercise of our powers, and of our good will and pleasure in that behalf, do hereby proclaim and declare and cause to be published and made known that the penalties of the law will not be imposed or exacted as against the men who belong to Class I. under our Military Service Act, 1917, and who have disobeyed our Proclamation aforesaid; or who have received notice from any of our registrars or deputy registrars to report for duty on a day now past and have failed so to report; or who, having reported and obtained leave of absence, have failed to report at the expiry of their leave, or have become deserters from our Expeditionary Force, provided they report for duty on or before the twenty-fourth day of August, 1918.
>
> And we do hereby strictly warn and solemnly impress upon all such men, and as well those

who employ, harbour, conceal or assist them in their disobedience, that, if they persist in their failure to report, absence or desertion until the expiry of the last mentioned day, they will be pursued and punished with all the rigour and severity of the law, subject to the judgment of our courts martial which will be convened to try such cases or other competent tribunals; and also that those who employ, harbour, conceal or assist such men will be held strictly accountable as offenders and subject to the pains, penalties and forfeitures in that behalf by law provided for their said offence.

I desire to point out to the House in discussing the resolution now before it, that the very fact that amnesty was granted in the broadest and most generous terms made it incumbent on all those men who, by ignorance or by deliberate intention, had evaded their duty to the state, to avail themselves of its terms and restore themselves to the position which those citizens occupied who were prepared to do their full duty. When, therefore, it is argued —and I am not pleading for anything but the most reasonable and generous treatment now that the war is over—that we should forget entirely all these things, I will ask the House to consider the position of those thousands of men (for I am glad to say that thousands of men did subsequently report) who presented themselves in time to avail themselves of the amnesty. In what position does the House think all those men are in, as compared with the thousands of men who deliberately, after the publication of that warning, refused to do their duty to the state, and thereby became doubly defaulters and traitors to their country? The House must not, and cannot, forget that aspect of the question.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) came to see me about that time and we discussed this question. I pointed out to him in the very strongest way that it was up to him, and to every man in this country of influence and power, to use all his influence to convince the men who, through ignorance or deliberation, were not rising to a full sense of their duty in the most terrible period we ever faced, to induce them to come in even at the last hour and discharge their obligation. And if, as I say, in the face of that warning, published broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the land, there were thousands of men who still placed upon themselves the stigma of having failed in that duty, it is not for us to lightly regard this whole question of punishment in some form or another, or to view with complacence the position of those men who took, in the face of such a perilous situation, an attitude which simply meant: I will not move hand or foot for the very existence of the state whose privileges I have been enjoying for years.

Now, Sir, the leader of the Opposition remarked that even the author of the attempted assassination of Premier Clemenceau was let off. That may be true, but my recollection of the ultimate result of the trial in that case is that the would-be assassin was adjudged to be insane, and that was largely the reason for the commutation of the death sentence to ten years imprisonment. Certainly there is considerable doubt as to the sanity of the criminal in that case, and I do not think, taking that fact into account, that it is at all a case parallel with those we are dealing with now. I would admit, and would be the first to do so, that now the war is over harshness should be tempered with mercy, and that there should not be any unnecessary continuation of the methods hitherto pursued or of any desire to unduly punish those persons, however guilty they may have been, who failed the country in the face of the highest call that the State ever issued to them. My hon. friend said we had scars enough already. God knows there have been scars enough in this war. But my hon. friend must not forget also that the men who have had the greatest scars are those who have done their highest duty, and their sorrowing friends and relatives, some of whom now live to mourn their loss, can never entirely view the matter in the same way as those men who are trying to obtain absolute immunity from punishment, who, in the face of the sacrifices that others undertook, made absolutely no sacrifice in any shape or form. I do not think that this country, or any citizen living in it, can afford to minimize the grave dereliction of the highest duty they owed to the State which these defaulters were guilty of. I do not look upon this as an ordinary crime. It seems to me, viewed in the light of our troubles in the past and our situation at present, that the full obligations

4 p.m.

and full privileges of citizenship in this country are not sufficiently realized by those who enjoy them. But this war has driven the lesson home, that if a man becomes domiciled in this country and enjoys privileges—and they are great—of citizenship, whenever the existence of the State is threatened it is absolutely necessary for him to rise to a full sense of those obligations devolving upon him and to carry them out in their entirety. None of us, therefore, can afford to look lightly at that crime, which is the greatest

crime of all, viz.: That of failing to move hand or foot in the service of the State when the State's life is threatened. That is why I say this: That even in spite of any desire to mitigate severity and to drop some of the methods that we adopted to bring men to punishment, or in dealing with this subject in any shape or form, we should not forget that this cannot be regarded in any way as a light matter. Personally, I would be strongly in favour of applying some form of disfranchisement against a defaulter. It would mean the sentence to that man: You have failed in your duty as a citizen, and therefore your privileges as a citizen are taken from you, at all events for a time. I believe that such would be a wise course to pursue. Whether that punishment should be applied to the man who has already undergone some form of punishment I need not discuss now. I am only arguing that, for the sake of those who have gone overseas and undergone untold sacrifices in our behalf, or in behalf of the state, in dealing with this matter we should, at all events, render justice, even if that justice is tempered with mercy.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough): Does not the hon. minister think that there should be some uniformity in the punishments inflicted?

Mr. BURRELL: I can only say to my hon. friend that for infractions of the law, whether this or any other law, there must be a minimum and a maximum penalty, affording a range of punishment the degree of which must necessarily be related to the crime itself, which also will vary both as regards motive and actual committal.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): I concur altogether in the last remark made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) that the subject brought before the House by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) is not a matter to be considered or weighed lightly. It is a matter of great moment and great importance, and the House has to consider it as such.

The mover of this resolution has brought before you, Sir, the question which has been discussed in all the papers and by most of the citizens of this country, and which is awaiting a solution. Are we going to solve this question as it ought to be solved, in a broad spirit of justice, or are we going to solve it in the narrow spirit of people who cannot look far enough ahead in the interests of their country? The Acting Minister of Justice has referred to Mr. Justice Langelier. I do not wish to discuss this afternoon the controversy between Mr. Justice Langelier and the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, which is a local affair and of not sufficient importance to divert our minds from the broader and more general problem suggested by the motion before the House. But, as a citizen of Quebec and as a member of the Quebec Bar, I wish to tell the Acting Minister of Justice that Mr. Justice Langelier is one of the most respected, most honoured and eminent members of our judiciary, he belongs to a family that has supplied to our Bar and to our judiciary very eminent men —suffice it to mention that his brother was Lieut.-Governor of the province of Quebec after having been Chief Justice of its Superior Court. Mr. Justice Langelier is not a man who would use his position as judge to be a partisan or to defeat the ends of justice, as was insinuated in this House —not by the Acting Minister of Justice, but by some other member on another occasion.

The Government, as regards the city of Quebec, are always in a most unfortunate position. Last year we had riots in our city. The matter was brought before the House, and the explanation given by the Government for the conduct of their representative was the same as that offered by the acting Minister of Justice this afternoon, to wit, that that representative did not belong to any Department of the Government. Colonel Machin was thrown overboard by the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Militia, and he was cast away by every other member of the Cabinet. He occupied an official position, but it was convenient for the Government that he should disappear, and he did disappear, for a week or so, to reappear a little later. But, Mr. Speaker, the members of this House will not be satisfied with an explanation of that kind. What was Mr. Whitehead doing in the city of Quebec? Was he an official connected with the Government? Did he belong to the Ministry of Justice or to the Ministry of Militia? Mr. Whitehead handed to Judge Langelier instructions; those instructions were official; the judge acted according to those instructions. Were those instructions prepared by the Acting Minister of Justice or by one of his officials? Were those instructions prepared by the Minister of Militia or by one of his officials? That is the question, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this country in general and of the city

of Quebec in particular, as well as Judge Langelier himself, have a right to receive a direct answer for once from the Acting Minister of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad of the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to avail myself of it to the fullest extent, to answer very fully what the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) asks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it for granted the hon. minister (Mr. Meighen) has the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The incident to which the hon. member refers was opened by a communication to the Department of Justice in regard to certain fines imposed on military defaulters in the city of Quebec by the magistrate in question, which fines ranged from $5—which was the usual amount—to $25. The Deputy Minister of Justice thereupon communicated with the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, drawing his attention to the report and asking that an explanation of it be given; and requesting if the report were true, that representations be made to the magistrate in question that such fines were not in compliance with the law, the Deputy Minister of Justice recognizing that the magistrate was no official of the Department of Justice or of this Government but was appointed by, and was within the purview of, the Government of the province of Quebec. Then a communication reached the department from the magistrate in question, to the effect that he had been instructed to impose light fines on defaulters. That was the first intimation the Department of Justice ever received that any instructions had gone from the department either to Magistrate Langelier or to any other magistrate or judge in Canada; indeed, we knew that no instructions of any kind whatsoever had gone out. On further inquiry into the matter, a report came to me—I am speaking now from memory; had I known that this matter was coming up I would have had the whole of the correspondence here —direct from Judge Langelier, I believe; it was not asked for by us, as our communications up to this time were only with the Attorney General of Quebec. Judge Langelier reported that he had been instructed to follow the course he had taken, and he referred, either in his first or in his second letter, to Colonel Whitehead as the official from whom the instructions came. Colonel Whitehead was an officer of the Dominion Police, which force is under the Department of Justice; it was only in that sense that he was an official of the department. Upon hearing that, Colonel Whitehead was immediately suspended. He reported that he had given nothing whatever in the way of instructions, but that he had himself prepared for the guidance of his own officials—he has inspectors, I think, or some other officials under him—a memorandum, which was as partially quoted by Judge Langelier, but it followed with a sentence to this effect: That his officials were to understand that they should in all cases ask for substantial punishment for the offence, but were not to be animated by feelings of severity. This was not in the form of instructions to the magistrate, as I have stated over and over again, and as any hon. member of this House must know, and none better than the hon. member who has just spoken, because to intimate that either we or Colonel Whitehead had any jurisdiction over the magistrate is to intimate an absurdity that could not enter the mind of a reasonable citizen. This memorandum appears to have come to the attention of Judge Langelier. He had been going over with Colonel Whitehead a certain book which police inspectors always carry, but which is not referred to in this case. In reviewing that book, which dealt with the duties of police inspectors, this memorandum came to Judge Langelier's attention. He asked for a copy of it, and a copy was given to him. It contained the portion he quotes, which I repeat again was for Colonel Whitehead's officials, and it contained next the qualifying portion which the judge always refrained from quoting. He then commenced immediately to proclaim that this was received by him from the Department of Justice as his instructions. Well, it would baffle my command of the English language to describe an absurdity more gross or a claim more palpably untrue. No instructions of any kind, let me repeat, ever issued to him or to any magistrate or judge, directly or indirectly, through an official or through any one else. No instructions were ever intended to issue and none ever did. He got a memorandum which was for the use only of the inspector and for the benefit of the inspector's officials, and chose to proclaim that as his instructions from us—who, he knew, had no power and no right to instruct him. Hon. members persist in repeating that the Department of Justice so far misunderstood its duties as to attempt to give instructions or advice to magistrates. This gentleman persisted in carrying on a correspondence which the Deputy Minister of Justice very properly refused to continue. That correspondence

I shall be only too glad to have read to the House; I would have read it myself had I had any intimation that the subject was coming up. But it will fail to disclose anything that even savours of an apology. The only time apology comes in is when Judge Langelier, misunderstanding and misrepresenting the facts again, as he did in the first place, replied to some letter and said that he had received an apology. The wit of man would search the correspondence in vain for anything in the nature of an apology. From memory, that is an account of what occurred; it is in essence, a complete account; it is in letter and in spirit an accurate account of what occurred, and nothing else.

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, it is evidently difficult for the acting Minister of Justice (Hon. Arthur Meighen) to give a direct answer to a question, because although during his speech of over five minutes he has talked about all kinds of things, he has not answered my question. I ask simply what Mr. Whitehead was doing in the city of Quebec and what department he was representing. That is all I want to know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I told the hon gentleman that. He was an officer of the Dominion police; the Dominion police is a branch of the Justice Department, and he was acting in pursuance of his duties.

Mr. CANNON: Now, I have an answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You got it three times.

Mr. CANNON: It would have been more satisfactory if the Acting Minister of Justice had given me at once a direct and concise answer, instead of trying to drown his explanation in a flood of words. We now have the information that Mr. Whitehead is an official of the Justice Department acting as Inspector of Dominion Police in the city of Quebec. Mr. Whitehead hands over to the judge written instructions. Well, any man who has had legal experience knows that those written instructions could not have been prepared or drafted by the inspector himself; they must have been prepared by his superior officer. That superior officer could not give instructions on a matter of that importance without consulting the head of the department; therefore the moment an officer of the Justice Department, the Inspector of Dominion Police, hands printed instructions to a judge in the city of Quebec, we connect the head of the Justice Department, the acting minister (Mr. Meighen), or the minister (Mr. Doherty), who is now away, with those written instructions. There is no use in running away with the idea that these instructions were prepared by a man who is in no way responsible. The explanation of my hon. friend tending to show that these instructions were prepared by an irresponsible official will be accepted by very few in this House. What happened? After Judge Langelier had given a few judgments in accordance with the instructions he had received, some opposition was made and some protest offered from certain parts of the country. As usual, the Government gave way, turned right about face, and tried to deny what had actually been done by its own officers. That was the whole situation.

Let us leave aside the incident of Judge Langelier; in coming to a conclusion in regard to this matter we have to go a little further back. The Secretary of State says that the people of this country had been straining every nerve to win the war. But we all remember something else, Mr. Speaker. If some people were straining their nerves to win the war, others not very far from the Acting Prime Minister and the Secretary of State were straining every nerve not to win the war, but to win the elections. Many gentlemen on your right, Mr. Speaker, when the question of conscription was being fought out before the people, were thinking not of the Canadians who were over in France facing death, but of the means by which they could defraud the electorate; of the means by which they could deceive their——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remark of the hon. member that members of the House attempted to defraud the electors is hardly in keeping with parliamentary decorum, and I would ask him either to qualify his language or to withdraw his remark.

Mr. CANNON: I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker. I say that lots of gentlemen sitting to your right were thinking at that time of the means they might adopt to bring about a decision in their constituencies favourable to them, notwithstanding the existence of a feeling adverse to them in those constituencies. Other people were thinking of something else, Mr. Speaker. Other people were trying to secure the farmers' vote in their counties. Farmers are not, like the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) all well versed in literature. They do not spend their leisure moments reading Shakespeare and the best English authors. What did some of the hon.

gentlemen sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, say? They went to these farmers and they told them: "Conscription will not apply to you." They were believed. What happened? The Government came back to power. The farmers had voted for a Government that had promised solemnly that the farmers would not be conscripted. In the month of March the new constitutional method invented by the present Government was adopted and an Order in Council wiped out the solemn promise of the members of the Government concerning conscription and the farmers—and the farmers were conscripted. Any hon. gentleman who has a good memory will remember what happened subsequently. The farmers came to this city, and they were curious enough to insist on seeing you, Sir. The Government told them to go home, that the farmers and their sons had to go to war. The agitation continued; discontent was rampant. The Government was frightened once more and instructions were secretly sent to officials throughout the country to this effect: "Bring the farmers to the city, but give them additional furlough, send them back home." They were sent home; in Ontario they were sent home because the Government was afraid of them.

What about the emergency? What about the German peril of March of last year? The farmers were sent home, Mr. Speaker, because the gentlemen sitting on your right were afraid that their promises might bring them to grief in the near future. What were the farmers to understand from all this? Exempted one day, conscripted the next; brought to Quebec one day, sent home on the following. Unsophisticated men could only conclude that what was going to happen was very uncertain and indefinite; so they remained at home. To-day the Secretary of State says that we must not forget to be just. I am of that opinion too, but I think the greatest culprits who should be brought before the tribunal for their action on conscription and the operation of the Military Service Act are some of the gentlemen on your right, Mr. Speaker, occupying Cabinet positions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the word "culprit" is not used in its ordinary sense, but that the purport of the hon. member's statement is that hon. gentlemen because of their policy are responsible for a certain result. That being so, it seems to me his remark is not out of order.

Mr. CANNON: They were the people who deceived, and I say that if we are going to have trials of people who did not conform with the Military Service Act the first man who should be tried is the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn), who went all through Ontario during the election campaign of 1917 and solemnly promised that the farmers would be exempted. The farmers having to choose between the word of a minister of the Crown and an Order in Council, stuck by the by the word of the minister. Were they wrong? The second guilty party whom I would bring before that tribunal is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar), who endorsed the pledge of the Minister of Militia. And next I would bring before that tribunal the Unionist candidates who went throughout this country bearing in their hands telegrams, messages, and declarations from those two ministers, in order to secure votes to which they were not entitled. As we say in our province it was "A tout seigneur, tout honneur"—I would give the precedence to the mover of this resolution (Sir Sam Hughes). I see by the Peterborough Evening Examiner of March 8, 1919, that a young gentleman by the name of Collins—not John—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am informed that John was drunk, and had disappeared.

Mr. CANNON: He had to. This young man, when asked by the magistrate to explain why he had not reported under the Military Service Act, said: "Because I was told by the candidate at the last election, Sir Sam Hughes, that I was exempt as a farmer." The judge asked: "When did Sir Sam tell you such a thing?" The young man answered: "Here is the handbill that he distributed all through Victoria riding." Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this handbill was circulated on the eve of the election—not after the election was over, when there was a huge majority for the Government, but when there were big rumours that things were not going as well as they might.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not in my part of the country.

Mr. CANNON: So my hon. friend from Victoria, who is a good tactician, adopted this means of securing a really good victory. He wanted uniformity in Victoria—everybody on his side. The handbill that was circulated amongst the electors contains, first of all, a message from Major-General Mewburn, then Minister of Militia, to this effect:

Farmers coming within Class A, called out for military service, who are actually employed

on a farm in the production of foodstuffs for Canada and her allies, and whose services are necessary in the work of such farm will be exempted from military services. If their claim for exemption is not allowed by a tribunal, an immediate appeal should be made. Arrangements are being made to extend the time for such appeals.

The Minister of Militia further states that if a farmer so called out for military service who is now honestly employed in the production of foodstuffs should be drafted into the army, General Mewburn feels it will be his duty to relieve him from military service on the condition that he returns to the farm and continues to be so employed.

This young man Collins had read that statement. He was a farmer and remained at home, because General Mewburn had promised that if he was taken from home he would send him back again. The hon. member for Victoria had not as much confidence in the new Minister of Militia as he had in his predecessor, so he appealed to another minister to endorse the note of the Minister of Militia. He appealed to our distinguished, candid, frank and sincere friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar): "Why don't you add something to what the Minister of Militia has said? In my county they might not believe Mewburn, but they will believe you." And this is what the Minister of Agriculture wrote:

Sir Sam Hughes, Lindsay, Ont.

It having been brought to the attention of the Government by Hon. Mr. Crerar, Minister of Agriculture, that in some counties tribunals appointed under the Military Service Act, have not given sufficient weight to the importance of the production of foodstuffs and have therefore refused exemption to men who work is essential to continue production on the farm and which they are now working, the Government has decided, on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture, to take immediate action in order to prevent any unnecessary interruption of farm work.

In order that the Militia Department and the Department of Agriculture may be empowered to have the necessary power to act, the following Order in Council has been passed:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, upon the recommendation of the Acting Minister of Agriculture, and by virtue of the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1914, and the Military Service Act, 1917, the Minister of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint a Representative of the Department of Agriculture in such counties or districts in any province of Canada as he may determine.

First—To attend the sittings of the tribunals appointed under the Military Service Act to guard the national interests in connection with the production of foodstuffs.

Second—To appeal from the decisions of the tribunals in any case where in his opinion the tribunal has not given due weight to the urgency of maintaining our food supplies.

Third—To investigate and report upon appeals or applications for exemption where the ground of appeal or application is that the party seeking exemption should in the national interests be retained in food production rather than be enrolled in the expeditionary force.

J. D. Reid,
Acting Minister of Agriculture.

Vote Hughes, Union and Liberty
Support the Boys who stand between you and the loss of home and liberty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the hon. member not receive these same telegrams? I understand they were sent by the Government to every candidate, both Unionist and otherwise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CANNON: If I had received these messages I would not have done as the hon member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) did I would not have gone to the extra cost of printing hand bills.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not aware——

Mr. CANNON: After such an appeal we have now the pleasure of again looking on the amiable face of the hon. member for Victoria. If we are to judge the guilty ones, if these people are to be fined or sent to jail for not having reported, are we going to overlook those who are parties to the crime, if there was any crime? Are we going to allow this man Collins to go to jail and let the hon. member who gave him that handbill move in the House such a resolution as he has moved this afternoon? I am in favour of British fair play and equal justice to all, and I believe in uniformity; and if the electors who were misled are to be haled before the courts in Ontario, I want to see standing next to them the members who misled them. For four years we have heard hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, discussing every question, not on its merits, but simply on a basis of trite arguments about winning the war, and I think it is time we got down to facts and considered things from the point of view of justice. Let us know if, when this conscription law was introduced by the Prime Minister, the real object was to help the Empire, or to save his party. Let us know whether it is British fair play that these poor farmers who were deluded and misled are to be fined and imprisoned while the members who were responsible remain in their seats and vote for a motion like that presented by the member for Victoria. In our province we want justice, but justice for the whole of Canada; we are opposed to treatment of a particular kind for the pro-

vince of Quebec, and a different sort of treatment for the other provinces. We have deceived nobody in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS Oh.

Mr. CANNON: I have been opposed to conscription from the very start. I fought conscription and I think it was a very inadvisable measure. I believe that that law has done more to disunite the people and to injure Canadian interests than any other law ever passed by this Parliament; and we in Quebec, who, from the very first day when this law was introduced, have stood on the platform of conviction can well discuss these matters with the hon. gentlemen to your right, who have shifted continuously.

An hon. MEMBER Shifted more towards the front.

Mr. CANNON: I notice many were back from the front rather early in the war. However, I wish to urge upon the Government the great necessity for legislation that will embody fairness and justice and abolish discrimination of any kind. We do not want Government for Ontario with a voice from Toronto; we want government for Canada with a voice from Ottawa, and the sooner we have a government that understands the problems of this country from a national standpoint, the sooner we shall have real union and progress in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, but in doing so I would add an amendment to the effect that not only should those be punished who are brought before the courts, but those who were accomplices before, during and after the fact.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): The attitude of the returned soldiers in regard to the subject under discussion has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), with all of whose remarks, I am sorry to say, I could not quite agree. With the statement that the returned soldier is not revengefully inclined, I am of course in hearty accord; but I have the honour to represent many returned soldiers and also to be on the Executive Committee of the Great War Veterans' Association and of all the returned men I have met I think the great majority feel very keenly in regard to this question of defaulters under the Military Service Act. While the returned soldier is not revengeful, he will insist on a square deal; and it certainly does not strike him as being fair or square that some men were allowed to "get away with it," as the saying is. I venture the opinion that from this day forward those men who would not fight should not vote.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my opinion on the motion which is now before the House, not because I believe it will not be taken into consideration by the majority, but because I believe that the members are in duty bound to put on record their views of the matter and the views entertained by their constituents.

I have listened with a very great deal of attention to the debate now before the House and a most noteworthy feature of the debate was that all the hon. gentlemen who have participated in it have advocated uniformity in the punishment inflicted on deserters and defaulters.

At the outset, let us ask ourselves what offence those young men have been guilty of, who have failed to report for duty. After hearing the remarks of the hon. members for Dorchester, I really believe that the deserters and the defaulters under the Military Service Act are not the only guilty parties, but that a good many other culprits are to be found among the framers of that law. It has been proven beyond contradiction that while recruiting was going on, after the Conscription Act had been enacted, the hon. ministers themselves told the people that exemptions were provided for the farmers and the sons of farmers; but it was very uncertain and indefinite, and there were many misapprehensions. I have a vivid recollection of hearing ministers and Unionist candidates, during the electoral campaign of 1917, emphatically stating that those who were engaged in industrial work and in the production of foodstuffs, would be exempted. So much was it the case and so well was it understood that they enacted the famous Order in Council calling to the colours all the sons of farmers from 20 to 21 years old. Why, surely, Sir, nobody has forgotten that delegation of farmers, not only from the province of Quebec, but from all over the Dominion, who waited on the Government, protesting that they had been deceived, when given the assurance, before the elections, that their sons should not be called to the colours. I really believe, as just stated by the hon. member for Dorchester, that the guilty ones, the real culprits are not the defaulters.

The hon. gentlemen opposite who have

taken part in the debate, said that it was a question of justice to the men who went and that the soldiers back from the front, the "boys" as they are called, insist upon the defaulters being brought to punishment. In the city of Hull, where I live, we have a large number of soldiers returned from the front and let me tell you, Sir, that they are not revengefully inclined and there is not a particle of spite in their nature. No, Sir, the returned men are not revengeful and do not want those young men to be penalized who from personal motives did not think they should submit to the conscription law. Why should we set our minds upon punishing them, now that the war is over and won?

We have won the war and won it well. I take it that it is incumbent upon the hon. members of this House to show themselves generous in their forgiveness, and my own feeling is that, after the brilliant victory we have just won, instead of imposing uniform penalties, we should enact a general amnesty law, letting off and granting pardon to the men who, from any reason whatever, have failed to report.

Now, Sir, I heard it stated by hon. gentlemen, that they were to be strongly in favour of penalizing the defaulters by applying some form of disfranchisement against them. Allow me, Sir, to tell our hon. friends to your right that they have a partiality for disfranchisement; that is their weak side.

Last year, when the question was the framing of a war time Franchise Act, not in order to win the war, as it was contended, but with a view to winning the elections, they formed the means of disfranchising half the voters of the country. But they are not yet satisfied; and in the new law that they are going to frame, they are contriving to disfranchise another class of electors. It is time we called a halt to such shifting. Let the hon. gentlemen give us fair play; let them give us the grounds on which they wish to disfranchise those men and deprive them of their civil rights.

Or, clearly, what they are aiming at is no longer to win the war, but to win again the elections. They find that the remedy resorted to by them in 1917 has proved helpful and that, in order to get a new lease of power, they must needs have recourse to it again.

As I already said I hope our old friends of the Liberal party who are sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, and who are no doubt still actuated by a high sense of honour and justice, shall not allow the Tories to enact a law disfranchising any class of citizens of the country, even though they were defaulters under the Conscription Act. I venture further to hope that the ideas and suggestions expressed by some hon. gentlemen will not receive the favourable consideration of the House.

In conclusion, as I said, I merely wished to give my opinion. Once more, I declare that I disapprove of the motion now under discussion; and not only do I object to uniformity in the penalties inflicted, but I deprecate as well any kind of punishment.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything upon this resolution, but I can hardly allow such a speech as that delivered by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) to pass without a few remarks. I regret that the hon. member has withdrawn from the House, but he will probably be back. He has uttered some rather brave words this afternoon, and we know that whether Quebec did or did not furnish a full quota, anyway there is one Cannon that remains to roar securely after the war is over, and it comes from Dorchester, I believe. Certainly, the hon. member has put some very brave words on Hansard, but I doubt very much if his action or the actions of the community that sent him here justify any such words as he has given to this House this afternoon. He has cast a reflection upon many ministers in this Government and, in fact, he has called them culprits. That has not been ruled out of order. It depends upon what makes a culprit whether they are or not, but there are, we know, big sinners and little sinners. If the members of the Government are little sinners such members as the hon. member for Dorchester must be classed as big sinners, because not only did they not recommend the farmer to go to the front, they did not recommend any class of citizens from any part of that province to do their utmost to see that Quebec should get to the front. If Quebec, of which the hon. member for Dorchester is such an eloquent exponent, had done its duty, as did the other provinces of Canada, conscription would not have been called for; it would not have been required, and it would not have become the law of the land. Everybody knows that who knows anything about the history of the last four years. Look at the figures that have come from every province of

Canada, and which are authentic, and you will find that had the province of Quebec come forward with the same quota as did the other provinces, we would have had some 80,000 to 100,000 more men to send to the front than we had. That is well known to every student of what has taken place during the past four years. Therefore, I say it ill becomes the hon. member for Dorchester, even if he is such a mighty gun, to fire off a squib so small as he fired this afternoon in regard to this Government, and, as he said, the men they misled.

Were these men misled? Not at all. Anybody looking at the conscription debate, which is very easily available, will find that it was expressly stated on the floor of this House, not once but a score of times, that the farmer being engaged in producing food for the Allies, which was considered at that time almost as important as the service of the man who had gone to the front, would be exempted from military service. It was not an election dodge. If it was an election dodge, it was just as valid in Quebec as in Ontario or the West. But it was not an election dodge; nor was it required. The people of Ontario heard the call and were ready. They did not ask for any exemption.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friends may laugh, but there are the figures. Over 400,000 men went from Canada by voluntary enlistment. We only fell short by one-fifth of what was required. If one-fifth more had been raised under the voluntary system we would have furnished our share in the greatest war of the ages, and done it without conscription. I wish sincerely that that had been the case; I can say that from the bottom of my heart. But it was not the case, and the reason it was not the case was that in certain sections of our country the citizens did not rise to the realization of the full meaning of their citizenship in Canada. But the training of the men of Canada as a whole was right, and true, and solid, and when the call went forth they did not need any law. My hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) can tell you that when the call for the first contingent was made, it was over-subscribed within forty-eight hours; the second contingent was the same and, so on. If it had been an ordinary war the ordinary voluntary system, which was based upon British law and justice and the desire that small nations might live, would have been sufficient to see us through the war. But, unfortunately, in a country such as Canada, there was an element to whom this appeal to a loyal citizenship to do its duty without any compulsion was not sufficient. That existed more or less in every province but a good deal more in some provinces than others. Therefore, the conscription law was necessary. It came down and I am thankful to say that I was one who held up both hands for it and would do it again. Let us look at the necessity of that law for a moment. Canada had been then two and a half years in the war and it was evident to everybody looking over the history—

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of conscription naturally arises when it is proposed to make an argument in respect to the resolution before the House, but it is not competent for an hon. member to discuss conscription as a separate subject, and I hope the hon. member will bring his remarks more closely to bear upon the question before the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not wish to dispute your ruling, in any way, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member for Dorchester discussed it for pretty nearly half an hour and I thought that I would have the right to reply. If not, I certainly bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Dorchester was not discussing conscription except as showing that certain results flowed from the application of the law. The hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) is attempting to justify conscription itself which is quite a different matter.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is a very fine distinction but, however, I will try to observe it. The hon. member at any rate based his argument on the exemptions that prevailed under the law of conscription. Perhaps I would be in order if I did it in that way. Infractions, it is true, in some cases were not equally punished—in fact, in many cases, were not punished at all. The hon. member for Dorchester calls for justice. If justice were done there would not be sufficient prison room in the county of Dorchester to contain all those who would be serving sentences for not coming forward as required by the Military Service Act. That condition would prevail not only in Dorchester but in many other counties. As far as I remember the figures, there

were nearly 40,000 defaulters under the law. We know where the bulk of them live. If it is justice that is wanted, justice should be had, and we are ready for it. What the resolution calls for is equal justice to all. We feel that has not been given. Some have been severely punished. We know that in those parts of the country where the voluntary system was the strongest, and where the defaulters were the fewest, the most severe punishments were inflicted not only by fine but by imprisonment. We have sentences ranging from thirty days to a lifetime of imprisonment for not obeying the Military Service law. Is that what justice requires in a country such as Canada? I think not. The resolution calls for justice and for a uniform administration of the law. We should have that and we cannot afford having punished, as we have, so severely a very great number of defaulters in those parts of the country that were ready to round them up, to listen to the cool proposition to come down now and say that where there are so many thousands the law is unequal to deal with them and that therefore we will let them all off entirely. That cannot be contemplated for a moment.

We must have the same uniformity of punishment for those who have not heard the call of their country. If their training in loyalty was not sufficient to bring them to the rescue of Canada and of the British Empire, to the defence of their freedom, and their rights within the law, but necessitated the state stepping in and saying: If you do not go voluntarily you must go under compulsion, then every man who avoided that call should certainly be punished. We set out under the voluntary system. The voluntary system imposes a very heavy responsibility upon the citizen. It says that when your country is in danger you as an individual unit in the country are called upon to do your duty, to go if necessary, and to risk your life in fighting for the defence of your country. What would be said of a case like this? A father has five boys in his house, all good strapping, sound lads; he is attacked by a bunch of bandits over night and, when the old gentleman calls for help, four out of the five sons only need to know that the father is in difficulty and needs help to get them to the spot. But the fifth lies in his bed upstairs and says: Let the old man and the other boys fight it out. What would you think of a son like that? Would compulsion be good enough for him? No, he should be disinherited—cut off—branded as a slacker, a man who, when his parent was in danger, when the family interests were at stake and when all that was dear to that household was calling for his help, played the defaulter.

Is that the kind of man this country would applaud, or would excuse? I think not. Therefore I say that for the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) to argue that these men should be let off, that their offence should be condoned in any way, and that those who were responsible for the issuance of the Military Service call, and the declaration as to who were exempt under it, should be allowed to go free, is something I cannot comprehend at all. I therefore say that in my judgment the resolution is one that is very well timed and requires the most careful and serious consideration on the part of those who administer justice. Because there could be nothing more lamentable than to have it go out to the country that the administration of justice in Canada is entirely in vain, and that the administrators know it and will not try to change that condition or put the law into operation.

We know that all human laws have inequalities, more or less. We know that sometimes a hungry man who steals a loaf of bread pays as heavy a penalty as the man who defaults with five or ten thousand dollars. We know that such things occur, and we know they are not right. In this case we had the moral law, calling for voluntary service, and I consider that is just as strong on the true citizen as is the law of the land. In addition to the moral law, which called upon every citizen to do his part, we had to enact the conscription law, which said: If the moral law is not strong enough in its claims on you, we must put something back of it that is. Therefore the law of force was enacted in Canada, and the men whose cases we are considering to-day are the defaulters and the slackers under it. They did not come to the assistance of the country when it needed their help. They did not respond when the call went forth that the British Empire and civilization were in imminent danger. Therefore I say that these men, having failed to answer that call, we cannot afford to disregard the punishment that should be meted out in every province alike, from coast to coast—an absolute even-handed sentence—to every one that failed to obey the law. That I think is evident, and in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, there can be no two opinions about the matter. I hope the resolution of the hon. member

for Victoria will have the unanimous support of the House, and that some uniform sentence will be imposed on every slacker in the country.

Mr. J. E. S. D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great attention to the remarks fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). I wish he could catch my meaning as well as I understood his own remarks. I understood my hon. friend to say that, the guilty party, the chief culprit responsible for the establishing of conscription in Canada was the province of Quebec. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Quebec opposed conscription, because she had a right to do so. Our province, in doing so, followed in the footsteps of Australia, one of the great Dominions in the British Empire which twice opposed the passing of a conscription law by two referendums and during an appeal to the electorate, Ireland also objected to the enactment of such a legislation, not on account of the Irish being cowards, seeing that the Irish, whenever their rights were in jeopardy, have shown themselves able to take care of themselves, but because they looked upon such legislation as inimical to their interests, the more so as Ireland, just as the other parts of the Empire, had furnished its full quota during the late war.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, our friends from the province of Ontario improve every opportunity of throwing discredit on the province of Quebec, by slandering and reviling her. I have the honour of representing here a constituency which did supply a full quota during this war. I do not think there are many representatives from Ontario who could boast of counting amongst their boys men who marched so fearlessly to the front and fought so well in the great cause of civilization and human liberty as lieutenant Briand and lieutenant Reable, who both were awarded the Victoria Cross and who are electors in the county which I have the honour of representing here.

The province of Quebec was willing to do her duty and she did it. But it must not be lost sight of, Mr. Speaker, that voluntary enlistment was going very well and that, if it fell off, it was because of the orders given by the Prime Minister, in a letter sent to the former Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), telling him that things were going too fast and that it was necessary to check voluntary enlistment which was going on too rapidly. And why were those orders given? Because, even in those days, our hon. friends opposite were already planning the enactment of conscription, not in order to win the war, as stated by all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken before, but to win the elections and to remain in power.

Mr. Speaker, I take it that the motion which is now before us is an insult to the people of this country. Canada has played an effective and glorious part in the great struggle which is now over and it seems to me that, on the eve of the final peace treaty being signed, the Government should look at the whole matter with more generosity, and instead of enacting legislation providing for uniformity in the punishments inflicted on defaulters, they should bring down a general amnesty Act and grant to those young men a lasting and enduring peace. As I said in my remarks on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne those young men for the most part acted in good faith, and more particularly the farmers and the sons of farmers who belived that it was in the interest of the country that they should remain steadily at work on their farms, striving patriotically to increase food production for our soldiers overseas. Besides, the Government realized it perfectly well,—even though they were actuated in so doing from political motives—when they passed an order in council, a short time before the elections, in order to exempt from military service the farmers and the sons of farmers. Therefore, those young men who did not comply with the law, who believed that they should rather remain on the farm in order to increase the production of foodstuffs are not altogether guilty, because they heeded the advice given them by the Government, and because the farmers of Ontario were told that they would not be called to the colours, owing to the desirability of increasing food production for helping our Allies. The hon. Minister of Public Works, in his remarks on the Address, stated that a year ago there was nothing which the civilized world needed so much as shipping; that shipping was more vital to winning the war than were men or shells, and the greatest cry of the allied armies was for ships, ships to carry American soldiers across the ocean and ships to carry food to the allied armies.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, such a motion as the one presented this afternoon by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) should be thrown out and all the members ought to protest against and vote down such a resolution. I take it, Sir, all the hon. members

who are actuated by patriotic feelings and desire to promote harmony and peace in the country, should clasp hands and ask the Government to pass forthwith an amnesty Act and put a stop to all vexatious proceedings against the young conscripts who, as I said, have acted in good faith. They have heeded the advice given them in high quarters. They gave heed to the advice and followed in the footsteps of the Unionist candidates who, during the last electoral campaign, throughout the length and breadth of the country, had told them that if they voted for the Union Government, the farmers would not be disturbed and would be free to remain on their farms to increase production, and so work for the triumph of the Allies.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Beauce (Mr. Béland) asked the Acting Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) whether it was the intention of the Government to provide during this session for the repeal or abrogation of the Military Service Act, as soon as demobilization is completed. All we could get from the hon. Prime Minister was a non-committal answer. I hope that this Act, upon the conclusion of peace, will be repealed. For my own part, when demobilization is completed, and after peace has been signed, should the Government deem it proper to repeal that Act, I shall ask—and I hope I shall find a seconder in this House—that that law be erased from our statute-books. The representatives of all the nations who are now sitting at the peace conference want conscription to be done away with in every country of the world, as the last was fought with a view to destroying militarism. We entered the war and fought against the Germans in order to uproot that pest of militarism which has been inflicted on Canada by the Conscription Act. It is of the utmost moment that conscription be done away with for ever, the more so as after the gigantic war which has just come to an end, we may have other wars, but in a distant future, and there is no reason why such a legislation should remain on our statute-books.

Before closing my remarks, Sir, I may add that I am strongly opposed to this resolution and that, were I called upon to vote, I should most heartily register my vote against it, the more so as it is not in the interest of the country that it is presented. Nowadays, in the press, in Parliament, all are bending their efforts towards promoting harmony, peace and concord among the various racial groups of Canada, in the interest of the country, as our common aim. Why then should questions be submitted to the House which are not making for union and harmony, but rather for disunion. It is time we called a halt and put a stop to such a state of things. It is high time we realized that we are all Canadians, not citizens of the province of Quebec or Ontario, but first and last Canadians striving for the development of the country, so that peace and harmony may revive and be reborn in Canada, in the best interests of the country.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): The resolution submitted by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) should appeal to the hon. members of this House and to our fellow-countrymen who feel that justice should be done. A more equitable means should be devised to punish defaulters under the Military Service Act and deserters from the Canadian army. But, having said that, it does not follow that because we want to see justice done and a uniform method of punishment devised, these defaulters are going to be given a clean bill of health and permitted to go about as citizens of Canada, which they are not and never were. I would follow the course outlined by the hon. Minister of Militia; I would take these men at their own valuation of themselves: they have by their acts said to their fellow-citizens that they do not want to take the responsibilities of citizenship in this country; therefore I would deprive them of the privileges of citizenship. That is the logical way in which to deal with them. After having listened to the hon. Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie), and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie)—men who have had a wide and varied experience in the courts of this country—as a layman I can do nothing else but come to the conclusion that simply by bringing these defaulters and deserters before our magistrates we cannot get uniformity of justice—to say nothing of the experiences we have had in the past twelve or fifteen months in connection with the operation of the Military Service Act. The defaulter under the Military Service Act is in reality in identically the same position as the man who deserted at the front. He was in the class of men who were called upon to come forward and stand valiantly behind our soldiers, who were giving their very lives in defence of their country, and he refused or failed to do so. I have very little sympathy with the argument put forward that a large number of these men were misled, that their parents

or friends got them into a false position. I have had something to do with a very considerable number of these men. I have followed the course they have pursued up through the section of the country in which I live, and it required very little leading to get them to hide in the bush or anywhere else that would save them from doing their duty as citizens of Canada. The way to deal with them—let me repeat it—is to take them at their own estimate of themselves and disfranchise them of the civil rights which they have failed to appreciate.

I would ask your permission, Sir, to refer very briefly to one or two things said by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). First, with regard to the attitude of the Government towards the farmers. It is true that Government candidates in the election of 1917 said that in so far as it was possible exemption should be granted to men who were producing foodstuffs. It is also true that the Government, so far as I have been able to learn, consistently followed that policy. Exemptions were allowed to farmers in the class of men from 20 to 34 years of age called up under the Military Service Act. But when it was found that in various parts of this country there was an organized effort to defeat the Military Service Act, that tribunals and judges had determined that they were not going to permit it to be effective if they could help it, some other means had to be found to support our troops in France—who were at that time standing, figuratively speaking, with their very back to the wall —and one-fourth of the total number of men had the exemptions withdrawn from them, men from 20 to 22 years of age, but the exemptions to the farming community in this country from 22 to 34 years of age were continued as before. I make that statement, and it cannot be gainsaid.

There is one other matter referred to by the member for Dorchester, and it touched me to the very quick as a member of this House. He stated, Sir, that members on your right who had supported the Military Service Act, who had gone out and done their very best to secure reinforcements for our troops at the front, were actuated not by motives of loyalty to our men, but by a determination to win the election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON: Hon. members say, "Hear, hear."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON: Not one of those who sit there and say, "Hear, hear," Sir, has the record for service and sacrifice—

An hon. MEMBER: He was right.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON: It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for Dorchester to make any such accusation. I hand back to him the miserable, cowardly slander that that is the motive which actuated hon. members on this side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The remark of the hon. gentleman is not parliamentary.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. If my command of the English language is not sufficient to properly characterize my opinion of the hon. member for Dorchester in the House of Commons, I will tell it to his face outside, if he will let me.

When any member stands up in this House and says that men who have given the very last they have in the world to win the war are actuated by any other motive than that of a desire to support the men at the front, he is making a statement that he cannot support and that he dare not make to the faces of those hon. gentlemen outside the House.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I had no intention of speaking on the subject of the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), but as I listened to the remarks of speakers on the other side I felt that in justice to myself I should say a word or two. I heartily approve of the resolution. Indeed, I would approve of a much stronger one,—one that would go further than any one has detailed here to-day. I was struck with the remark of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) as to what Judge Langelier had done for the Bench. I should have been much more interested to learn what Judge Langelier had done in the way of soliciting the good offices of the people of his district to join the colours and go to the front. With the hon. member for Dorchester it was a case of drawing a red herring across the trail all throughout. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Quebec riots, which culminated in the burning of the military service records. These riots were witnessed by at least one member of Parliament who stood on the scene of action and did not offer a hand to stop it, to intervene, to interfere. The justification for my saying that he stood there is his own word in this House. It looked to me as if men in high positions in the province of Quebec, members of this House, were glad to see the

military service records burned. It was concomitant with the feeling that prevailed in the province against military service.

The proposal has been put forward here that slackers, as they are termed, should be disfranchised. What punishment is disfranchisement? A man who in the time of stress and trouble seeks the bush or leaves the country should not be dealt with in any such way by the Parliament of Canada. A man who would not fight for his country has no right to live in it; he should be deported, not disfranchised. He should be sent out of the country; he is a disgrace to himself and to the country in which he lives. The member for Victoria should make his resolution stronger; should make it provide that these men be sent out of the country. They are not fit to live in it, they know it themselves and the country knows it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He has too good a heart for that.

Mr. MORPHY: I fear so. The member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) sometimes agrees with me and I with him. When the question was put about penalties in this House, there was too good a heart in the Minister of Justice (Hon. C. J. Doherty). I asked the minister when the military service penalties were being imposed not to put such a power in the hands of the magistrates; I asked him to make the minimum fine $200. But the heart of the Minister of Justice was soft; he misjudged the people with whom he had to deal. He turned to me and said: "We do not wish to fill the jails or to collect fines; we wish to fill the ranks of the army." Well, these men went to the bush and the army ranks were not filled. The tender heart was there—I leave that with the hon. member to think about.

The member for Dorchester said that the people of this country were straining every nerve to win the war. What right has he to speak for the people of this country and the nerve they strained? What right have most members from the province of Quebec on the opposite side to stand on the floor of this House and boast of nerve being strained to win the war? Presumption unqualified! Why, if you look at the campaign that was propagated you will find that it was not conscription against which Quebec fought; it was not conscription that caused evasion of the Military Service Act; it was a propaganda engendered and put up for an excuse —language; language was the reason; this argument of the member for Dorchester is an afterthought. I remember seeing in the Ottawa papers an appeal by the Patriotic Fund Association of Ottawa asking certain churches in the city to urge their congregations to spend money for patriotic purposes, to contribute to patriotic funds. And I saw an article by five French clerics in this city which, in substance, said, no, we will do nothing of the sort; we will ask our people to raise money to be spent not to fight the battles of the country and of the Empire, but to fight the battle of language. The argument has been made that the people were easily misled. I do not know that they were so easily misled, but they were misled by appeals of that kind made by people who should have known better, by people who should have much better respected the liberty they enjoy than to issue such an appeal to their co-religionists.

The member for Dorchester speaks about straining nerve to fight the battles of the Empire. I just looked at the votes of the soldiers in a few of the counties in the province of Quebec in the last election. In Kamouraska it is officially reported that only fifteen votes of soldiers were reported out of a total vote of three thousand six hundred.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish unduly to interrupt the hon. member. He has a right to reply to any argument made by the member for Dorchester, but I hope that he will bring his remarks more closely to bear upon the resolution before the House than he is doing at present.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not apprehend that Your Honour wishes to make a ruling until you have heard me a little further. I intend to apply these remarks directly to the resolution under discussion. I submit that I am entitled, in view of the rules of the House and of the course which the debate has taken, to show where the large body of slackers are likely to be found, and to show it by an argument based upon the fact that they did not go to the front. That deals with the question of uniformity and punishment. I wish, therefore, to proceed with the argument; but if Your Honour feels that I may not do so, I shall submit to your ruling. In the county of Joliette, 3 soldiers' votes were polled out of a total vote of 4,500.

Mr. DENIS: Will the hon. member permit me to make an explanation?

Mr. MORPHY: No, thank you, not at this stage. There will be lots of time for explanations; I do not wish to be interrupted in the midst of a very interesting table

of figures. In Dorchester 15 soldiers' votes were polled out of a total vote of 4,700; in Bagot 19 soldiers' votes out of a total of 3,400; in Berthier, 8 out of a total of 3,800. In the German county of North Waterloo, Ontario, 659 soldiers' votes were polled out of a total of 9,000. If in North Waterloo the soldiers' votes had been cast in the same proportion as they were in Dorchester, there would have been only 30 out of the 9,000. But in this riding, which is eighty-five or ninety per cent German, the soldiers polled 659 votes in favour of fighting against the old German Fatherland. I put that against all these ridings in the province of Quebec. I will leave it to the country to say whether there is anything fair in a man getting up on the other side of the House and saying that the people of the province of Quebec have strained every nerve to win the war.

Mr. GAUVREAU: How many French-Canadians were sent to be slaughtered?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GAUVREAU: My hon. friend is insulting our whole race.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is very distinct and clear that an hon. member having the floor may not be interrupted except on a point of order or to ask a question with his consent. The hon. member who has the floor has declined to answer questions, and except a point of order be raised I must ask that he be not interrupted.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He should not be allowed to proceed as he is doing.

Mr. EDWARDS: Take your medicine.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You mix it yourself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I asked the hon. member who has the floor to bring his remarks more closely to the subject under discussion, and he assured me that he purposed making an application of his remarks. I must therefore give him an opportunity to make good his endeavours.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. MORPHY: Not just at present, but I will answer any question my hon. friend puts before I sit down. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, a uniform system of administrating the law with uniform penalties in relation to defaulters, deserters, slackers, evaders and others amenable, is essential to the well-being and good government of the country, and is due to the soldiers who voluntarily marched so fearlessly to the Front and who fought so well in the great cause of human liberty.

[Mr. Morphy.]

The point I wish to make is this, and I make it fearlessly: I claim that there should not be a uniform punishment territorially in this country. There is a black mark standing out strong in this country against the province of Quebec, in many portions of it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Shame!

Mr. MORPHY I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen opposite getting excited and crying "Shame." I turn and say to them: Clean your own doorstep, and take your own shame, because it is there the shame lies, and you deserve it. I regret that this debate has been precipitated, but in common with many members on your right, Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent and always will resent such taunts as were thrown across the floor of this House this afternoon by the hon. member for Dorchester, whose county has the magnificent record, apparently, of having sent fifteen soldiers to the front, in spite of his "straining every nerve to win the war." Why, county after county in rural Ontario has sent 600, 700, 900 and 1,000 men. The mark stands out strong upon Quebec, and it will stand there until Quebec redeems herself and becomes regenerated, and takes a humble position in the councils of this country.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will my hon. friend tell me the number of soldiers who voted in Chambly and Vercheres?

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member has that information at his own hand. He has the right to get up on the floor of the House and say what he thinks, and I do not think it is necessary for me to do any menial work for him.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): When I came to this House this afternoon my intention was not to take part in this debate, but to discuss the simple and gentle subject of titles in Canada, but as I am not going to have an opportunity of discussing that subject I propose to add a few words to the discussion that has taken place. Coming from the city of Kingston I cannot sit in my seat and allow such statements as were made here this afternoon by the hon. member for Dorchester to go unchallenged. I might say that I sent a message across the floor of this House by one of the pages to a Whip on the other side asking him to advise the hon. member for Dorchester that I proposed to say a few things about him, and that I would prefer he should be in his seat rather than absent when my remarks were being made. But no doubt the hon. member proceeds on the assumption

that "He who fights and runs away will live to fight another day," and has decided not to come back to this Chamber.

The hon. member for Dorchester says he is against conscription. I quite agree that he is against conscription; against not only military conscription but industrial conscription as well. He not only is against conscription, but he is and has been against the war since its very inception. I will not ask you, Sir, to take my words for this, but I propose to read to the House a few extracts from the speeches made by the hon. member for Dorchester when he ran in a by-election in his county in the year 1917.

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. I understood your Honour to rule, when the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was speaking, that he was not to discuss this question of service or no service as it was not to the point.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling was with respect to a discussion of the question of conscription. I take it that the hon. member for Kingston desires to reply to the hon. member for Dorchester, who quoted certain statements made during the election in the county of Victoria. I think it would not be competent for me at this stage to pronounce the hon. member out of order, but if at a later stage the point of order is again raised I shall then be in a better position to judge.

Mr. NICKLE: I would not think of discussing conscription in the abstract. What I am endeavouring to prove is that the hon. member for Dorchester is just exactly what he said he was—against conscription—and the way to prove the consistency of a man's action is certainly to compare his conduct of to-day with his conduct and speeches of some time ago. What better standard is there by which to judge a man?

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. My point is that the hon. member for Dorchester had no business to go beyond this resolution, and simply because he was permitted to go beyond the terms of the resolution, it is not permissible for some other hon. member to go beyond the resolution to reply to him. I know of no rule by which that can be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has raised a point of order. I was not in the chamber during the greater portion of the speech of the hon. member for Dorchester, but while in the Chair I allowed him to read an extract from the election address of the hon. member for Victoria. The hon. member for Kingston has a right to reply to the speech of the hon. member for Dorchester, and I shall be in the judgment of the House in ruling when he has gone beyond the proper bounds in making reply.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I rise to a question of privilege or a point of order? I was not charged with writing the telegrams of ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is a correction.

Mr. NICKLE: At the time the leader of the Opposition rose to his feet I was about to draw the attention of the House to certain remarks made in the election of 1917 by the hon. member for Dorchester, but if the House will pardon me for a moment I will step aside from the original argument as intended and draw the attention of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) to the fact that while I understood he was only a temporary leader of the Liberal party, I had no idea that his leadership was of such a temporary character that he could not keep his followers in the House in order for one afternoon. If the hon. the leader of the Opposition is correct in his contention that the hon. member for Dorchester was out of order in what he said, then, Sir, I would suggest with all deference that the leader of the Opposition should have risen in his place and called your attention to the fact that one of his followers—one of his new followers—was out of order in making the attack he made a few moments ago. Consistency is a virtue even in politics. I shall quote only a few extracts from the speeches made by the hon. member for Dorchester in 1917. One of his statements, as quoted in the Montreal Gazette, was:—

> Are we to ruin our country from the point of view of men of wealth and everything else for England? I say, no, without hesitation.

He was more than a anti-conscriptionist there. He was against the war because he failed to realize that it was Canada's war just as much as it was England's. Again, in another address he delivered in his riding, he said:

> I signed my card,—

This was in reference to registration.

> —but I say that I am opposed to conscription, whether industrial or military. If this national service means what it did in England I am ready to fight with all possible means against it.

He therefore established by these two speeches his opposition to the organization of this country for the prosecution of the war to a satisfactory and victorious conclusion. I only quote these remarks to show that the hon. member for Dorchester was consistent this afternoon, at least in this respect, that he was and always has been against conscription. But I want to go further than that and to direct the attention of of the House and of yourself, Sir, to the fact that in a letter that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) wrote, or was alleged to have written, to his sister when he was a prisoner in Germany, he stated that the speeches of the hon. member for Dorchester were reported at great length in the German papers and were there used to demonstrate the supposed fact that Canada was growing weary of the war—weary at a time when it was essential that the strength of the Allies should be kept at its highest point. If what I say is not correct, I would ask the hon. member for Beauce to rise in his place and say so, and I will willingly retract. But if the statements I have made are correct, I think it is beneath the dignity of the hon. members who are taunted for their support of conscription to sit silent in this House and allow vociferous utterances and honeyed phrases to lead us aside from a discussion so momentous as that which has taken place this afternoon. The member for Dorchester says he wants justice. I say, let him thank God that he has not got justice; because if he received justice for those men that failed to do their duty and failed to realize what the responsibilities of citizenship meant, men in his county and throughout this country who failed to realize the wonderful opportunity that they had, would be punished, not with a fine or trifling imprisonment, nor by the deprivation of citizenship, but punished on the principle that there should be "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," and that they should give their lives but not as those heroes did who went to the front to take the place of the men who defaulted in the time of their country's need. The hon. member for Dorchester held this Government up to contempt because he says in 1917 one promise was made to the country whereas a different policy was pursued in 1918. Suppose one policy was followed in 1917 and another in 1918. Are we blind to conditions and to facts? Have we no remembrance of the awful days we went through between the autumn of 1917 and the early spring of 1918? Do hon. members forget that in the autumn of 1917 we hoped that the war would soon be over, but in the spring of 1918—I think on the 21st of March—there was foreboding in the House when we realized that the line of the Allies was as thin as a thread and that all that stood between the enemy and civilization was that thin, khaki-coloured line that stretched from the sea to the bounds of Switzerland? Do hon. members forget these things? The hon. member attempts to hold this Government responsible, because, stirred by a stern sense of duty, they may have changed their policy. He says the Minister of Militia should be pilloried and held up to public contempt, and the Minister of Agriculture treated similarly. Why? Simply because, imbued with a true sense of national necessity, they may have abandoned positions they originally held to be tenable, and, in the face of a great danger, realized that everything should be subordinated to the great necessity that existed, and that the national effort should be centred on securing reinforcements to hold a line that was fast growing thin through the wastage of casualties. Are we on this side of the House—perhaps affected by a call that other men did not hear—to sit silent and not reply to taunts and criticisms such as have been levelled against us? Am I, coming from a riding that has given approximately 2,000 men to the service of the state in this great war, to stand by and be taunted with charges of inconsistency and an insinuation that my conduct was actuated by a desire to win an election? —taunted by a man who received only some 15 soldier votes in the last election? It is the height of inconsistency to ask those who have sacrificed much to stand by and listen without complaint to insults such as this. We used conscription to win elections? I remember in the late summer of 1917 when I left the House of Commons after the vote on the Military Service Act had been taken, an hon. member said to me: "Nickle, you and I have put a knife to our throats to-day because we will never be able to carry conscription in our ridings;" and I said to him, as I say to-day, that if we had put a knife to our throats and had gone down to defeat and eternal political oblivion, a thousand times would that have been better than that we should have been traitors to the men who cheerfully went, to save our cause, if need be, to death. We endeavoured to use conscription to win elections? Sir, nothing was further

from our thoughts. We used it not to win elections, but to endeavour to win the liberties of the world. Democracy? Democracy is all right in its way, and there is no more thorough-going democrat in this House than the member for Kingston; but the member for Kingston realizes that there are two aspects of democracy—that of privilege and that of duty; and if this country was good enough as a place to live in it was good enough to fight for and to die for, if necessary. I do not wonder that the member for Algoma East (Mr. Nicholson) was apparently in some heat this afternoon, for I can understand the frame of mind of a man who gave his only son for the great cause, when language such as was used by the member for Dorchester is hurled across the floor of the House. Used conscription as a means to win elections? The life blood of his son in one scale and the election in the other. Which should win? The member for Algoma East paid the supreme sacrifice; he gave to the country his only son in whom his ambitions were centred in the conviction that he was making some contribution to the great cause. Yet the leader of the Opposition says that now it is all over we should forget. Forget what? The sacrifices that were made? The member for Dorchester says he was always against conscription. I was against conscription in the early days of the war, and I never faltered in my faith that this country would respond, until I used every effort that the mind of man could devise to bring to our colours those who were defaulting, but when I realized that national necessity demanded that extreme measures should be taken I was just as enthusiastic for conscription as I was at first against it. The leader of the Opposition says we should forget. Am I to forget the homes from which were taken sons that never will come back? Am I to forget the homes in which weeping women to-day are mourning the loss of loved ones? Am I to forget that while I advocated conscription I also advocated a fair and just determination on the part of the Government to see that all those should go who ought to go and that some of those who went from my riding went to take the place of others that should have gone but did not? Am I to forget that the people of my riding made sacrifices that were necessary because of men who failed to do their duty?

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) says Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, was generous in his forgiveness. True, he was generous in his forgiveness; but the argument is not on all-fours, because between Clemenceau and the assassin it was in part an individual relationship. If Clemenceau is prepared to forgive a crazed assassin, that is for Clemenceau and France to decide. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) says that free speech exists in England, that England is tolerant of those who care to speak and that therefore we should be tolerant of those who did not obey the law. That is not on all-fours with the principle that has been enunciated this afternoon. We pass a substantive law declaring that each man who is of age and has the physical capacity should go to the front and do his duty. I cannot imagine anything more unfortunate in this country than that we should have the principle of substantive law ignored. I cannot think of anything more unfortunate than that the view should prevail among the young men of this country that in a time of national peril, when Parliament asembled determines that men must go, that we must have conscription, and when the nation, in an election, ratifies that principle, this law should be disobeyed and that these young men should be permitted to say: Forget our ignoring of the law and allow us to go free, because we found that compliance with it was not at all palatable to us.

There is not one bit of revenge in my nature. No one would be more willing to drop the whole thing if it were merely a question of the breaking of an obligation betwen one individual and another. But that is not the question to-day. It is a question of justice to the men who went; it is a question of justice to the homes that are sad to-day because men went and others did not go.

Democracy demands that privileges and duties are to be recognized together, and as a true democrat I say that those who are not prepared to fight for their country should certainly not have an opportunity of participating in the national life through the franchise, which really is the exercise of kingship.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I am sure that my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) would not desire to misrepresent me in a matter of fact. He said that I pleaded that we should be tolerant with those who disobeyed the law. I twice said something the very opposite of that. I am sorry, even at this stage, to disagree with my hon. friend in any point; that was the only flaw in a very able speech, but it is a flaw to put into one's mouth what one did not say.

Mr. NICKLE: If I in any way incorrectly quoted my hon. friend from Red Deer, certainly I desire to retract, because there is no man for whom I have a higher respect or whom I would less desire to misrepresent.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

Thursday, April 10, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Annual report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Memorandum No. 5, with respect to the work of the Department of Militia and Defence from 1st January 1918, to 31st October, 1918.—Major-General Mewburn.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

AVIATION IN CANADA.

Mr. TOLMIE:

1. What is the policy of the Government with regard to encouraging aviation?
2. What is being done to encourage our pilots and mechanics, who rendered such valuable service, to remain in Canada when they return?
3. Does the Government intend to take the initiative in this matter? If not, is it the intention of the Government to assist private enterprise organized by returned flyers?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The policy of the Government with regard to the encouraging of aviation is at present under consideration and will be announced at a later date.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

REPATRIATION COMMITTEE ADVERTISING

Mr. PROULX:

What is the total cost of advertising to date paid or contracted for, in connection with the work of the Repatriation Committee?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: The committee to date has contracted for advertising to the total amount of $70,000. The amount paid to date for advertising is $25,000.

LIQUORS ON AUXILIARY PATROL VESSELS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Subsequent to April 1, 1918, were any spirits or spirituous liquors to be found on board vessels of the auxiliary patrol fleet of the Canadian Naval Service?
2. If so, did the Government supply and pay for said spirits or spirituous liquors?

[Mr. M. Clark.]

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The use of liquor on warships is regulated by King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions and is controlled by the captain of each ship.

2. The department supplied and paid for small quantities of spirituous liquor for use for medical purposes only.

H.M.C.S. CANADA.

Mr. DUFF: Referring to the Report of the Auditor General 1916-17, page ZZ-262, item of expenditure charged to H.M.C.S. Canada paid through the High Commissioner for Canada, British Admiralty, Welsh coal, at $8.45 per ton—$561.41; and also to certain questions and answers appearing in Unrevised Hansard of March 19th, page 636:

1. Why was this coal charged to H.M.C.S. "Canada" if it was not used by this vessel?
2. What vessel did use this $561.41 worth of Welsh coal?
3. To whom was the $561.41 paid?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. This coal was charged to H.M.C.S. Canada because it was used by that ship.

3. The amount of $561.41 was paid to the British Admiralty.

COMMANDING OFFICER OF HOCHELAGA.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the name of the commanding officer of the Hochelaga who was dismissed from the Naval Service?
2. Can a properly constituted court martial of the Naval Service sentence an officer or rating to a term in the penitentiary, to be followed by dismissal?
3. Has this ever been done in Canada?
4. If so, what was the offence?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Lieutenant Robert Douglas Legate, R.N.C.V.R.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

ADMIRAL KINGSMILL.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. During the autumn or early winter of 1914 did Admiral Kingsmill officially visit Victoria, B.C.
2. If so did he officially address a body of Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve ratings?
3. Did Admiral Kingsmill advise them to disband?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.

LAKE NIPISSING WATERPOWER.

Mr. HARRISON:

1. How many cubic feet of water per second are discharged from Lake Nipissing at high and low water, respectively, upon which power development can be based?

2. Upon suitable works being constructed, what power could be obtained from the discharge of the lake at high and low water, respectively?

3. What would be the approximate cost of a navigable twenty-foot waterway, and of a navigable sixteen foot waterway, respectively, in conjunction with the several power units?

Mr. CARVELL:

1. (a) High water discharge 13,390 c.f.s. (b) Low water 4,573 c.f.s.

2. Power development will vary from 20,000 to 25,000 E.H.P. at low water, depending on loss of head, leakage of dams, water used for passage of logs, lockages, etc.

3. (a) Cost of navigable 20 foot waterway approximately, $20,000,000, exclusive of elevators, etc.; (b) No estimate yet made for a navigable 16 foot waterway.

THE LATE DR. THOMAS BARNARD FLINT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I feel it my duty to make appreciative reference to a former and much respected official of the House of Commons of whose death we learned yesterday. I refer to the late Dr. Thomas Barnard Flint, who for a period of nearly sixteen years occupied the important position of Clerk of the House.

The late Dr. Flint was a man of wide culture and scholarly attainment. In his youth he won high academic distinction in the educational institutions of his native province and at Harvard University, from which he graduated. Becoming afterwards a barrister, he occupied a number of important public positions in Nova Scotia.

Subsequently, in 1891, he was elected to the House of Commons, of which he remained a member until 1902. During that period he was chief whip of the Liberal party for the Maritime Provinces and occupied also the position of Chairman of the Committee on Standing Orders. He became Clerk of this House in 1902, retiring owing to ill-health early in 1918. He was a man profoundly versed in constitutional law and in the rules and practice of parliamentary procedure. A notable contribution to the latter branch of knowledge was his third edition of Bourinot's Practice and Procedure, which has been of great value to the members of the House.

We of the present House who were members during the time that he occupied the position of Clerk will always remember him as a most courteous, obliging and affable official, always ready to assist in any way within his power, and an official of high efficiency and capability in the important position which he occupied.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I join with the leader of the Government in what he has said about our departed friend, Dr. Flint. There is in the House to-day hardly any person who was here when Dr. Flint first became a member of Parliament. So rapid are the changes in the public life of this country and in the personnel of the House of Commons that it is surprising how quickly the Parliament of twenty years ago disappears and new men fill the seats in this House. Ever since I came here until a short time ago, when Dr. Flint left the chair, that distinguished official was the Clerk of the House of Commons. This is an office of great responsibility, requiring many excellencies of head and heart, and I think all of us who came into contact with Dr. Flint while he occupied that high office, must concur in what has been said by the leader of the Government, namely, that he was a splendid official, a man who brought education, patience, and affability to the discharge of the various duties devolving upon him as Clerk of this House. We regret his demise, and he will be missed by his wide circle of friends, and although he had left the position of Clerk of the House, we had all hopes, as he himself had, that we would have an opportunity of coming in touch with him and that for many years he would be in companionship with his old friends. His departure was more sudden than we looked for, but after all it is perhaps the best way to get out of this world and to avoid lingering illness. On behalf of the Opposition, I join in what has been said so well by the leader of the Government.

TORONTO LETTER CARRIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HORATIO C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Has the attention of the Government been called to this petition of protest by the letter carriers of Toronto. It says:

We, the undersigned, all of whom have served our King and Country in France, England, and Canada, and who are at present employed in the Toronto post office as letter carriers, strongly protest against what we feel is unjust and unwarranted action of the Government, through the Civil Service Commission—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It would be perfectly competent for the hon. member to submit a question, but not to read a document which is a protest and which calls into question the action of the Government.

Mr. HOCKEN: Then I will ask the Government if they have received this protest and what they purpose doing about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Appoint a commission.

Mr. ROWELL: The remarks of the hon. member are the first I have heard of this matter. If it has come to the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General has not brought it to my attention. I shall make inquiries about it.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I do not wish to be insistent, but in view of the many requests that have been made by various parties, might I not ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if the time of the House could not be adapted to city time until a judgment is rendered by the Chairman of the Railway Commission? I do not wish, Sir, to make a speech, but I may say this, that the members of the House of Commons who have attended morning sittings of the committees find it very difficult to come here at a different hour and to leave here at a different hour from city time. Moreover, I am told that the parliamentary press is seriously handicapped in its work. To change the time until a judgment has been rendered by the chairman of the Railway Commission would not prejudge the action of the Government. I am in earnest, Mr. Speaker, and would like my hon. friend to take this matter up.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I shall be glad to take my hon. friend's remarks into consideration and also to make inquiry from the Railway Commission as to when their decision may be expected. That will possibly enable me to make a statement respecting the matter either to-morrow or at an early date.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Before the Orders of the Day are called, might I ask the Acting Prime Minister, the head of the highest executive power in this country, whether he could not solve the difficulties of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) by bringing the city of Ottawa temporarily into line with the House of Commons.

[Mr. Hocken.]

QUESTIONS OUTSTANDING—FRANCHISE BILL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): There are two matters I would like to bring to the attention of the acting Prime Minister. One is about questions on the Order Paper over which matter my hon. friend has perhaps no control. Complaints have been made to me that some questions, amongst which are some very simple ones, have been standing now for nearly a month. For instance, question No. 2 on the Order Paper is a simple matter, but it seems to have been standing for nearly a month. The other matter which is more serious and concerning which I should perhaps have given notice to the Acting Prime Minister, but I did not have the opportunity to do so, is that measures which have been forecasted in the speech from the Throne. should, as soon as is convenient to the Government, be brought down so that all members may know what the programme is going to be. I refer particularly to the Franchise Bill which is forecasted in the speech from the Throne. We on this side of the House at all events are very anxious to know what that Bill contains as it is bound to have a very perceptible effect on the proceedings of the House one way or another.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government will be glad to take into consideration the representations of the leader of the Opposition with reference to legislation to be introduced into the House.

The Order Paper contains a very substantial body of legislation. I do not recall any session of Parliament at which so much legislation has been ready for the attention of the House as at the present one, which in that respect is an exception. We have a considerable amount of additional legislation prepared which is not yet on the Order Paper for the reason that it is desirable that the Order Paper should be further cleared up before this legislation is brought down. At all events the House is certainly not awaiting any action on the part of the Government so far as legislation is concerned.

With regard to questions, I sympathize with my hon. friend's point of view. I observed that many questions which had been standing for some time had not been answered, and I have taken some pains to ascertain from the various departments why answers have not been submitted at an earlier date, it may be owing to the war or to the greater range of government activity.

But I find that many questions that are asked should really stand as orders for returns for the reason that it is quite impossible to answer them within a reasonable time. In connection with many of these questions the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) is obliged to communicate with all the departments, and it takes considerable time to get those returns in order that he may make answer to the House. My hon. friend has called attention to question No. 2 —"What was the total expenditure of every kind, made by or on behalf of the Fuel Control Board of Canada, from its inception to the end of 1918?" That seems a very simple question, but nevertheless, when it is taken into account that there may be many expenditures which have not yet gone through the books of the Department of Finance, it is difficult to answer such a question without delay. I repeat that there are many questions on the Order Paper which really should be made orders for returns. We have hesitated to ask that they stand as orders for return because our desire has been, if possible, to bring down information to the House in answer to the questions. I assure my hon. friend that I have given the matter personal attention and it is the desire of the Government to have the answers submitted to the House just as promptly as possible, consistent, of course, with our giving accurate answers. In addition to what I have stated, I may say that we shall endeavour to give answers to questions just as quickly as we possibly can, and of that I can assure my hon. friend.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May we expect the Budget Speech before the month of May—or at what time after recess?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am unable to fix the date definitely but I shall see that a week or ten days' notice is given so that hon. members may be prepared.

LABOUR UNIONS IN THE WEST.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Is the Government aware that the labour unions in the West have severed their connection with the International Union and formed one big union on the lines of the Independent Workers of the World; and also of the fact that at their convention in Calgary they practically approved of the Bolshevik form of government? I would like to know if the Government has any official information in that respect, and if so, what steps they intend to take in the matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government is not aware that members of the western labour organization have severed their connection with the Trades and Labour organizations, as stated by my hon. friend. I saw a report in the press of the meeting at Calgary, but I do not understand that any severance has taken place.

WAR EXPENDITURES,—$350,000,000 VOTE.

On the motion of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to provide,—

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding three hundred and fifty million dollars ($350,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1920, for:—

(a) the defence and security of Canada;

(b) the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada and the demobilization of the Canadian forces;

(c) the promoting of trade and industry, and transportation facilities therefor;

(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war; and

(e) payments made or expenditure incurred during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and nineteen, for the purposes mentioned in The War Appropriation Act, 1918, and in excess of the amount authorized by the said Act.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money, less any amount borrowed in excess of the amount authorized by any War Appropriation Act, as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these resolutions.

3. That the principal raised by way of loan under this Act and the interest thereon shall be chargeable on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This resolution precedes a Bill which will appropriate the sum of $350,000,000 to meet expenditures connected with the war and the demobilization of our forces, and outlays for other purposes arising out of the war. The Bill will also provide for the necessary borrowing powers to raise the sum in question, or such part of it as may be necessary. It has occurred to me, and I put it forward as a suggestion to the Committee, that as I shall lay before the Committee to-day certain summaries dealing with all our expen-

ditures for war purposes since the beginning of the war, and an estimate, somewhat in detail, of our expenditures during the coming fiscal year so far as we can forecast them, it might better serve the purposes of intelligent discussion of the subject if I placed the figures upon Hansard so that the Committee may be able more fully to discuss them when in Committee stage on the second reading of the Bill. I put that forward as a suggestion now for the Committee to concur in or not as it may deem advisable. My reason for doing so is that the figures which I shall give are necessarily complicated and will be difficult for hon. members to follow. Having them on Hansard, where they may be studied for a few days, it would seem to me that the Committee would be in a better position when in the Committee stage on the Bill to discuss them. I do not desire to be understood as in any way wishing to limit such discussion as the members of the Committee may desire to-day upon the subject.

I believe that last year the debate took place in the Committee stage of the Bill. That was done by consent between the Government and the Opposition through their respective leaders and I believe it was concurred in as the most convenient method of dealing with the subject. Needless to say, in the Committee stage upon the Bill, if the course I suggest is concurred in, the fullest freedom will be given for discussion; in fact, such freedom, I think is amply provided for by the Rules of the House when in Committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is proposed by the minister is perfectly satisfactory to us and I think it will assist the minister in getting the figures on Hansard consecutively so that they will be more useful to us than if they were broken in upon by any remarks from this side of the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am grateful to my hon. friend and I am sure that the course suggested, and agreed to by the leader of the Opposition, will greatly facilitate the consideration of this important measure.

The total expenditure in connection with the war to March 31, 1919, was $1,225,098,-122.36.

The estimated total, including amounts not yet entered, for the complete fiscal year, 1918-19, is $1,277,273,000.

I desire to place upon Hansard a summary showing the total war expenditure which I have mentioned by departments and Commissions during the fiscal years 1914-15, 1915-16, 1916-17, 1917-18 and up to March 31, 1919. It is necessary, unless the House consent, that I should read all these figures, and I hope the House will pardon me because I am afraid they will be somewhat tedious.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) might as well dispense with the reading of them and put them in Hansard.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Very good.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If there are any observations on the totals they can be made now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am obliged to my hon. friend and I shall hand the figures to the reporter of the Hansard.

The statement presented by Sir Thomas White is as follows:

WAR EXPENDITURE BY DEPARTMENTS AND COMMISSIONS-

Department.	1914-15.	1915-16.	1916-17.	1917-18.	To Mar. 31/19.	—
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Archives			1,462 42	11,926 38	17,483 53	
Agriculture		5,077 79	12,432 41	70,303 81	459,780 12	
Auditor General's Office		4,439 17	21,254 01	38,242 21	51,078 90	
Canada Food Board				198,528 17	532,491 81	
Canada Registration Board					638,051 70	
Canadian Munitions Resources Commission			11,123 21	17,732 52	54,261 04	
Civil Service Commission					2,512 50	
Commission of Conservation					2,347 50	
Customs				5,541 25	299,233 23	
Dominion Police	132,763 89	201,508 04	159,380 55	203,174 60	357,724 94	
External Affairs	4,214 14	11,211 06	11,119 29	31,647 79	222,574 20	
Finance	149,630 09	73,671 16	54,472 22	17,916 46	103,168 20	
Governor General Secretary's Office	4,330 90	9,108 81	8,118 63	10,531 94	5,270 92	
Halifax Relief Commission					6,000,000 00	
Immigration and Colonization				26,692 85	51,205 40	
Inland Revenue		6,723 40	782 50	858 00	38,510 29	
Insurance			541 60	1,174 74	2,519 46	
Indian Affairs	81 72	5,688 83	5,836 93	41,014 99	266,170 66	
Interior		41,346 13	57,455 11	94,532 41	610 37	
Invalided Soldiers Commission					8,547,341 28	
Justice	254,945 85	1,287,693 31	1,248,415 60	2,288,720 91	2,969,312 18	
Labour		1,071 19	85,980 86	10,461 04	64,755 72	
Legislation		270 00			5,565 00	
Marine		1,529 77	2,157 68	471,985 49	16,231,961 99	
Militia and Defence	53,176,613 55	160,433,416 42	298,291,030 66	316,669,871 95	289,220,119 38	
Military Hospitals Commission			1,378,078 43	11,393,654 65		
Mines					20,177 95	
Mounted Police	597,126 44				1,875 00	
Public Printing and Stationery					35,697 13	
Naval	3,096,125 35	3,274,019 94	3,806,329 19	9,666,229 14	11,139,979 60	
National Service Commission			111,759 89	142,093 91	117 97	
National War Savings Commission					53,338 33	
News Print Commission				33,312 20	41,383 73	
Power Control Commission					3,023 76	
Paper Control Commission					2,526 53	
Post Office	110,097 80	349,672 00	634,824 59	749,608 36	(Credit)	15,050 00
Privy Council	13,637 91	17,346 91	24,068 34	26,220 34	24,351 03	
Reconstruction and Development Commission				640 10	8,185 12	
War Committee				5,597 77		
Public Information				17,782 46	68,867 62	
Public Works	12,865 45	94,344 04	142,750 96	185,321 11	8,687,820 39	
Railways and Canals	178,845 20	313,740 33	299,934 09	350,545 35	453,457 63	

WAR EXPENDITURE BY DEPARTMENTS AND COMMSSIONS.

Department.	1914–15.	1915–16.	1916–17.	1917–18.	To Mar. 31/19.	—
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Halifax Reconstruction				846,305 53	307,699 03	
Repatriation and Employment Committee					56,419 40	
Secretary of State	16,192 63	21,667 98	54,486 47	81,766 99	48,127 99	
Shell Commission			8,550 00			
Trade and Commerce	3,003,005 06	14,795 40	23,391 30	117,201 22	322,142 36	
War Purchasing Commission		29,413 39	33,077 69	30,587 42	59,251 86	
Housing Commission					350 00	
Trade and Commerce—Pig Iron					334,063 75	
Canada Trade Commission					26,417 77	
	60,750,476 01	166,197,755 47	306,488,814 63	343,836,801 98	347,839,324 27	15,050 00
			Deduct Post Office		15,050 00	
					347,824,274 27	

Finance Department, Ottawa,
April 8th, 1919.

Estimated Total for 1918–19—$400,000,000.00.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (continuing): I may say that the last figure, $347,824,274.27, is not quite complete, because all the returns have not been entered up in our books. In round figures, the estimated expenditure for the last fiscal year is $400,000,000.

There is one important item in connection with our war expenditure which I shall be unable to state with accuracy to the House because it is not possible to do so. I refer to the charge which will be made against the Canadian Government by the Imperial Government in respect to the maintenance of our troops at the front. The House may recall that at an early date in the war we made an arrangement which was eminently fair to Canada that we should pay the Imperial Government for the upkeep and maintenance of our forces at the front at the rate of six shillings per day per man. That charge covers all supplies, equipment and ammunition used by the Canadian units at the front as part of the Imperial forces. It was made up as follows:

	£	s.	d.
Rations, forage, fuel, clothing, equipment, general stores, drugs, stationery, etc.	0	4	0
Small arms ammunition	0	0	3
Gun ammunition	0	1	0
Upkeep of small arms, machine guns, artillery equipment, etc.	0	0	6
Air service, bridging, engineers' material, etc.	0	0	3
	£0	6	0

I may say that these rates were based upon the expense which had been incurred in previous wars, consequently it was more or less of an estimate.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask the date of that arrangement?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not sure as to the date when the arrangement was made, but I think it was in 1915 or 1916. However, I will make it a point to have the date ascertained and on the second reading of the Bill will give that information. It was generally understood that the rate was a very fair one, at least to Canada. The committee will recall that it was the desire of the Canadian Government, as well as of the members of this House and of the people of the Dominion, that this country should pay its way in this war, and that the expenses which properly appertain to our war effort should be borne by us.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do the figures that the minister has given for each year contain the full adjustment of the account between us and the British Government up to the end of each of those dates? For instance, does the account for 1915-16 embrace all the arms, ammunitions, and supplies that the British Government furnished to our troops during that period?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The six shillings per day per man was to cover all the services that I have mentioned in respect to the Canadian forces at the front. That arrangement held good up to September 1, 1917, when it became apparent that this war was different from all previous wars in respect of the immense amount of heavy gun ammunition required. The House, of course, will recall the battles of the Somme, and the scale of artillery fire in all engagements during the latter years of the war. After the agreement had been acted on for some time, it was found that the expenditure of ammunition for small arms and other guns and for air service was so greatly in excess of the figures upon which the charge was based, that it was suggested by the Imperial Government that the six shillings should be increased to nine shillings and four pence. It has been found since that even the nine shillings and four pence may not be adequate to take care of the heavy charges for ammunition, and the present position is this: That there is something in the nature of an arbitration proceeding between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government, and, I understand, the other Overseas Dominions as to what that per capita charge per day should be. In this connection the Auditor General, Major Sutherland, has left for London, and together with a firm of chartered accountants will represent this Government in the inquiry which is being had as to the proper charges for expenditure for ammunition.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the name of the firm of accountants in question?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is Price, Waterhouse & Company. Now the committee will observe that is an exceedingly important item, and I wish to be distinctly understood that in the figures which I have given as to the cost of the war to date, that undetermined factor be taken into account. I can make no estimate as to the amount to which it will run, but that it will be very substantial indeed admits of no doubt.

Mr. LANCTOT: It will amount to more than the twelve hundred millions already expended on behalf of Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not at all.

Mr. LANCTOT: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend, and so that he may not get the impression that the additional charge will represent any such figure as our war expenditure to date, I am informed by my assistant from the Finance Department that the Overseas Minister has asked that the sum of $45,000,000 be included in the estimate to cover this increase to become effective from September 1917.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We have to pay it anyway.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have to pay it, there is no doubt about that. We should pay it if Canada is to pay its way in the war. Our attitude has always been that Canada desires to bear the full financial burden that is properly ours in respect of our war effort. I think that has been practically common ground. Now with regard to the estimated expenditure for the coming year—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest that the representatives of Canada in their arbitration proceedings referred to, see that the prices that we pay for the supplies mentioned are compared with the cost of the goods to the British Government, because there may be a difference.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am glad to have the suggestion of my hon. friend with regard to that. Of course Major Sutherland is, I am sure, impressed with the importance of the work in which he is engaged. He is a very faithful, staunch official, and he will be assisted by a most competent firm of accountants.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let me mention what I regard as a parallel case: The trucks that we got cost $1,800, or thereabouts, whereas the cost of the British trucks was $5,400.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will take the opportunity of especially bringing to Major Sutherland's attention the observation of my hon. friend on the matter. Now with regard to the estimated expenditure for 1919-20, it is as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister leaves that branch of the subject. In the figures which he has given us in respect to the war expenditures, has he included the calculation based on the six shillings a day, or whatever it was? How much per diem per man did he allow in the calculation which he has made?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The six shillings a day charge is included in the figures I have given, and the amount which will be ascertained as the proper additional charge against Canada will be added to those figures. The estimated expenditure for the present fiscal year, 1919-20, is as follows:

Militia and Defence	$275,494,857
Other Departments	21,201,757
	$296,696,614

Of the estimated expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence, $91,000,000 is required for overseas account and $184,000,000 for expenditure in Canada, speaking in round figures. Of course, the higher expenditure in Canada is occasioned by the troops who are coming back this year. The amounts I have mentioned are made up as follows:

	Canada.	Overseas	Total.
Pay and Allowances	$ 7,811,800	$13,000,000	$ 20,811,800
War Service Gratuities	92,680,000	.....	92,680,000
Deferred Pay and Cr. Balances	36,000,000	.....	36,000,000
Assigned Pay	11,520,000	.....	11,520,000
Separation Allowance	5,580,000	2,000,000	7,580,000
Rations and Billeting	4,106,250	4,500,000	8,606,250
Clothing and Necessaries	52,500	.....	52,500
Outfit Allowances	.....	300,000	300,000
Accoutrements	2,000	.....	2,000
Equipment and Stores	654,500	2,000,000	2,654,500
Ammunition	840,307	.....	840,307
Forage and Stabling (includes horse equipment Overseas)	400,000	200,000	600,000
Engineer Services	2,200,000	800,000	3,000,000
Civilian Employees	3,832,500	600,000	4,432,500
Transport and Travelling	17,000,000	6,500,000	23,500,000
Training Areas	15,000	.....	15,000
Sundry	1,400,000	500,000	1,900,000
Maintenance of Troops in France	.....	61,000,000	61,000,000
	$184,094,857	$91,400,000	$275,494,857

Sir SAM HUGHES: Have we any interest in the principal, that is, in the stores of ammunition, guns and supplies in France?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not to my knowledge. My understanding is that we should be charged with the amount of ammunition that was actually expended.

I come now to the Estimates of war expenditures by departments other than the Department of Militia and Defence.

The Estimates of War expenditures by departments other than Militia and Defence are made up of the following details:

Agriculture.		Estimated Expenditure 1919-1920.
Salaries	$ 12,000	
Live Stock Industry.	500,000	$512,000

This item arises out of the efforts of the Department of Agriculture during the war and in the period immediately succeeding.

The salaries item is for substitutes for regular employees who are on Military leave. The Live Stock item is for contemplated expenditure for movement of food and cattle in the Western Provinces. Expenditure under this item probably will not reach the amount named. This provision is to continue the policy adopted last year in the west owing to the great scarcity of forage in certain parts. The Department of Agriculture, in co-operation with the Provincial Governments and the Railway Companies undertakes to pay for the transportation of cattle and sheep from the southern to the northern portions of those provinces for grazing purposes and for the transportation of feed from the districts where available to the cattle districts.

Audit		
Salaries		$42,000
Travelling Expenses		1,000
Printing & Stationary		2,000
		$45,000
Archives:		
War Trophies Exhibition	$ 4,000	
Freight, Contingencies, Salaries	7,500	
		$11,500

The note which I have states:

The War Trophies Exhibition has been displayed at Winnipeg, Moosejaw, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver during the last few months. This item is to cover cost of future exhibitions. The second item covers $2,500 for cost of bringing over further trophies and war records; $1,500 for purchase of rare and valuable pictures and historic souvenirs; $3,500 for salaries including the salary of a member of the War Survey Commission collecting historical information connected with Canadian war activities.

Customs:

Salary and expenses of Supervisor of Metals, Fibres and other materials	$10,000
	$10,000

External Affairs:—

Salaries, etc.	$65,000
This item comprises the following items:—	
Salaries	$40,000
Travel	5,000
Telegrams	12,250
War literature	1,000
Printing	3,500

The salaries item is in connection with the Passport Department upon which there have been very large demands, involving the employment of a considerable staff. There is a monthly revenue of about $8,000 from the passports issued.

Mr. McKENZIE: How do you get any revenue?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Fees received for the passports.

Governor General's Secretary:—
Clerical assistance, etc., $7,000
This item covers $2,340 for clerical assistance and $4,660 for telegrams.

Indian Affairs—

Salaries	$ 4,937.50	
Greater production	75,000.00	$79,937.50

By Order in Council of February 16, 1918, an advance of $300,000 from War Appropriation was authorized to assist in greater production on unused Indian lands in the Western Provinces. 21,000 acres of new land have been broken and prepared for seeding this spring. The advance of $300,000 has been nearly exhausted and it is estimated that a further advance of $75,000 will be required. It is estimated that the yield of the acreage prepared will be amply sufficient to repay the advances.
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919 was..$266,170.66

Inland Revenue—

Salaries	$1,100.00	$1,100.00

This is for the salary of a substitute official in the Methylated Spirits Warehouse.

Immigration and Colonization—

Salaries for war substitutes	$10,000	
Inspection and handling soldiers' dependents	15,000	
Transportation of soldiers' dependents	3,000,000	$3,025,000

Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was..$51,205.40

Interior—

Salaries	$69,100	

This item is for payment of substitutes replacing officials absent on military duty and comprises $52,070 for officials of the Inside Service at Ottawa and $17,030 for members of the Outside Service outside of Ottawa.

Justice—

Internment operations	$765,500	
Dominion police	1,800,000	
Military Service Branch	200,000	
Sundry Legal expensfes, etc.	34,500	$2,800,000

Exp. to Mar. 31, 1919, was $2,969,312.18

Labour—

Cost of living, etc.	$75,000	$75,000

This estimate is based on expenditures for the first ten months, 1918, and includes $35,000 for cost of living; $12,000 for director of coal operations and $10,000 for Civil Service War bonus.
Exp. to Mar. 31, 1919, was $64,755.72

Naval Service— 6,350,000
This item covers the following services:—
H.M.C.S. Niobe and Rainbow. $100,000
Dock yards 75,000
R.N.C.V.R. overseas division 550,000
War Service Gratuities. 975,000
Atlantic defence 225,000
Suspense accounts (recoverable), disbursements for account of Imperial and Allied Governments . 4,250,000
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. $11,139,979.60

Post Office—
Salaries. $200,000
This item is for paying substitutes for employees on Military Service.

Public Works—
Construction, etc., military hospitals . . $3,110,000
Rents, sundry premises 700,000
Halifax Dry Dock expropriation 1,250,000
Sundry minor expenditures. 100,000 $5,160,000
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. $8,687,820.39

Railways and Canals—
Salaries. $300,000 $300,000
This item is chiefly for payment of substitutes for employees of Canadian Government railways on service.
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. $453,457.63

Trade and Commerce— 2,241,000
The principal item is $2,000,000 in connection with contract for pig iron with Midland Iron and Steel Company and Parry Sound Iron Company.
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. $656,206.11

R.N.W.M. Police—
Expenses re. Secret Service and Military Service Act 142,500
Increase due to taking over by R.N.W.M.P. of work formerly looked after by Dominion Police as to territory from Port Arthur west to coast.

Insurance—
Salaries. $1,520
This item provides for two clerks, one at $800 and the other at $720.
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. . $2,519.46

Finance— 3,600
Decrease due to reduction of staff formerly paid under war appropriation.
Expenditure to Mar. 19, 1919, was. $103,168.20

Privy Council—
Clerical assistance, etc. . . . . $ 7,500
Reconstruction and development 10,000

The Department of Public Information—108,960 126,460 85,000
The item of $10,000 for development covers salaries, travelling expenses, stationery, telegrams, etc., required by the Reconstruction and Development Committee.
The item for Public Information includes:—
General office salaries $7,920
Distribution 2,100
Canadian Official Record 54,000
Canadian daily record 9,480

This estimate assumes that the publication will cease after July 1, 1919.
Reference branch . . . $6,840
Thrift and War Savings Stamps 5,820
Miscellaneous, including some printing stationery, cables and contingencies 22,800
Expenditure to Mar. 31, 1919, was. $24,351.03

The expenditure under the head "Justice" will depend on the conditions with which we are confronted during the year. It is thought that the amount stated will not be exceeded. The amount which was appropriated last year for the registration of aliens does not, of course, appear in this year's estimate.

That gives in some detail the expenditures of the Dominion upon the war to date and the estimated expenditures for the coming year in connection with the war and demobilization and to meet the conditions arising out of the war.

The total of the various items which I have mentioned to the committee is a little under $300,000,000, and I should point out to the committee that we are asking for $350,000,000. There are at the present time considerable funds available in the treasury of the Dominion, and the surplus over the $296,000,000, the aggregate of the figures which I have mentioned, which will be provided by this appropriation, will be used for the purpose of providing credits which it will be necessary for Canada to provide in connection with the financing of our export trade. That is a matter with which I shall be glad to deal on any convenient occasion when we are in Estimates or in committee after the second reading of this Bill. Suffice it to say that, just as for the past three years Canada has been obliged to provide dollar credits in Canada for the purchase by the Allies of foodstuffs and manufactured products, so for a considerable period after the close of the war, how long I do not know, but for the period at least in which international exchange is strongly against Europe, Canada will have to continue to provide dollar credits for the purchase of many of our foodstuffs and manufactured products. That is a consideration arising directly out of the war, and the United States has been obliged to take the same course and upon a much larger scale. The ordinary commercial and financial methods, by reason of the machinery of international credits and exchange having been thrown out of gear by the war, are no longer effectual for the purpose of enabling us to carry on our international trade.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How does this system operate in practice?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It operates in this way in practice. In the period before the war Canadian wheat, flour and other foodstuffs, and manufactured products that were sold abroad were sold in the ordinary way. That is to say, a bill of exchange would be drawn upon the consignee abroad to which would be attached the bill of lading and other securities, and the seller in Canada would hand the bill of exchange with the other documents to his bank. The bank might either send those forward to London and sell them there or sell them in New York, which is the exchange centre for this continent. No question of governmental assistance arose at all, because the bills were taken in hand by financial institutions and were ordinarily sold in New York, and by draft on New York, money was brought to Canada.

Owing to the breakdown in international exchange between Europe and America there has for the last two years not been a free exchange market in New York, although there has appeared to be one. The fact is that for the last two years or more and until very recently the Imperial Government has been obliged to provide for the maintenance of sterling exchange on an artificial basis. It was "pegged," to use an expressive financial term, at $4.76, but it was not generally realized in Canada, and I do not think it is to-day, that bills of exchange drawn by Canadians in respect of goods sent abroad and sold in New York were not really sold upon a free market in the old sense. Very large sums of money, as large as $1,000,000,000 in 1916, had to be provided, in dollar credits in New York by the Imperial Government for the purpose of holding up sterling exchange to $4.76. That was one of the reasons why restrictions upon imports were imposed by Great Britain and by continental Europe, because not only was there scarcity of shipping, but it was an object to them to diminish to as great a degree as possible the amount of money which they had to provide on this side for the purpose of holding up sterling exchange. Consequently, during the last two years of the war, practically all buying on behalf of Great Britain and her European Allies was done through an International Commission. For instance, the Wheat Export Company, which is the buying agency of the Imperial Government in Canada, was the sole purchaser of wheat and flour. I use that just as an example. It was not open to firms dealing in grain to sell their grain as in the period before the war, draw bills of exchange in respect of it and negotiate them with their banks. In other words, the exchange situation, although on account of its being a complicated matter, this is not generally realized by the public, had much to do with the restrictions placed upon imports by Great Britain and other European countries. The idea was to limit imports to Europe to necessaries, because money had to be provided in New York to keep sterling exchange up to $4.76. Many of those restrictions still remain. What I have said remains good with regard to wheat and flour to-day. Until recently it was true with regard to bacon which now has a free market. It is true to-day with regard to beef. Great Britain, although in command of almost unlimited resources in sterling in Great Britain, cannot pay in sterling for her purchases on this side of the water; she must pay in dollars either in the United States or in Canada. On account of the exchange situation being as it has been for the past two years, Great Britain has not been able to furnish dollar credits on this side of the water as she was in normal times. As a result Great Britain would not have been able to make purchases in America unless she could obtain dollar credits either by borrowing in the money market in the United States or from the American Government or from the Dominion Government here. As far as our producers, both farmers and manufacturers, are concerned, they do not know and I suppose they do not particularly care where the money comes from as long as they receive it in the usual way.

But it can only be provided for purchases of our foodstuffs and our manufactured goods and other exports—I will not say all, but a great volume of them—by provision of credits in Canada for Great Britain and the other governments. It is of the greatest importance to Canada to participate to the utmost in export trade. We have incurred a very heavy indebtedness during the war and that indebtedness can only be met as to interest and sinking fund, with a view to gradual liquidation, by Canada playing an increasingly important part in exports of agricultural and manufactured goods.

A nation is very much like an individual. An individual can pay off his indebtedness only if he produces more than he consumes, and the same holds true with regard to a nation. The nation can only reduce its national indebtedness and meet the interest obligation upon its debt re-

maining from time to time by producing more than it consumes, and its excess production must be sold abroad. I hope I am not wearying the committee, but the question has been asked me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand from the minister that we are providing credits for Great Britain, and therefore we have a contra-account to file when the final settlement is made. Has my hon. friend any idea of that account?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: According to our books to date, and not taking into account that extra charge which we shall have to pay for ammunition, the indebtedness of Great Britain to Canada is about $200,000,000. Let me explain to the committee how this has worked out in practice. We had our Canadian Expeditionary Force overseas in Great Britain and the Continent and borrowed from Great Britain, in monthly amounts, such sums as we required to pay our expenditures in Great Britain and to pay Great Britain the maintenance charges of our troops in France. On the other hand, Great Britain was expending in Canada for herself and her Allies immense sums for the purchase of wheat, flour, and other foodstuffs, airplanes and munitions, and almost since the first year of the war Canada has been advancing to her the money which she required here for those purposes. Those advances are consequently a set-off to the advances which were made by Great Britain to us in London; but in addition, as I said a moment ago, there is a balance of $200,000,000 in favour of Canada. To what extent that $200,000,000 will be reduced by the added charge which will have to be paid in respect of the expenditure of unexpectedly large amounts of ammunition in France and Belgium since September 1, 1917, I cannot say, and until we know that we are not in a position to state with any degree of accuracy what the amount is that is owed to Canada by Great Britain. Now I have been speaking of what is owed to the Canadian Government by Great Britain, but in addition, the Committee may know that the banks of Canada have also substantially helped the Imperial Government by making advances for the purpose of purchasing grain and other Canadian products during the past three years. That money was borrowed by the Imperial Government from the banks, maturing in a year from the date of the advances, and it has been renewed from time to time during the war. In that connection I would point out an important feature, namely, that it will be a very great advantage to Canada after the war to have an indebtedness from Europe to the Government and to our banks. It will be an important factor in our exchange situation, because when sterling exchange becomes normal again we shall be able to collect that money by drawing on London, and that will tend to strengthen and stabilize our own exchange.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Have we any account with France or Italy?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am glad my hon. friend has raised that question because it is evident I am not wearying the Committee. When the war came to an end we realized that the world was going to be confronted with a very serious industrial and commercial situation. On account of the restrictions upon imports to the European countries and the general demoralization in Europe caused by the war, we thought it highly desirable to offer credits not only to Great Britain but to other European countries as well, to finance purchases which they might make in the Dominion. As soon as the armistice occurred we at once brought the matter to the attention of the French Government. Negotiations have been had because we should have been very glad indeed to make very substantial advances by way of credits in Canada to our great Ally, France. So far the French Government has not felt that it required Canadian credits, but the offer remains open and the matter is still under negotiation in Paris. I cabled Mr. Lloyd Harris and the Prime Minister weeks, in fact, months ago, that we should be very pleased to create a substantial credit for France amounting to $25,000,000 or $50,000,000 or whatever sum she required. Then we felt that Belgium would need to make substantial purchases on this continent, and we entered into negotiations with that country with the result that a credit of $25,000,000 has been arranged for under agreement for the purpose of enabling the Belgian Government to purchase goods and products in Canada. An agreement was also entered into with the Rumanian Government for a credit of $25,000,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Order in Council?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is under the authority of an Order in Council. There is also a $25,000,000 credit to Greece. I may say that we considered very carefully with the British Government and the Imperial

Treasury the question of security and the desirability of making the advances in question, and we are satisfied that we will be justified in making them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are these credits earmarked for certain classes of goods?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They are not marked for specific goods, but the position is this: Wheat and flour are being bought by Britain and we are furnishing credits for them. We also provide credits to Great Britain for the purchase of beef, and with regard to the European countries—I am speaking only from memory—one-fifth will be for agricultural products, one-fifth for raw material, and three-fifths for manufactured products. That is, what they require to purchase in Canada they will purchase that through the Canadian Trade Mission, or through missions of their own, or through firms or companies they may employ for that purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Government any say in the designation of the firms that are employed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the purchasing is done through the Canadian Trade Commission here, they are in close touch with all the manufacturers of the goods in question. They have connected with them representatives of the various sections of Canadian manufacturers and agricultural producers and the object is to give every one an opportunity to tender. I can show that to my hon. friend very clearly from the correspondence.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understand that our representative, Mr. Lloyd Harris and his associates in Europe at the present time, have been commissioned by the Government to look after business for the Canadian manufacturers. I understand also there is an independent agent looking after these orders in Europe and distributing them in Canada at the present time. I think the name of the gentleman is Mr. Yapp.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Whom does he represent?

Mr. PEDLOW: I fancy he is representing the woollen industry and he is obtaining orders in Europe at the present time. He is negotiating with the woollen manufacturers regarding the distribution of these orders. I understand too that the woollen manufacturers were called together in Toronto not long ago and, together with one of the managers or leading men of the Trade Commission, they distributed these orders. These orders were distributed with the understanding that they would be confirmed subsequently by the Government. The question I wish to ask is: Have these orders been confirmed by the Government and, if so, how? Have they been confirmed by Order in Council?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sure they have not been confirmed by Order in Council. The Canadian Trade Mission in England have been promoting and obtaining on the continent, trade for Canada, and we have strongly urged upon the manufacturers and agricultural producers of Canada to send representatives over there and not leave the matter entirely to the Government, but to make use of the facilities we have afforded through the Mission in England, and push their business. The Dominion Government are in privity with governments only, the Governments of Great Britain, Belgium, Rumania and Greece, and, if we extend credit to France, the Government of France. The Belgian Government will, let us say, send a commission out here or act through some established company or firm for the purchase of goods in Canada. That is for them to determine. They say to the Dominion Government. If we purchase $25,000,000 in Canada, will you lend us the money? We say: Yes, we will lend you the money. On account of the conditions existing in Europe, it is not possible for the transaction to be carried out in the usual way as it would be before the war. In other words, Canada cannot get the business unless we furnish the credit. I am not familiar with the transaction to which my hon. friend (Mr. Pedlow) refers, but if a representative of the woollen manufacturers of Canada obtained an order from a foreign Government, let us say the Rumanian Government, they would come quite within what we have in view. It would be proper for the Rumanian Government to place that order as they might think best either through a commission of their own or ask the Canadian Trade Commission in Ottawa to place the order for them. In placing orders our commission have to consider the several manufacturers. They have their specifications and they have to purchase to the best advantage and up to the standard required by the Rumanian Government. The price must be fair and reasonable and the purchase would be financed by an advance made to the Rumanian Government through our banks here and through which payment would be made for the goods supplied.

Mr. PEDLOW: What function does Mr. Lloyd Harris perform in regard to contracts of that kind?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would be Mr. Lloyd Harris' duty to assist the representatives of the Canadian producers in obtaining business in Great Britain or on the continent. Some of the business might be obtained without any Government credit at all. It might be Mr. Lloyd Harris' duty to enter into negotiations with foreign governments and I have no doubt that in that he would be assisted by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) for the purpose of offering them credit for the purchase of goods in Canada. While this business is of unusual character—

Mr. CAHILL: Very much so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: —that is in peace times—it is precisely what has been carried on during the war. In order to obtain a market for the goods and commodities which we have to sell we had to furnish credit to the Imperial Government here. In order that the House may realize the extent to which we have made advances during the war, and which advances, as I explained, are much more than a set off to the advances made by Great Britain to us for the maintenance and upkeep of our troops in Great Britain and on the continent, I should like to place upon Hansard some figures showing how these credits we have furnished to Great Britain have been expended in Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand that the Government is pledging the credit of Canada in order that specific and particular manufacturers should do business outside of this country?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would not put it in that way. The Dominion Government is extending credit to foreign governments in order that the export trade of this country may be promoted and increased. I would be very apprehensive of what would happen in Canada in the period succeeding the war unless the Government had the courage and resource to furnish credit for the purchase of our agricultural and manufactured products. I believe—and I am prepared to argue this at any time—that we occupy the best position with the sole exception of the United States, and I do not know that I should even make that exception, of any of the belligerents who have been in this war. I believe this is due not only to the great natural resources and productiveness of Canada but to the fact that the Government has taken the necessary measures to provide for the continuance and expansion of our export trade.

Mr. JACOBS: In other words, we can compete against the world?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We can compete against the world provided our people have the financial facilities. Supposing the Dominion Government had said: No money for credit in Canada. What would have happened? Our wheat, flour, beef, manufactured goods, cheese, and salmon could not be sold abroad, and the export business of this country would practically come to a standstill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would you restrict the exportation of butter just now?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows that raises a very important question. If the Dominion Government at the close of the war deliberatly took the position, "No more credits for export trade," I would not want to be Minister of Finance in this country.

Mr. CAHILL: I would ask the minister, do we not, in the event of Rumania not paying, have to assume the obligation: It certainly would not be the manufacturer.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not contemplate the possibility of Rumania not paying

Mr. CAHILL: When you give credit you must do so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If I contemplated that possibility I would not give the credit. We have made inquiry into this matter, and we are satisfied that if we advance the money for the purpose of purchasing here that Rumania will observe her international obligations.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it within the knowledge of the minister that a large number of trading companies have been formed in the United States to do this very class of business without any assistance from the United States Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It has been drawn to my attention that certain trading corporations have been formed in the United States, which is financially a very different country from Canada. If my hon. friend formed twenty trading companies in Canada to-day, and started out to do nothing but finance the Western wheat crop—the exportable surplus Western wheat crop—of last year, I venture to say he would not get very far.

Now let me put upon Hansard what we have done in the way of providing credits

in this country, and I would like the Committee to realize, in this connection, what it has meant to the trade and commerce in this country to have those credits provided. I have explained fully to the House that we borrowed from Great Britain for the maintenance and upkeep of our troops in France and elsewhere on the Continent, and that we made advances here to Great Britain for the purchase for herself and her Allies of Canadian agricultural and manufacturing products during the war. I explained further that according to our accounts, and subject to further adjustment as to the cost of maintenance of our troops at the front, that there was a balance in favour of Canada of $200,000,000; but from the figures which I will now place upon Hansard, the Committee will realize what a tremendous part in the trade and commerce of this country, and consequently in its prosperity, the provision of credits has meant. Now here are the figures:

STATEMENT of Advances between the Dominion Government and Great Britain since outbreak of war as entered in the books of the Finance Department, March 31, 1919, still outstanding.

Advances by Dominion of Canada to Great Britain—		
Department of Agriculture, "hay, oats, etc."		$ 15,342,398 65
Canadian Cereal Crop		68,500,000 00
Dairy Produce Commission		34,748,119 62
Finance Department Special Account		19,466 66
Food stuffs		17,500,000 00
Marine Dept. "Requisitioning Boats"		801,853 27
Militia Department		135,572 45
Munitions Board		315,207,458 20
Munition Workers Separation Allowance		43,747 09
Interest Account		5,500,000 00
Naval Service Dept. "Shipbuilding"		2,273,594 47
Railways & Canals Dept. "Rail Account"		4,331,416 13
Royal Air Force		1,863,269 79
Addition to Royal Mint		39,369 52
Russian Clothing Account		977,954 59
Salmon Pack		8,467,144 85
Siberian Account		271,285 81
Trade and Commerce Dept. "Paper Account"		7,492 70
		$476,030,143 80
Less—		
Militia Dept. Sale of Govt. Property at Halifax	$ 209,985 00	
Agric're Dept. Flax Seed Account	100,000 00	
Finance Dept. Remit. from New York	30,581,250 00	
Bullion Spec'l Account	13,063 12	30,904,298 12
		$445,125,845 68
Advances by British Government to Dominion of Canada—		
Tempor'y Loan, London	$187,366,666 65	
Tempor'y Loan, Feb. & Mar. not yet posted	26,766,666 66	$214,133,333 31
Balance in favour of Dominion of Canada		$230,992,512 37

Note: £80,679,204 19s 7d. or $392,638,797.39 written off advances to Great Britain against advances received from Great Britain in London, as per agreement 29th June and 15th November, 1918.

Let us take, for example, the commodity of cheese. In the summer of 1917 it was drawn to my attention that the Canadian surplus production of cheese, which had always found its way to the British market where it enjoyed a high degree of favour, could not be purchased unless the Dominion Government found the money. We found $40,000,000 for cheese.

An hon. MEMBER: For Great Britain?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, we advanced that amount for Great Britain for cheese. Then, as I have shown, we made advances for the purchase of all the salmon pack of British Columbia. We also made enormous advances to the Munitions Board, not only for munitions, but for the carrying out of their large shipbuilding and airplane programme throughout Canada. Then we made advances for the purchase of other foodstuffs, and coming down to the present time, I am now arranging an advance for the purchase of the exportable surplus of our wheat and flour. Now my hon. friend says those advances were made to Great Britain, and so they were, but if Canada is going to engage in international trade, it will have to do what they are doing in the United States, although, of course, on a smaller scale, which will be to grant credits to other countries for the purchase of goods in Canada.

My hon. friend has asked whether the credit is especially for the manufacturers. It is not only for farmers for their wheat and foodstuffs, but for the manufacturers of food products and of all kinds of goods. If we had all these factories standing idle in Canada to-day by reason of the lack of provision for the credits, what about the question of providing work for dependent people? It is not only a question of manufacturers getting orders, but of their being able to keep their staffs employed and preventing unemployment in this country.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I point out to the minister that the agricultural commodities

are going to Great Britain, whereas we can only hope to sell the manufactured goods to Rumania, Serbia, Czecho-Slovakia, and the other new countries that are now being created at the Paris Conference.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let us assume that is so. Here Canada confronts one of the most critical periods in the history of the world, and in her history also. The Government had two courses open to it. One is to say: "Now the war is at an end and we will furnish credits only for the financing of our foodstuffs; we will not furnish any credits for manufacturers at all". The one thing that a country should guard against, especially at the close of a war and a long war such as this, is unemployment. We do not want unemployment in this country. We want the factories to be engaged, and the workpeople to be at work; and there would have been a very different story told in Canada to-day if the Government had not taken the measures which it has taken to maintain the factories in operation and obtain business. I have already said that I believe we are in one of the best positions in the world by reason of the course which the Government has adopted. I think it is perfectly clear that Canada, like the United States, must provide credits to foreign governments for the purchase of commodities in this country, if we are to sell to them, for a more or less indefinite period until exchange between Europe and the United States becomes far more normal than it is to-day.

Mr. JACOBS: Irrespective of guarantees? The point I make is that we are pledging the credit of this country to countries which, to say the least, are not in a very good financial position at the present moment. If Canada is to cast about looking for trade, is it advisable that she should deal with those countries that have been overrun for the last four or five years which are practically on the brink of bankruptcy and threatened on all sides by Bolshevism and everything that implies?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not expect that this world is going to continue practically in a state of war. It is my hope and belief that an enduring peace is going to be brought about during the next few weeks. If it is not I should almost despair of the future. The five great Powers that won this war, will, one of these days, sign a treaty of peace, and when that treaty of peace is signed I do not think that the conditions which prevail in Europe to-day will continue.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. JACOBS: Will those conditions continue here? Will unemployment continue here?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desire to say to my hon. friend what I said before. If he will look up the records of all the countries in the world that have been in this war, he will find that Canada is to-day in the best position with regard to labour, employment and prosperity.

Mr. JACOBS: That being so, why should we want to look for trade to insolvent countries?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The retort is very obvious indeed; if the Dominion Government had not taken the course which I mention, had not had the courage and the resource to announce that it would push for overseas business, and establish the credits to enable that business to be carried on, there would to-day be much more unemployment in Canada than there is.

Mr. JACOBS: As a matter of fact, has one dollar's worth of goods gone forward from Canada to those countries since those negotiations were entered into?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Goods are in process of manufacture. I would remind my hon. friend that there is one very important thing no country can afford to lose, and that is confidence. We maintained it during the war and we have maintained it since. The policies which this Government adopted of establishing an Overseas Trade Commission and of financing purchases by Great Britain in this country represent the difference between our position to-day and what it might have been—a prospect I would not like to contemplate. Courage and resource are required by the Government during this period succeeding the war, and if they lack those qualities, the people are going to suffer.

Mr. JACOBS: Every one admits that courage is necessary.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes; but it is rare.

Mr. CAHILL: What was the purpose of the Government a few days ago in asking for a vote to make good a deficit of $100,000,000, if they are in a position to loan money to every more or less insolvent country in the world?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have a deficit because last year was a war year, and we will have a deficit this year because this year in a sense is also a war year. But if my hon. friend desires to ensure recurring

deficits for many years to come, he would take measures——

Mr. CAHILL: Of precaution.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: ——which would prevent the expansion of our international trade. On the other hand, if he desires this country to meet its interest obligations and to reduce its national debt, the best course that he could pursue, I submit, would be to adopt a policy of meeting financial conditions and providing credits which will enable it to sell its goods abroad at a profit. Our future depends upon our increased production and our ability to find markets for it; and these markets cannot be found under present conditions unless credits are extended by us. I agree with the hon. member that there may be a difference of opinion whether particular credits should be extended or not; that is a question upon which the Government must make up its mind after inquiry from those whose opinions it deems valuable; but as to the principle of continuing to establish credits this year for the purchase of our agricultural and manufactured products, I do not think it is open to question, because I do not see how our trade could go on unless we pursue that course.

Mr. CAHILL: What about next year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We will see. Last year there was no free market for bacon; there is a free market now. The manufacturers of bacon can send their goods forward and sell their bills of exchange as they could before the war. But that cannot be done with regard to wheat, and flour, and many other commodities, and with regard to those commodities purchasing can only be done by governments and upon credits furnished to them. If the Dominion Government today said: No more credits for the purchase of our wheat, flour, and cheese and the products of our manufactories, you would have a panic in this country.

Mr. CAHILL: Our business with Great Britain during the war was transacted very much the same as my hon. friend did in his boyhood days: he took a basket of eggs to the market and got tea for them. We had to exchange; we furnished Great Britain certain things and she furnished certain things to us. But the idea of hoping that this country is going to be in a position to finance its manufacturers in foreign markets by creating a false market for our manufactured goods, I cannot conceive of any man of reason entertaining. No nation ever got into the business of exporting manufactured goods until it was an importer of foodstuffs. Great Britain is the greatest exporter in the world and she is a great importer of foodstuffs; the same with Germany—

Mr. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the House would like to hear the hon. minister complete his statement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not want to interrupt my hon. friend because I have taken nearly all the time of the Committee this afternoon. I do not understand my hon. friend when he says we must be importers of foodstuffs if we are to be exporters of manufactured articles. If he will look at the trade returns for the few years before the war he will find that we were exporters of both agricultural and manufactured products, agricultural products being largely predominant, but if he will follow down through the war years he will find a colossal increase in the export of our manufactured goods, largely consisting of munitions. This country developed an extraordinary ability for manufacturing munitions and other war commodities. When the war came to an end, if all the munition plants had ceased operating what would have happened to the 200,000 workers in munitions and allied industries? The problem was to substitute other business for the munition business. We must endeavour to find markets abroad for our agricultural and our manufactured products, or not only will our farmers and manufacturers suffer, but our work people will suffer, and our merchants who depend on our work people will also suffer; in fact, the whole country will suffer. I believe that the sooner Canada and all other countries can get back to normal trade conditions, so that all this business may be conducted through the regular commercial and financial channels, the better. I do not want to have to find one dollar to finance the purchase of foodstuffs and manufactured products from this country. "Well, then, why do you do it?" you may ask. Because we are in this period succeeding the war, the most critical in the history of the world, and we have to do it in connection with our manufactures and our commerce, which have become badly dislocated by reason of the sudden termination of the war. The Government must endeavour to meet that situation. I hope that we are meeting it wisely, but I have to tell the House that courage and resource are required if we are not to have very serious conditions. We must find a market

5 p.m.

abroad for our agricultural and our manufactured products, and we must keep our work people engaged so far as in our power lies. If my hon. friend puts forward the proposition that apart from a condition of war, or the period succeeding the war, the Government should not interfere in financing the purchase of the products which we have for sale abroad, but leave that financing to the institutions established for the purpose, I agree with him.

Mr. CAHILL: Right from now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not from now. I wish I could say from now. It would be a great relief to the Government at this time if we could say: Old conditions are restored; there is nothing abnormal. Let trade take its course, and let finance take its course and play its part. We would be very glad to do that. But look at the conditions prevailing to-day. You have international exchange demoralized, as I mentioned a little while ago; you have highly artificial restrictions on trade by reason of the prohibition of imports and licensing systems.

We have an entirely artificial condition in the world of international trade. My own view is that we will probably come out of that more quickly than even experts think. I am hopeful enough to believe that this period will not last as long as men whose opinion is probably entitled to more weight than mine think it will; that when trade comes back to its usual channels exchange may rectify itself more quickly than some financiers imagine. But until it does, we must conform to the conditions that we find in the world; otherwise our people will suffer and our trade and industry will suffer. I am sure no one in the House desires that to happen.

Mr. DEVLIN: Where does the minister propose to get the money that he will require this year, including the $350,000,000? I understood him to say that he had some $54,000,000 on hand and would require only $296,000,000 of the $350,000,000. Does he propose to float a loan abroad, or will he get the required amount by increased taxation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Dominion Government is in funds to a very large amount at the present time—speaking from memory, to the extent, I think, of a couple of hundred million dollars. That is one reason why $50,000,000 only in excess of the actual expenditure is asked for. I have not had it in mind that we shall need the full $250,000,000 for the credits, but we have large expenditures for other things and it will be necessary, I think, later in the year to make a loan in Canada. We have certain maturing obligations in Great Britain and United States and it may be necessary to borrow there later, but for the present we have not in contemplation any loan. With the armistice coming so suddenly and unexpectedly, it is rather fortunate that we were in funds. The Dominion has some temporary obligations of which I will inform the House in the Budget Speech; but on the whole our debt is pretty well funded, and there is nothing within the next five years, so far as I can see, that need cause any serious apprehension; that is to say, as to our being able to borrow to meet any deficits we may have. But I am the first to say that just as soon as we get through this very trying period, retrenchment must be the order of the day. What we are doing to-day we shall not be able to continue to do. The Dominion Government will not continue in the years that are to come to extend credits to finance our exports; just as soon as free markets are obtained, that will not be necessary. Trade and finance will be as before the war and the Dominion will have its Budget as it had before the war, only, of course, on a very much more extensive scale.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does the minister expect that out of the $350,000,000 he will have enough for the increased pensions to soldiers?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The item for pensions is in the Main Estimates.

Mr. ELKIN: There has been some discussion in the past as to whether we provided funds in New York to take care of interest obligations in connection with Great Britain's borrowings. Exchange, of course, would be against us at the time we provided that money. Did we, as a matter of fact, provide money to take care of Great Britain's interest charges falling due in New York, and to what extent, if we did, was the exchange chargeable to ourselves or to Great Britain?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have not provided any money to Great Britain except for purchases in Canada. On the contrary, we have received from Great Britain a great deal of money in New York funds; in other words, what we have received from Great Britain there has helped our exchange. Of course, that had to be so. Canada has large interest and other obligations in London; she has also interest obligations in New York and during the war many short

date maturities of our Governments, provincial and municipal, and of corporations, fell due there. That meant that Canada had to provide the necessary money there to take care of these obligations. That, with the fact that we had an adverse balance of trade with the United States, accentuated our exchange situation. That was relieved from time to time by money provided by Great Britain in New York and drawn upon by the Dominion Government. I should not like to be misunderstood with regard to Great Britain. Great Britain and Canada have worked together in this war; nothing has so compelled my admiration as the courage and resourcefulness of Great Britain with regard to the tremendous financial tasks which have confronted her. I am speaking particularly of those on this side of the water. We have been in continuous communication with Great Britain in respect of her finances in Canada and in the United States, and certainly we have nothing to complain of. On the contrary, we have much to be grateful for in what Great Britain has done in a financial way in order to enable her to purchase to the utmost of her power in Canada. Great Britain desired to buy all our agricultural produce and all our manufactured goods that she could buy during the war. She appreciated the war effort we were making and she supplemented to the utmost of her financial power the credits which were made available for the purpose of those purchases in Canada. I desire to pay as strong a tribute as I can to the action of the Mother Country with regard to those matters.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was very glad that the minister was allowed to make his statement consecutively so that when the Bill which is founded on this resolution is brought before the House we shall have an opportunity of discussing it freely, and of making use of the figures which have been given.

I profess to have the ordinary man's intellect, but this system of trade is new to me, and, I think, deserves serious consideration. Hon. gentlemen behind the Prime Minister whom I regard as not having any greater intelligence than myself seem to treat this thing as if it were an every day occurrence, a very small matter, a subject for hilarity and laughter. But I fancy they do not really understand the situation very much better than I do. It is a very serious matter when we have to create trade by the use of our own money for the purchase of our own goods. If a manufacturer goes to the Bank of Montreal for an advance of money on goods which he has in his store, he must warehouse those goods and give the key of the warehouse to the bank. The banker advances the money on a certain percentage of the goods that are warehoused. The manufacturer gets the money, the goods are warehoused and the bank has security for them. In this case the Government of this country becomes the banker and lends the money. The manufacturer sells his goods, the goods go out of this country, and so the Government has no security at all. That is the inviting proposition which is put before this House by the Government, and upon which we are entering, and which hon. gentlemen supporting the Government cheer and laud and think it is absurd for any person on this side to ask anything about.

Mr. LALOR: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Canada has no security and that we are giving the goods away? I do not think that is the case.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the hon. gentleman enlighten me by explaining what security the Dominion Government has for the money it is advancing?

Mr. LALOR: If the goods are shipped to Belgium, it has the security of the Belgian Government.

Mr. CAHILL: Rumania?

Mr. LALOR: The same thing applies to Rumania.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the Belgian Government is reliable, why does it not advance money in Europe to its own people for the purchase of these goods? Some hon. members shake their heads, but if the Belgian Government is able to furnish money to its own people to buy goods in Europe, why cannot it advance money to its own people here and let them purchase our goods? That is the way the matter strikes the ordinary man, and we would not have this backing of the Belgian people by the Belgian Government in order to get this money which the Belgian Government does not possess and cannot get unless the Canadian Government accepts a long term promissory note which some day may be good. The long term note of the Belgian Government which the Minister of Finance purposes taking, is not negotiable to-day; it will not be negotiable to-morrow; it will not be negotiable next year. The minister does not know when it will be negotiable, but he hopes it will some day. He puts that note in his pocket or in his vault and keeps it there, or he leaves it with his banker with instructions to cash it when it de-

serves to be cashed. That is all the security we are getting for this money, and the situation is a very grave one, although it may turn out all right. As far as the manufacturer is concerned, what is the difference between sending those goods out of the country without getting any security for them and the manufacturer warehousing them if they do not take up too much space? If a manufacturer of boots and shoes in Montreal says to the Government: I cannot go on with manufacturing boots unless you give me credit, the minister could very well say to him: If you are going to continue manufacturing those goods and if you warehouse them and give us a lien on them, we shall give you money to the extent of $500,000, or $1,000,000, as the case may be, and the manufacturer promises to put the goods in the warehouse. The people who are working in the factories are kept going just the same and are getting their wages. The boots are being stored away and, if the manufacturer cannot repay the money, the Government has this security that the goods are on hand. The Government's object is to give our people work, and I am in favour of that being done, but at the same time I want to make sure that the money of our country is secure, but it is not a system of trade to be encouraged and lauded and be proud of that we are furnishing money to foreign Governments to come here and buy our goods and take them away without giving us any security at all. If it is absolutely necessary to do this, it is a new and grave situation, and before the Government launches upon it to any great extent, the Canadian people should thoroughly understand the matter.

There is also a vicious element about this business. As has been pointed out to-day, credit has been given to certain persons in Rumania, and through certain channels, over which the ordinary business man in this country has no control, they get the right to come into this country to buy goods. Through some influence in this country they are steered into certain factories and to certain manufacturers here and there from whom they buy those goods. The money of Canada is drawn into those channels and directed to friends of the Government or friends of those people on the other side who have goods to sell, while the ordinary everyday man, who has no friends at court and no connection with those influences on the other side, is not in a position to get this trade. I am sure every person who desires the general prosperity of Canada wants a free opportunity given to everyboy who is in any trade to do his best in the open market with his goods, but here we have everybody in Canada furnishing the money, through the taxes we pay, but the trade that is produced by the use of that money is directed into certain specified channels through certain specified agencies created either directly or indirectly by this Government. That is not fair. If we are using the money of the people to create trade, that trade should be as general as possible and not directed into certain places where it will find its way to favour either friends of the Government or anybody else. Those are things that should be avoided. It was pointed out to-day that a certain convention of agents from foreign countries and agents of manufacturers had a meeting in Toronto the other day for the purpose of allocating this business. That is the first we heard of it here, and if that is being done, it is evidently being done to the advantage of people who have inside information. If this must be done, it must be because it is highly necessary and there is no other way out of it, and in that case we have no right to be priding ourselves on our great ingenuity and forethought in securing trade for this country. Almost any man, no matter how blunt he is, when he has the power, can take money from the people of this country, hand to a man and say: Here, as long as this money which I have furnished for you lasts, come and buy our goods with our money; when it is gone, I do not know what will happen, but here is the money, start plying trade with our people while this money lasts. This is a grave problem which should receive the serious consideration of every hon. member.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand, my hon. friend to ask why the Belgian Government does not supply the money to make these purchases without asking the Dominion Government's assistance. The Belgian Government would have no difficulty whatever in supplying money in Belgium, but on account of the breakdown in exchange between Europe and Canada, the Belgian Government can purchase in Canada only if she gets dollar credits here. Belgian exchange has broken down as English exchange has. The result is that Belgium, like Great Britain, is unable to get credits in either the United States or Canada unless the money is loaned on this side of the Atlantic. Belgium was one of the most prosperous and wealthy countries in the world, and I have a very high opinion of the industry and en-

terprise of the Belgian people and a great hope in their future. I think the future of Belgium is assured and that her finances will be wholly restored by indemnities from Germany. But apart from indemnities, the enterprise of her people, and their capacity for trade, together with the natural resources of the country and its colonial possessions, give promise of a great future for the nation. I may tell by hon. friend that the Dominion Government is not desirous to raise money by way of loans and advance it to foreign governments unless for the purposes I have mentioned, but I have pointed out that under present conditions our international trade cannot be carried on unless dollar credits are furnished here. Unless such credits were furnished here it could not be carried on with Great Britain, much less with other countries I have mentioned. The alternative is easily seen; our products, agricultural as well as manufactured, would not find a market. I have had a great deal to do with the financing of wheat, flour, and foodstuffs, during the past two years, and can assure the hon. gentleman that if wheat buying in this country stopped you would hear from all the growers of wheat immediately, for they must sell their wheat to pay their accounts, to pay their help, and to carry on their business as growers of grain. It is absolutely necessary that the money should be provided to take care of that wheat crop and the flour produced by our millers, and if we have to lend money to Great Britain or any other country in order to ensure the purchase of the products of our fields, it is clearly the duty of the Government to do so. There is no other course open. If through timidity we said we would not borrow any more money to make advances to Great Britain, it would mean that the grain raised on Canadian farms would remain there and would never get into the elevators and be sold on the markets of the world, and there would be a panic all through the West and throughout this country. In connection with the financing of last year's wheat crop, we have paid out nearly $70,000,000 and $90,000,000 more must be provided for the financing of the purchase of the exportable surplus of last year's wheat crop—I refer to exportable surplus of wheat and the amount that will be exported as flour. These are vast sums, but I affirm that we must provide money if these commodities are to be sold. I have been speaking about agricultural products, and the same thing applies to our manufactured products sold in Europe. On account of the exchange situation that exists, we must provide dollar credits here. Business cannot be carried on in the old way, and therefore the Dominion Government must extend credits which will enable purchases to be made. People who manufacture here must have the money because they have to pay for the raw material, pay their work people, and keep their companies going by providing for overhead and fixed charges. We could adopt the course which I think my hon. friend has in mind and say, "No credits for overseas business." Well, I venture to say that if my hon. friend were in my position and took that view he would not hold it a week hence.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister is mistaken if he thinks that I say there should be no encouragement to overseas business. As far as Great Britain or France and other substantial countries are concerned, it is all right; but to go into the highway and byways to deal with people whom we do not know is, I think, objectionable.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is pronouncing upon the credit of the countries in question. We have made careful inquiry of the Imperial Government, who are thoroughly posted in matters of the kind and who, as a matter of fact, have made and are making large advances to those countries to-day, and we are satisfied that the course we have adopted is the proper one, having regard to the conditions that exist here and the paramount necessity of extending our trade.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the minister any idea what advances have been made, say, by Great Britain to Rumania and Greece, outside of those for purely war purposes?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say offhand, but I should think the advances would be of a mixed character during the past three or four years—for war and other purposes.

Now, my hon. friend spoke about the desirability of having orders placed fairly in Canada. I concur in every word he said in that respect, and I affirm to him to-day that although I have had the task of the provision of these credits, I have had no complaints from any one that there has been any partiality in the placing of orders, nor have I in the slightest degree interested myself in the disposition of any of the orders. On the contrary, in November last I arranged with the British Government for a credit of $50,000,000 from the Dominion Government for the purchase of timber in Canada, and I may say to my hon. friend that if we had not arranged that credit the

timber industry of British Columbia would to-day have been in a very serious condition. I took the matter up in correspondence and was very careful to emphasize the fact that, as Canada as a whole was providing the money, the orders should, as far as possible, be distributed fairly throughout the country. I made that point, using the very argument my hon. friend has used, and I have heard no complaints whatever. If we provide credits for Great Britain, Great Britain owes to us that money and will pay with interest. The firms that supply that timber must be firms that can supply according to specifications and at proper prices, because you cannot expect a Government to which you loan money for the purposes of doing Canadian trade to give orders unless the prices are right, nor to accept delivery unless the specifications have been conformed to. It is very essential that in purchases made in Canada by the British people or the British Government specifications should be strictly observed and business conducted properly, and consequently the buying agency has an important task. So far as timber buying is concerned it is going through the usual channels, and I expect and have heard no complaints. Consider what the provision of that $50,000,000 credit has done and will do for this country. It will keep our timber industry flourishing, and as the timber is bought in Canada it will provide cargo freights for shipping to Great Britain. Therefore, it is in every way a highly desirable transaction. Indeed, if we did not provide that money, Great Britain could not get dollar credits here and would buy in the United States.

Only recently it was brought to my attention from British Columbia—falsely as it turned out—that instead of buying in British Columbia, Great Britain was buying in the United States. I have no doubt she is buying in the United States but she is only able to buy in the United States if given credit there and she can only buy here if we give her credit. The alternative is that either this business is to be done in Canada or not according as we furnish credits or do not. If we want the business Canada must furnish credits to Great Britain. I desire to assure my hon. friend that in so far as I know there is no favouritism in the placing of the orders and, if it comes to his attention that there is, I would be glad if he would let me know because I would not stand for that kind of business. There is another matter that I desire to mention. When we appointed this Canadian Trade Commission, which was complementary to the Canadian Mission in London, the chairman of the Reconstruction Committee, my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maclean) submitted the memorandum to council which was adopted and became an Order in Council. If hon. gentlemen will read it they will see the functions and powers conferred on this commission. They will also see that various Canadian industries may, through their representatives, keep in close touch with the commission. Suppose that an order for furniture is obtained in Europe; those in the furniture business in Canada, or their representative, will be in touch with the Canadian Commission here. I am sure that I should have heard if there had been any favouritism but I have not heard one word to that effect. If there is any complaint on that score I can assure my hon. friend that I would be one of the first to stop it because if we are financing with the money of the Dominion of Canada our export trade, it should be on terms that are as fair as possible to our Canadian producers, subject to the necessity of the party buying only the goods that he desires and at a fair price.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think the country at large will breathe easy in view of the statements and assurances given by the Minister of Finance this afternoon. He speaks with absolute confidence of the conditions that obtain in connection with the financial affairs of the country and he should know whereof he speaks. I am very much pleased indeed to have that assurance. But I would like to call the attention of the minister to one feature of the situation that I think will require some consideration on his part. I refer to the matter of Canadian exchange. During the past winter the sterling exchange rate has been maintained at about 4.76. It is well known in commercial circles that exchange on London must be brought in this country through New York. Unfortunately our balance of trade with the United States is not as favourable as it is with London and notwithstanding the fact that the sterling exchange rate stood at 4.76 until the peg was removed some few weeks ago, it was of very little advantage to the Canadian purchasers of exchange on London. The reason for that is that in order to buy exchange on London the purchaser in Canada must buy it through New York. I have always been at a loss to understand why we should not have an exchange rate

direct with London. In view of the fact that we have not at the present time, and never have had that direct exchange, the advantage of a favourable balance of trade with Great Britain, and of our position of financial strength, is of little value to the purchaser in Canada of exchange in London because it is absorbed in the exchange rate in New York. The position of affairs is that the advantage of the exchange rate between Canada, New York and London is absorbed almost entirely by the rate we must pay in buying our exchange through the New York market. I would like to see the day arrive when Canadians can purchase their exchange direct on the market in London.

I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a concrete case in connection with the placing of business with the Canadian woollen manufacturers. I have these facts on authority that is beyond question. The War Trade Board placed orders within the last two weeks amongst woollen manufacturers in this country. I do not claim that there was favouritism shown in the placing of these orders. That is not my claim, but what I do claim is that if these orders had been placed in the open market the material would have been purchased at a price possibly 20 per cent lower. For instance, the contract called for a material weighing 22 ounces to the yard. The price paid to these woollen manufacturers was 11 cents per ounce, or $2.42 per yard for the material sold to the War Trade Board on account of the Rumanian orders. I know as a matter of fact there are manufacturers in this country who, if this business had been placed on the open market, would have been delighted to have supplied the material at 9 cents per ounce or $1.98 per yard. The material is made up of one third wool, one third shoddy and one third cotton. I do not know the extent of these orders that have been placed for woollen materials but I do know from information I have received that this special agent who organized the woollen manufacturers association obtained a commission of 2½ per cent on the transaction. If these orders amounted to $6,000,000 —I am not saying that these are the actual figures—this agent has got $150,000 on this transaction.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: May I ask what the name of this agent is?

Mr. PEDLOW: Mr. Yapp was the agent who, I understand, crossed to the old country and, through Mr. Lloyd Harris, or through his assistance and otherwise, obtained these orders. These orders have not been placed on a contract basis but have been divided up among the woollen manufacturers who would accept the business on the basis of Mr. Yapp's figure of 2½ per cent. Some of the manufacturers objected to that way of transacting business and claimed that these orders should have been placed in open competition by the War Trade Board. If they had been the Government would have purchased the materials at a price in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent less than the amount paid and the orders would have been distributed generally amongst all the manufacturers of the country.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Were the orders in question placed by the Canadian Trade Commission or were they placed by a representative of the Rumanian Government in London?

Mr. PEDLOW: I can answer the question to the extent of saying that the War Trade agent in Ottawa was present in Toronto at the time Mr. Yapp distributed these orders.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am only asking for information because I am not conversant with the matter. Did the Canadian Trade Commission here place the orders for the Rumanian Government, or were the orders obtained in London by the party in question from the Rumanian Government, or some other authority?

Mr. PEDLOW: I am not able to answer that question; all I can say is that the orders were confirmed by the War Trade Board in Ottawa. Therefore, the Government must have some knowledge of the transaction.

Mr. McKENZIE: If not, it should have when we are furnishing the money.

Mr. PEDLOW: Yes, we are furnishing the money. The main point I make is that if the Rumanian Government had purchased through the Canadian Government, and these orders had been placed in the open market instead of having been distributed in the manner in which they were, these materials would have been bought for twenty per cent less.

Mr. LALOR: I have great respect for the leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry that he is so suspicious as to the way these orders were distributed, and which orders he intimates were given to friends of the Government. The hon. member for Renfrew has also made similar statements, but I think I can refute these statements to some extent. Let me say that the association of which the hon. gentle-

man speaks is an association of woollen manufacturers in Canada that is called together to take into consideration the question of export business and select samples to be sent overseas for Rumania, Belgium and other countries to make a selection from. If I remember correctly, all the manufacturers of Canada were invited to submit samples. From those samples selections were made that were considered to represent the best value. They were sent overseas and purchased by the commission representing the countries in question in the open market. So far as the woollen manufacturers paying Mr. Yapp a commission of two and-a-half per cent, I know that my hon. friend from North Renfrew would not want to misstate the facts The truth of the matter is that Mr. Yapp is in receipt of a salary of $5,000 a year, and I do not think that he ever received a cent of commission in any way, shape or form from the manufacturers of woollen goods in Canada for selling goods overseas. The goods, as I already stated, are bought upon the judgment of the commission representing the purchasing countries, and bought in the open market, and when those purchases are made the best values are selected. The orders are not distributed to friends of the Government, as the leader of the Opposition has intimated, but they are distributed to every manufacturer in Canada, regardless of the province in which he lives, or what his nationality or politics may be, in proportion to the capacity of that factory to manufacture the necessary goods.

Mr. PEDLOW: Did the Renfrew Textile Company get any portion of this business?

Mr. LALOR: I do not know whether the Renfrew Textile Company got any of the business, but I am satisfied that if they did not it must have been their own fault, because all the woollen manufacturers were invited to attend the meeting that was held. I may say that the orders have not yet been distributed, but they will be distributed, I understand, regardless of whether the manufacturers are members of the association or not.

Mr. ROBB: In presenting a statement this afternoon the Acting Prime Minister has apparently forgotten the promise that was made the first time we went into Committee of Supply in reply to the request that before voting any considerable amount of subsidies, the Finance Minister should give the country a complete statement of the total debt of Canada, including all obligations of whatsoever kind, including obligations for contracts that have been given and are not yet completed, obligations as to railways, and the pension obligations so far as we know them at the present time. I am not sure that the Finance Minister was in the House at the time, but the Minister of Railways promised to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter. I am not making this demand particularly on behalf of the members on this side of the House, but I feel the country as a whole desires and expects such a statement from the Finance Minister, and I would be glad if he would take the first opportunity of complying with the request.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The usual course, from which as far as I know there has been no departure, has been to make the statement which my hon. friend has in mind when delivering the Budget speech. The annual announcements of the Government with regard to its financial obligations are always embodied in the Budget speech and I submit that it would be a departure from a practice well established, and I think sound, that the Finance Minister should not anticipate his annual financial statement. However, I am always desirous of being obliging, and when the Bill which I am about to introduce on this subject has had its second reading, and we are in the Committee stage, I shall, if I can, give my hon. friend a little statement which will substantially set forth the position—that is to say, if he presses for it.

Mr. ROBB: Let me point out that this is an extraordinary vote for which the minister is asking. It is a vote that represents more than the total debt of Canada in 1914, and it seems to me that the country is entitled to the information which has been asked for in view of the late period at which the Budget speech will be presented this year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will not overlook, nor will the Government, that this is really a war year. By far the greater part of this vote of $300,000,000 is required for war purposes, for the demobilization of our soldiers and for the payment to them of war gratuities. This year is really a war year, in a financial sense, although we have emerged from it. I agree with my hon. friend that these figures are large, but we have to get our soldiers home, and we thought it wise to pay them a gratuity to enable them to bridge over a

period during which they might obtain employment, and also recognition of their splendid services at the front. Other items which go to make up the entire vote I have already given to the Committee. However, when the subject comes up again it will give me pleasure to make a brief statement, but I hope my hon. friend will excuse me for not going into great detail, because I do not want to make my Budget speech twice.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am anxious for the resolution to carry, but there is one slight matter in connection with the hon. Acting Prime Minister's reply to my previous observations which I would like to have explained a little more fully. I was complaining that we were not getting any security for this money advanced to Belgium, and he said that Belgium had plenty of money, but the difficulty was the rate of exchange. If that is so why not put that money up as security? I would be quite willing to accept it if it is deposited in some institution in Belgium in which we have confidence, or if securities that any financial agency of Great Britain will accept are handed over by the Belgium Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have Treasury bills of Belgium; in other words, we have precisely the same security that the British Government takes, and has recommended us to take.

Mr. CAHILL: Would the hon. minister explain why this vote is included in the war vote? This is not in any sense a war measure or for war purposes. These loans ought not to be included in this $350,000,000. Why not put the war loans where they belong, and the loans for other purposes where they belong?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would agree with the hon. gentleman, save for this: We would not be called upon to make these advances for credits at all if it was not for the abnormal condition following the war. As I explained, it is not my expectation after we get out of this period that we shall have to continue these credits. In the Bill and in the resolution there is a clause which is adequate to cover these credits: the promoting of trade and industry, subsection (c) of section 2 of the Bill that I will present.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not see why this should be included in this vote at all. This is a big question, whether or not we are going into the business of loaning money to foreign countries, and it should be debated on its merits. It should not be put in a resolution which has absolutely no bearing on the subject, and which resolution it may hold up. The Acting Prime Minister speaks of credits to Great Britain. There is no question of credits to Great Britain; everybody is willing that Great Britain should have all the credits Canada can furnish, because we owe her more than we can possibly loan to her. But when the question of going into the business of loaning money to foreign countries is involved, I think it should be dealt with on its merits and not in a vote of this kind. I think this is the most insane transaction that any Government ever attempted to put through.

Mr. DUFF: Is it a fact that an Order in Council has been passed covering this loan to Roumania?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: When was it passed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was passed recently. An agreement was first entered into in London between the Foreign Minister of Roumania and the Minister of Trade and Commerce representing Canada. That was approved by Order in Council.

Mr. DUFF: What is the date of that Order in Council?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was passed quite recently.

Mr. DUFF: I want to know the exact date, Mr. Chairman.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that I am not able to give my hon. friend the exact date. I will undertake to bring down a copy of the Order.

Mr. DUFF: I would like this resolution not to carry, Mr. Chairman, until I get that information.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: If the information my hon. friend wants will be furnished before the second reading comes on it ought to answer his purpose.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let me assure my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, and the House, that any information I can get at any time about the public affairs of this country will be brought down with the greatest of pleasure.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 68, for grant-

ing to His Majesty aid for demobilization and other purposes.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 37—Hon. N. W. Rowell—respecting the Department of Health, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 4, subsection (h)—collection, publication and distribution of information to promote good health, and improved sanitation:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council): While it is evident from this subsection that the Department of Public Health does not intend to go into the collection of vital statistics, it has been suggested that the matter should be made perfectly clear by inserting suitable words to indicate that the department will not duplicate the work of the Bureau of Statistics. This may be done by inserting at the beginning of the subsection the words, "Subject to the provisions of the Statistics Act."

I suggested the other evening that another phase of the work which is, perhaps, not fully covered by the subsection as it stands might be covered by the addition of the words "social welfare." but as objection was taken I did not press the point. I now, suggest, however, that the subsection be so amended that it shall read as follows:

Subject to the provisions of the Statistics Act, the collection, publication and distribution of information relating to the public health, improved sanitation, and social and industrial conditions affecting the health and lives of the people;

We all recognize that in future more attention must be paid to the health and physical well-being of those who are engaged in industry. In the past, emphasis has been placed on property; in future, emphasis must be placed more largely on life. The country is deeply concerned in all matters connected with the carrying on of industry that affect the life and health of the people. Information should be gathered and published touching that aspect of health as well as the more general classes of subjects which we include in the words "public health." The latter words of the amendment have been suggested to me by Mr. Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and I think the suggestion is a good one.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. TRAHAN: I submit that the words "and social and industrial conditions affecting the health and lives of the people" will empower the new department to legislate upon matters that are subject to the jurisdiction of Provincial Governments. The department may deal with conditions of health as applied to industries and with the conditions prevailing in the buildings wherein these industries are carried on. But when they are empowered to deal with social conditions as well, we have the same objection that we had to the inclusion of the words "social welfare" in this subsection. In the amendment which the minister proposes the idea of giving the department control over matters affecting social welfare is carried out—under different terms, that is all. For my part, I prefer the subsection as originally drafted, although I am disposed to accept the restriction imposed by the words "subject to the provisions of the Statistics Act," which, in my judgment, is a good one. I am in favour of the Bill, but I believe that there should be no encroachment upon provincial rights. In an article published on 19th March last, the Ottawa Journal-Press expressed the opinion that public health was a matter which, under the terms of the British North America Act, had been handed over to the provinces; that health, like education, was a provincial matter. It is desirable, of course, that there should be co-operation among provincial boards of health. But in drafting this Bill this committee should be very careful not to interfere with provincial rights, and I would, therefore, be quite satisfied if the minister who is in charge of the Bill would not insist on the words:

—and social and industrial conditions affecting the health and lives of the people,

I have the greatest possible admiration for trades and labour organizations, and I am a staunch supporter of every legitimate claim which is made by such organizations, but I feel it is my duty to decline to accept in a Bill a clause which in my opinion is an encroachment upon provincial rights.

Mr. SHEARD: I commend this clause very highly. I do not think it is possible to compass the objects of this federal Health Bill in any better way. The clause provides practically for a publicity department in connection with this enactment, and that publicity department has the duty of setting forth before the House and the public the facts relating to public health as they

affect industrial and social conditions in this country. I can see where it will do a great deal of good in indicating the lines of progress along which the federal department of public health will proceed, and I really cannot see wherein it could operate so as to encroach upon provincial rights and the autonomy of the provinces in this work in which we are all presumably interested. The clause is, I understand, intended to permit the federal health department to secure reports as to conditions in factories and workshops regarding ventilation, lighting and the evil influence which may result from dust contamination. These are all very important to workers. The department, I assume will also ascertain and make known conditions as to noxious vapours and poisonous fumes which, in certain factories where large quantities of nitric acid and sulphuric acid are used, are very serious menaces to the workers, and also as to aerial infection of illuminating gas vapours and of the carbohydrates, some of which are extremely noxious. These, I take it, are some of the points concerning which it would be the duty of the department of health to investigate the facts. Then again, we have the great and all-important question of the ages at which children are working in factories where the conditions in employing child labour are, from a sanitary standpoint, far from satisfactory. The hours are often such as to retard the right and healthy development of child workers, and in some parts of this Dominion, notwithstanding the present enactment in force in this country, there are many children under age who are working under unsanitary and unsatisfactory conditions, in factories and rooms that are dark and ill-ventilated, and these conditions ought to be known to the Government and to a federal health department. I consider this clause is designed to bring the facts before the public, and by informing the public generally we may hope to remedy conditions which I am sure no member of this committee would willingly have continued. I think the clause will be in its effect a distinct benefit in the working and development of this federal health department.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: I think in the case of a doubt such as exists in regard to this amendment, the Government should put in a proviso that no such regulations will be put into force without having first received the approval of the Board of Health of each province.

Mr. ROWELL: I think my hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay) misunderstands the clause, and I think the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Trahan) also misunderstood it. This deals only with collecting and distributing information in connection with industrial conditions. There is no power to legislate at all, and this does not, therefore, infringe upon provincial rights.

Amendment agreed to.

On subsection (i):—such other matters as may be referred to the minister by the Governor in Council.

Mr. PAPINEAU: Will the minister explain the meaning of this clause?

Mr. ROWELL: Let us take the illustration I gave my hon. friends the other evening, the question of administration of such a fund as the Government's fund to aid in housing. That has a very close relation to the question of public health, and at present it is being administered by a committee of the Cabinet. I should think it would be a very appropriate thing for the Governor in Council, if thought fit, to entrust the administration of that particular branch of the public service to a department like this, and, therefore, power to do so is given. There are at the present time certain departments dealing with matters that more or less intimately affect the public health in certain aspects of their work. These Acts are not mentioned in the schedule because there may be a difference of opinion as to whether the administration of those Acts which touch a certain aspect of public health should be entrusted to this department or not, or whether the administration should be continued under the existing departments. This would simply permit the Governor in Council to transfer to this department the administration of certain branches of work closely connected with public health which are now being administered by other departments of the Government.

Mr. PAPINEAU: Section 4 reads:

> The duties and powers of the minister administering the department of health shall extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health and social welfare of the people of Canada.

All the necessary powers seem to be included in this; and I cannot therefore see the need for Orders in Council. The minister says he may decide this and that, but all powers are stipulated in this clause.

Mr. ROWELL: If we have all the power already in the first part there can be no harm in having it in the second. It simply indicates the method by which the power can be exercised; it must be exercised by Order in Council. To give an illustration: The Department of Indian Affairs has a medical branch having the medical care and supervision of the Indians on our reserves. It is not proposed by this Bill at the present time to transfer the administration of that branch of the service to this department, but it might be considered desirable in the future to do so and provision is made by which it may be done. Clause 4 is quite broad enough to cover all power—this provides machinery by which a certain aspect of work carried on in one department may be transferred to another.

Mr. McKENZIE: Subsection (i) gives the minister authority in "such other matters as may be referred to the minister by the Governor in Council." If that were found in any law referring to the Department of Railways we would know at once that the word "Minister" meant the Minister of Railways, but in this matter there is no minister. The President of the Council told us the other night that this was to be merely a branch of some department, or at least that it would be under some present minister. As there does not seem to be any special minister in connection with this work this clause is not very significant.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member will see that section 2 provides that there is to be a Department of Health, "over which a minister of the Crown to be named by the Governor in Council shall preside." That is the minister referred to in subsection (i). If my hon. friend would prefer, the word "department" might be substituted for the word "minister."

Mr. McKENZIE: I think there is a great deal in what is said by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Papineau), that this country is getting somewhat tired of Orders in Council. Orders in Council are good things sometimes, and so is a little whiskey, but there is such a thing as abusing whiskey, and certainly such a thing as abusing Orders in Council, and the people of Canada are anxious to have as little business done by Order in Council as possible. I think it would be well if the President of the Council could embody in this Act specifically and clearly the powers that are proposed to be given, leaving no latitude for Orders in Council. By Orders in Council we are having legislation that is very extraordinary. For example, we had to-day before us legislation which had to deal with $350,000,000 and, to our consternation, it was found that the whole thing, or practically the whole thing, had already been settled by Order in Council. The same remark applies to the housing scheme, involving an enormous sum of money. It came before the House as a matter of form, but in reality an Order in Council had settled the whole matter. And in regard to the question of highways, I understand that when the premiers of the different provinces were here, an expenditure of some $20,000,000 was made by Order in Council. These matters are brought before the House and we are just used as a sort of rubber stamp to say automatically, "That is all right." I think it is time we got back to the good old way of submitting to Parliament in its early stages, or at its inception, every question of importance, particularly in connection with the expenditure of moneys. There is an old story that in Scotland they used to hang people first and then try them afterwards, and it does seem that that is the attitude of the Government in regard to important public questions. When the thing is all settled and there is no remedy, they submit it to Parliament. We on this side of the House at all events are getting tired of Orders in Council and desire specific enactments so that we may know exactly what we are doing, and that we are not delegating power to somebody else to make laws which perhaps we would not make if we had a say in the matter ourselves. We are anxious to help the minister to put the Bill through, but its provisions should be made specific and definite. If the amendment which the minister substituted for clause (h) simply means the collecting of information, and has nothing to do with administration, I have no objection to it; but if the new clause contemplates administrative powers, it certainly is objectionable. In the province from which I come, we have large coal mines, and the regulations in connection with the sinking of shafts, the ventilation system, and everything else, touching the interests of thousands of men working in these mines are clearly within the jurisdiction of the local legislature. The Mines Regulations Act of Nova Scotia is as complete as any of its kind in the world. If there is to be any executive operation in connection with the clause which the President of the Council has substituted for clause (h), such regulations would come within the jurisdiction of this House.

Mr. LESAGE: I understand that this Bill will enact a law that will receive the co-operation of the provinces, and it seems to be understood that there will be no infringement of provincial rights. With regard to section 4, it seems to me that everything is covered and there is no need to enumerate such matters as are there dealt with. There you have covered everything in connection with these subsections, and the specification of all these matters will result in trouble with reference to provincial rights. Amongst other things, you mention child life and child welfare. That is a clause that I shall not discuss just now, but it is a very delicate question, and the power here conferred should be applied with great discretion having regard to provincial rights. In every province there is a great deal of work done in regard to child life and child welfare, and I think that it is within the right of the province to look after such matters as these. This matter in particular has to do with the school system and the habits and customs of the people in the different provinces, which should be entirely within their jurisdiction. As far as the other matters are concerned, it seems to me that they could be safely left to the Dominion Council of Health as it will be constituted. If you leave in this Bill a clause of this kind reserving to the deputy minister the right to modify or change certain conditions of his own accord subject only to Order in Council, I think it will certainly interfere with provincial rights, and instead of being an Act to help the provinces to promote the welfare of the people, it is more likely to bring confusion and prove a detriment rather than an aid to public health. I would therefore suggest that this clause should be amended and made more definite in its meaning.

Mr. SHEARD: When we had this Bill last under consideration, we submitted a clause which I understood was to stand for further consideration. I would like to ask the minister if he has that clause in mind and if he proposes to incorporate it in this Bill. The clause that I submitted was this:

Provided that nothing in this Act shall authorize any officer or authority created by or appointed under the authority of this Act or under any regulation made hereunder to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial health officer or any provincial or municipal board of health or other authority operating under the laws of any province.

Mr. ROWELL: I had intended suggesting that the clause moved by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard), slightly modified, but not changing its effect, should go in as a paragraph immediately following subsection (i). I think it will meet all the objections that have been raised. It would come in as subsection (j), and what I propose would read as follows:

Provided that nothing in this Act or in any regulation made hereunder shall authorize the minister or any officer of the department to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial health officer or any provincial or municipal board of health or other local authority operating under the laws of any province.

There is no desire or intention to interfere with the local authorities. There is not the least objection to putting that in as an additional clause.

Mr. BELAND: Is the wording the same as that of the clause submitted by the hon. member for South Toronto?

Mr. ROWELL: It is slightly different in wording but the effect is the same. The phraseology is slightly changed.

Mr. BELAND: What is the change?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not like to interrupt but I must remind the Committee that subsection (i) has not yet been adopted.

Mr. BELAND: I know, Mr. Chairman, that we are anticipating. I would object to the carrying of this subsection (i) if no other amendment is going to be adopted by the committee, but if the amendment that we have been speaking about is adopted by the minister I would not have any objection to the subsection. I would say that so far as the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from South Toronto is concerned I really have no choice.

Mr. ROWELL: I am quite content to accept the form moved by the hon. member for South Toronto. The amendment I submit is a little broader in that it specifically names the minister.

Mr. BELAND: I would rather have the amendment of the minister.

Mr. ROWELL: I am quite content that this should be inserted as subsection (j) and I should think that if that is done there should be no question about subsection (i).

Mr. McKENZIE: I submit that this amendment should not come immediately after subsection (i), but immediately after section 5.

Mr. ROWELL: There again I am quite willing to meet the convenience of the committee. I think it would be a proper subject for a clause. It probably should not be lettered, but should be a proviso to

govern the whole section. I think that would be better than to put it in as a part of section 5.

Mr. McMASTER: I would think it would come in best as section 6. Section 5 provides for power to make regulations; it would be well to have the saving clause follow the other clauses dealing with the powers given to the minister or his deputy or anybody else under the Act.

Mr. ROWELL: Perhaps my hon. friend's suggestion is the best one of all. Leave out the proviso and make it a distinct section reading:

Nothing in this Act or in any regulation—

And so on. Let 6 stand as it is; make this new section 7, and then let 8 follow that.

Mr. McMASTER: Let it come before 7, because 7 is simply a section dealing with the report.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so, make it 7, and then 7 will become 8.

Mr. TRAHAN: I come back to subsection (i). If I understand the minister he wants to give the Government power to transfer from other departments to this department matters concerning health. Would it not be well to limit the powers conferred upon the Governor in Council to the matters dealt with in this Act. I would suggest adding after the word "matters" the words "concerning health."

Mr. ROWELL: I would be quite willing to insert in this clause after the words "such other matters" the words "relating to health."

Mr. TRAHAN: Very good.

Mr. ROWELL: I think it means the same thing.

Mr. TRAHAN: But as at present worded the paragraph is not limited in its effect.

Mr. ROWELL: Then I would move to amend the paragraph by adding the words "relating to health."

The CHAIRMAN: The paragraph will now read:—

Such other matters relating to health as may be referred to the Department by the Government in Council.

Amendment agreed to and paragraph as amended agreed to.

On section 5—Regulations.

Mr. SHEARD: Before this section is adopted I would like to point out that there was an amendment submitted by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) regarding the establishment of a bureau of scientific research with hygienic laboratories. I think this is a proper place to introduce an amendment of that kind; I certainly would not like to see it left simply as a matter of condition or regulation; I would like to fix responsibility for the creation and operation of such laboratories upon the Deputy Minister of Health, whoever he may be, to administer and be responsible for. I have said before, and I need hardly repeat, that I can imagine no great advancement, nor any great benefit, is being likely to result from the operation of the federal health law, unless—as it is a pivotal point of operation—the work of a scientific hygienic laboratory goes on in connection therewith. I would ask the minister if there is any provision in the Bill for this particular branch of work?

Mr. ROWELL: As I pointed out the other evening when the Bill was introduced, it appears to me that the general powers given by section 4 are broad enough to cover the establishment of such a bureau of scientific research, or at least of a laboratory for research purposes, and that all that would be necessary in that event would be for the Government to bring down an appropriation for the establishment of such a bureau, or for the building of a laboratory for research. My hon. friend from Muskoka did move an amendment, his view apparently being that there should be an express provision in the Bill dealing with the matter, and that amendment stood over for further consideration.

Mr. SHEARD: I want to remind the minister that this matter has been previously before the Government. In October, 1910, a meeting of the Commission of Conservation was held, presided over I believe by Sir Edmund Osler, when the establishment of a national public health laboratory was recommended. The recommendation was forwarded to the Privy Council, and the report of the Committee of the Privy Council (P.C. 601) dated March 27, stated that a laboratory was to be established, and the sum of $25,000 was provided for that purpose. There, so far as I can trace it, the matter ends. I think it was transferred to, or planted in, the Department of Agriculture, but so far as I have been able to ascertain, it has not borne fruit. Yet in the broad scheme of conservation there was abundant provision under the regulations of the Commission for this work, and money was provided in a limited and in-

effectual degree for carrying it on. However, it seemed to die from inanition or inaction. Now that is exactly what I want to provide against by urging the insertion in this Bill of a clause which shall state specifically that the deputy minister of health shall be responsible for establishing and continuing such a bureau of scientific research and investigation as will relate to the entire field of health matters. If that is done there can be no possible evasion of responsibility, and if the work is not carried out in a satisfactory way we shall have an opportunity in the House when we are considering the annual report to point out where this officer has neglected his duty. If we do this we shall be in a position to insist that this work be carried out without further delay, and it will not be left as a mere matter of regulation with all the uncertainties attendant thereon. There is not a department of health worthy of the name in any civilized country that I know of, that has ever rendered any real service, but has based that service upon a series of laboratories whose work has prompted all further activity and improvement. If we are going to run this department upon proper scientific and progressive lines we must have that laboratory, and provision for it must be made in such a manner that there will be no possible way of avoiding its creation. That is what I have in mind, and that is my reason for urging, with all the emphasis at my command, that such a provision should form an integral and important part of this enactment.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I want to emphasize the statements which have been made by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). It does appear to me that to have this Bill go to the world in its present shape, without any provision for the establishment of a department of scientific research, would be to cause it to be looked upon, by every sensible man who knew anything about the matter as more or less a joke. It would appear to me that without this provision the only use the Government could make of the Bill would be to provide an office for some political friend—I do not know what other use could be made of it. It passes the imagination of man to know what use a department of public health would be in this age of the world without scientific laboratories. If all these clauses had been omitted from the Bill I could see some excuse for omitting any reference to a department of scientific research, but when we deliberately specify certain things that we want the health department to take up, and leave, as I said the other night, the very heart and soul out of the measure, I really cannot see what advantage there is from a Dominion standpoint in passing this Bill at all. Departments of scientific research are very potent in the world to-day, there is no gainsaying that. They are the "end all" of everything, and these undertakings have passed the stage where they can be left to private individuals, or even to provincial governments, to carry out. Nowadays their operation involves a large amount of money. The outlay will amount in the aggregate probably, in the next ten years, to from $500,000 to $1,000,000 if this country is going to do this work properly. To my mind there is nothing which Canada needs so much today as it does the paying of keen attention to the scientific aspect of matters which pertain not only to health but to the business of the country.

We have during the war seen how terribly we were handicapped by the advanced science that was brought to bear in a practical way by the different enemy countries. There is no question at all that their scientific knowledge prolonged this war immensely. We in Canada have been slow in following up the scientific side of research, we have not grasped its great importance either in the commercial sense or in the sense of the preservation of health. I would not like to see this Bill pass out of this House as the finished product of our mature judgment without the main thing for which this department is to be created being even mentioned.

Mr. McMASTER: On this side of the House we have not been endeavouring to restrain the zeal and enthusiasm of the hon. minister in charge of this Bill, we have merely been trying to keep it within the proper constitutional channels. Therefore it is well, perhaps, that a word should be said from our side in support of the measure along the lines suggested and urged by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon). As a member of the same profession as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), I quite agree with him that the establishment of a research bureau would fall under the general terms of the beginning of section 4; but it seems to me that it would give a good impression throughout the country it we made it perfectly clear that such a research bureau or laboratory was to be instituted. I was reading the other day that the discoveries

of the great chemist Pasteur had brought sufficient wealth to France to offset the whole of the indemnity that she had to pay Germany after the war of 1870. It would appear to me that the hon. minister might meet the views of those who support the Bill, because he is in the happy position of promoting a measure which meets with universal approval; we are all trying to get to the same end; some think it might be better gained one way, some another way, but as to the purpose of the Bill there is no difference of opinion. Therefore I would suggest to the hon. minister that he might very properly declare, en toutes letters, as we say in our province, that is in set terms, that we are going to have in Canada such a bureau or laboratory of research as has been most eloquently urged by the hon. member for Muskoka, who, as a member of a very learned profession, medicine, is much better able to talk with authority on these things than a mere lawyer.

Mr. STEELE: Much has been said in support of a laboratory in connection with the Department of Public Health with which I heartily agree; in fact, I would go so far as to say that a Department of Public Health without the facilities of a laboratory is out of date before it is established. But I do not find myself in hearty agreement with the advocacy of such a laboratory as has been suggested this evening. I believe that what we ought to have in Canada is one great national laboratory, a laboratory which would carry on the work required for industrial and scientific research; a laboratory with which could be associated the laboratory we now have in connection with our Inland Revenue Department, a hygienic laboratory, and a laboratory which would take up every work which will be required in Canada in the future. I believe that to insert this clause in the Bill at the present time would simply have the result of establishing one more branch laboratory in connection with our national work. To my mind what we want is to co-ordinate the laboratories which we now have, and add such a branch as has been suggested to carry on the health work. But before that is done, I concede, the Government must give a good deal of consideration to it, and I sincerely trust that within the next year a great national laboratory will be established, following the system and plan of the Pasteur Institute of Paris and the great laboratory at Washington. I would therefore advocate that the Government omit this from the Bill at the present time and take into consideration the establishment of such a laboratory as I have suggested.

9 p.m.

Mr. COWAN: When I first saw this Bill I searched through it for some mention of a laboratory, because I could not imagine that we could have a Health Department established without it. I must confess that at my first reading I was not able to find any provision for it, but on going through the Bill again I came to the same conclusion as the hon. minister, that one of the clauses covered the point. I think, however, that it would be very much better for us to definitely state that such a laboratory is to be established. Because, Sir, I cannot imagine the hon. minister wanting this department to be a failure, and without a laboratory—and a better one than anything we have in the Dominion to-day—it is certainly going to be a failure. If you establish such a laboratory as has been proposed you will immediately rally to the support of this department the entire medical profession of the Dominion, and otherwise I doubt if you will get its support to any great extent.

Although I am not of the medical profession,—I am one of the allied professions,—yet I have had a good deal to do with the medical profession in Canada, and I cannot subscribe to many of the criticisms in the press these days of the medical profession and their relation to this health department. I have always found them a very progressive body, and I think they have made more progress than any other profession—except, of course, the one I belong to and which claims my loyalty—and I am confident that the medical profession of Canada are equal to the medical profession of any other part of the world. Of course, if we expect them to maintain their position we must give them the opportunities to continue their progress. Therefore I say we should make up our minds to establish this laboratory at the earliest possible time. If that is to be done, there is no reason why it should not be so stated in this Bill, for then you will immediately get the sympathy of the medical profession throughout Canada and at once make it a success. I suggest that this be done, and I support as strongly as I can the position taken by the hon. member for South Toronto.

Mr. MANION: I rise in support of the suggestion, and also to say a word in justice to the provincial Boards of Health.

Some speakers have criticised those boards—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MANION: I mean they have criticised them unconsciously in saying that public health work cannot be carried on without a laboratory. I agree in the necessity for instituting a research laboratory, but according to my understanding none of the provincial Boards of Health is so equipped.

Mr. SHEARD: The Ontario board has had one for ten years.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps the hon. member is right; I did not think they had. However, I wish to support the idea. I think we should have a research laboratory. Some mention was made of research laboratories in the United States. One of the finest in the world is the Rockefeller Institute which is supported by funds supplied by John D. Rockefeller. Some of the war lords of this country who have made millions out of the war might show a proper sense of proportion by helping to establish in Canada a practical research laboratory along the lines of the Rockefeller Institute in the United States.

Mr. ROWELL: So far as the general view expresses the importance of a research laboratory, I am heartily in accord with it. I have intimated that the power to establish a research laboratory is quite clearly set forth in section 4, but there appears to be a general desire on the part of the members of the House that some words should be included in the Bill to indicate specifically that the establishment of such a laboratory is within the powers of this department. We should not have a series of laboratories established in various departments. It is very important that the work should be done as economically and efficiently as possible. In consenting to such an amendment as I have suggested, I am not committing myself or the Government to the bringing down of an appropriation for the purpose this session; that is a matter that will have to be taken up by the Government when Estimates are under consideration. If I assent to any reference to research laboratories going in, I am assenting to the specific mention of the fact that this department contemplates the esablishment and maintenance of a laboratory. We might put in as paragraph (b):

> The establishment and maintenance of a national laboratory for public health and research work.

I think it would be more suitable to give it that place in the section.

Mr. DAVIDSON: If this provides for an expenditure of money, it would have to be preceded by the consent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: It would be simply defining the powers of the department. We are not voting any money, nor is the Government committing itself to any expenditure.

Amendment agreed to, and section 4, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5—regulations:

Mr. SHEARD: I offered an amendment the other evening—I do not know whether it was defeated or not; perhaps you can inform me, Mr. Chairman—which was something to this effect:

> The control of venereal disease by quarantine at the various ports of entry or by such other methods and investigations as shall limit the spread of these diseases throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Some specific statement in this regard ought to be included in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment mentioned by the member for South Toronto was defeated upon division the other night in committee.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: The amendment that was defeated was much more drastic than the one at present proposed.

Mr. FIELDING: To what extent will the hospitals come under the observation or control of this department?

Mr. ROWELL: The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment maintains hospitals for soldiers.

Mr. FIELDING: These are military hospitals.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, and hospitals wherein men who have been soldiers are cared for. But the ordinary hospitals of the country, with the exception of the marine hospitals, are wholly under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of this measure must appeal to us all, especially in the light of the statistics the minister gave us the other night as to the alarming loss of child life. What I fear most is that the Act is so general and so vague that we shall have a large and necessarily expensive organization, the object of which is excellent, but which will have nothing in particular to do. According to the word-

ing of the Bill, we are to have co-operation, co-ordination—a great word in these days—conservation, inspection, and supervision, but there is nothing specific to do. One is almost reminded of the reference frequently seen in the comic papers to the man who is "all dressed up and no place to go." I do not say this in a spirit of objection; but I shall offer a suggestion as to something for this department to do—and it has a bearing on my question with regard to the hospitals. There is in the Mother Country and in some of our neighbour States quite a large body of what I may call social legislation of a progressive character—legislation respecting minimum wages, old age pensions, and a variety of things of that nature. To all of these we must hereafter give more attention than we have in the past, but we cannot deal at once with them all. One class of legislation that, I think, might well engage the particular attention of this department is the encouragement and extension of maternity hospitals. Talking not long ago with the manager of an organization of charities in one of our large cities, I was much interested in the account he gave of the work in which they were engaged. He said—not in a boastful way—"We are looking after our people from the cradle to the grave. We do better than that: we anticipate the cradle, because we are organizing maternity hospitals." There are in some of our communities—including Ottawa, I am glad to say—a number of these institutions. They are necessarily local in their character; they are all more or less expensive, because they have to charge fees. But if there is anything in the way of social legislation which we should deal with seriously, it is the taking of steps to provide that the woman who is approaching the time when her child is to be born shall be surrounded by all the conditions which will give her comfort, which will give her medical attendance, which will give her proper food and rest both before and after the time when the child is born. That is the best kind of work for the conservation of child life. Where there is a hospital of this character it might well come under the direction of this department. and where there are not such hospitals, they might well be established. I do not mean to say that any uniform plan could be adopted, but wherever there is such a hospital, I should like to see this board get in touch with it and see that it is encouraged. This is clearly a case where there could be co-operation between the federal, provincial and local authorities, and it is a most promising field for useful work. Indeed, I know of no branch of social legislation which offers such large opportunities. I do not need to dwell on the subject, because hon. members who are of the medical profession can say all that I can say and say it much better, but if there is in the world anything in the way of social legislation which we need, it is something which at that critical time in the life of the mother and child will ensure that she is provided with medical attendance, comfort, food, and all the conditions which will go to enable her to perform the function of motherhood with safety to herself and benefit to the community at large.

Mr. SHEARD: The only aid which the federal Government could, under the British North America Act, give in the case referred to by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) would be a subsidy or a monetary grant to hospitals in the counties. Eleemosynary institutions and all hospitals, specifically mentioned in the British North America Act as being under the control of the legislatures of the various provinces. That is the only reason why, I fancy, this Bill has not undertaken to set out what has been mentioned.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to say that the Bill should set this out specifically. I am quite content, if the object is a good one, to leave it in the hands of the minister. I repeat my first statement, that in many things which are distinctly within the control of the provincial legislatures, we are yet dabbling a good deal. The road question is a distinctly provincial one, and yet we are delving into it; and if this matter is taken up, I am sure we shall find a great deal of co-operation on the part of the local and provincial authorities who will permit my hon. friend to do something. I find that, while we are all sensitive in this matter of provincial rights, when any proposal made to encroach upon provincial rights is accompanied with a generous grant, there is not generally very much objection

Mr. ROWELL: With all that the hon member for Shelburne and Queens has said as to the importance and urgency of the question he has raised, I am in most hearty accord. I think, however, it is a matter coming within the jurisdiction of the provinces. So far as the Federal Government may act, I think, that power is to-day conferred by subsection (a). Subsection (b)

was added to (a), and (a) now provides for co-operation with the provincial, territorial, and other health authorities in the conservation of child life and the promotion of child welfare. Those words are, I think, broad enough to cover what my hon. friend has in mind, and if Parliament should see fit to make a grant for such purposes, it would be quite competent for Parliament to do so.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I should just like to support the expression of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens. I recognize the constitutional objection, but I also recognize that in the interest of this country many so-called constitutional objections will have to disappear in the future. In my judgment there is nothing that would do more good to help a lot of needy people than the suggestion the hon. member has thrown out, and I am in favour of going even further and giving every poor man, woman and child in this country free medical service from the cradle to the grave. I believe the time is coming when we shall have to do this in the national interest.

Mr. STEELE: I should like to add a few words to express the pleasure I have felt in seeing the unanimity that has existed throughout the whole discussion in committee on the question of the establishment of a department of health. If there is one matter that has been proposed to be put under that department that has met with more perfect unanimity than any other it is child welfare. From the Atlantic to the Pacific prominent people who are deeply interested in this subject have expressed their hearty approval of the establishment of a federal department of health, if for no other reason than that the subject of child welfare might receive greater attention and consideration. I want especially to express my pleasure that, on this occasion at least, Quebec and Ontario can stand hand in hand in support of that which is going to be a great blessing to both provinces. This is a question on which Ontario and Quebec are not disunited. We have evidence of that in the expressions of hon. members from Quebec to-night and on previous occasions. I want to quote an extract from an article published in La Presse a few weeks ago. That paper, which I understand has, perhaps, the largest circulation of any French paper published in the country—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of any paper in Canada.

Mr. STEELE: The largest circulation of any paper in Canada. That magnifies the value of expressions of opinion by La Presse. It says, relating to child welfare:—

> At a time when war and another evil not less cruel than war has thinned our ranks, who will refuse to admit the necessity of making an urgent effort to fill the void? The time has come when more attention than ever should be paid to guarding the cradle.

That brief extract expresses in a few words the sentiment of the great majority of the people of this country. La Presse, I have no doubt, had in view conditions which unfortunately prevail in Quebec, and which, perhaps, place that province—and I am saying this in no disrespectful spirit—in a place by itself in this country as regards infant mortality. I should like to quote the figures just to illustrate that. If I compare Quebec with Ontario, hon. members will understand that I am not doing it for the sake of disparaging Quebec, but simply to show how the infant mortality rate in Quebec can be improved in the future. In 1915, there were in Quebec 83,274 births, with 12,775 deaths under one year of age. That is a terrible percentage. In Ontario—and Ontario is not by any means in the first class in this respect, because some of the other provinces stand higher than Ontario, but I use the Ontario figures because they are the only ones I have—there were 67,032 births in 1915, with 6,838 deaths under one year of age. With about 20 per cent more births in Quebec in that year, there were very nearly 100 per cent more deaths under one year of age, and if we carry that to deaths under four years of age, we find the discrepancy still greater. To illustrate the matter still further, let me quote the figures for Montreal and Toronto.

In 1916, in Montreal there were 186 deaths of children under one year of age for every 1,000 births. In Toronto in the same year, the number of deaths was only 93 per 1,000 births, or exactly one-half. There are many cities in which the mortality is less than that, but throughout the whole province of Quebec and the city of Montreal there is great room for improvement, and I would urge on the people of Canada a careful consideration of the views expressed by La Presse.

Mr. BELAND: I do not rise to contradict any of the statements made by my colleague and friend, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), but rather to corroborate to a certain extent what he has said, especially as regards the co-operation that should exist between Ontario and Quebec. I am sure that not

only in the matter of public health but on many important public questions both provinces can by mutual good will accomplish an enormous good for the country. There is no doubt that the introduction of this Bill has engendered some anxiety on the part of those who are sensitive on the subject of local autonomy, but after a careful study of it, and in view of the amendments which have been introduced and accepted by the Government, I think that sufficient guarantee is afforded for the strict preservation of provincial rights. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens referred with a touch of ridicule to the word "co-ordination," but it seems to me that the bringing under one control of the different activities of the Federal Government in its relation to public health, is rather advisable. The Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture and the Inland Revenue Department, have all something to do with the general subject of public health, and who will deny that the co-ordination of these branches under one head would make for effective and efficient service? The British North America Act does not assign the matter of public health to either federal or provincial jurisdiction; but it is evident that in certain cases, for instance, the inspection of schools, the jurisdiction would be in the provinces. In some of the larger fields, such as preventing the propagation and dissemination of contagious diseases, the question of jurisdiction may not be so clear, but up to the present time the most important matters connected with public health have been under the jurisdiction of the provinces, and in accordance with this interpretation of the British North America Act, provincial boards of health have been established all over Canada. My hon. friend from South Perth, doubtless without any ill design on his part, made particular reference to the situation in Quebec regarding the high infantile death rate. I may say that the Provincial Board of Health of Quebec is one of the best-organized in Canada, and Quebec was the first province to be divided into sanitary districts. It has ten such districts, and at the head of the organization is a sanitary inspector who holds a diploma of public health issued by a university. There are in Quebec, and probably there may be in Ontario and the other provinces, elaborate laboratories of chemistry and bacteriology to which physicians have access in the diagnosing of diseases, and to which samples of milk and drinking water can be brought for analysis from any part of the province. There is also a very efficient department of statistics.

Mr. MANION: Have you a research department?

Mr. BELAND: We have not, except for the purpose of ascertaining whether water that is meant for public use is potable.

Mr. MANION: That is not research.

Mr. BELAND: No. As far as school hygiene is concerned, there is an effective system, but I confess that the rate of infantile mortality is higher in Quebec than in some other provinces. One must not overlook the fact, however, that the population in Quebec is very thinly spread over quite a large territory and also that the birth-rate is much higher. It will be obvious, therefore, that families experience a greater degree of difficulty in caring for their children. In this respect a considerable improvement has taken place in the last ten years, especially in the city of Montreal. Regarding nuisances, dwelling and industrial establishments, we have laws in the province of Quebec that call for the highest praise and admiration. During the last session of the provincial Legislature measures were adopted which I think deserve the commendation of all who have at heart the advancement of public health. Coming to the more delicate subject which has been touched upon by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, venereal diseases, on the recommendation of the Superior Board of Health legislation was adopted during the last session of the Legislature. I will not delay the work of the Committee by reading that law, but it contains three very important clauses which were inserted in the Public Health Act of Quebec. I have no objection at all to inserting in this Bill a clause referring to the establishment of a bureau or laboratory for scientific research. Provided we are assured there is no intention of infringing or encroaching upon the rights of the provinces, we on this side of the House as well as hon. gentlemen on the other side, are willing to co-operate with the Government.

Mr. TRAHAN: I desire again to refer to section 5 which reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council shall have power to make such regulations as may be necessary to give effect to and carry out the objects of this Act, and to impose penalties for any violation of such regulations.

I am not inclined to give many powers to the Governor in Council. With regard

to this question of inflicting penalties, we have had during recent times examples which are not very reassuring to us. If the Government use this power in the same manner as they have used similar powers in the past, the burden will be a very heavy one. I would be very glad if the minister would drop the words "to impose penalties for any violation of such regulations." If he is not willing to do so I am of the opinion the amount of the penalties should be limited in the Act. It will not be very satisfactory if the Government, by Order in Council, inflict a penalty of $5,000 for a violation of the regulations. As an alternative I would suggest that the words "not exceeding $25," or "$50," be added after the word "penalties".

Mr. McMASTER: In order that the operation of this law, may be successful, it must proceed along lines of co-operation, co-ordination, harmony and peace. Why have penalties at all? If it is found in the operation of the Act that co-operation, co-ordination and other considerations of that kind are not sufficient, then the minister may come back at a future day and ask us to "make the punishment fit the crime." Let us adopt the principle of trusting the people, of trusting the provinces. Let us strike out those words giving power to impose penalties and appeal to the good sense and reasonableness of the people as a whole. I imagine that the operation of this Act would have to do largely with provinces and municipalities. Let the Big Stick not be in evidence at the beginning of this matter.

Mr. ROWELL: The clause is simply the usual one in Bills of this kind.

Mr. McMASTER: But this is a very unusual Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: Where you have the power to make regulations. if those regulations are to have any effect, there must be the usual provision for a penalty. There is no danger of harshness under this Bill. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that the whole framework of the measure contemplates co-operation. That is evident from the very next clause providing for a federal council of health bringing in all the chiefs of the provincial departments. My hon. friend surely does not seriously think there is anything wrong with the clause.

Mr. McMASTER: I would dislike the committee to think that I would take up the valuable time of this House in presenting a proposition that was not serious. If you have to deal with a man or woman along the lines of co-operation and co-ordination I would advise the minister that it would be well to keep penalties in the background. I understand that in a new department of this sort some latitude may be given to the Government to make regulations by Order in Council—much as we dislike that method—but you will not be able to get people to co-operate with you if you hold heavy penalties over their heads. I think it is well not to have these words in the Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: Where you are administering the Quarantine Act, the Adulteration Act and such Acts as that, you must have penalties in order to give the Government power to carry out the provisions of these Acts.

Mr. DEVLIN: I agree with what hon. members on this side of the House have said. I think this Committee should have some idea at least of the penalties that are going to be imposed before Parliament is asked to sanction penalties.

Mr. ROWELL: The penalties would absolutely depend upon the character of the regulations. You will see that there is power here to deal with the inspection and medical care of immigrants and seamen, the administration of marine hospitals, and the supervision of railways, boats, ships, and all methods of transporation. If you were dealing with transportation companies you would have to have an absolutely different penalty from that for some offence of a private individual of a different character. That is the reason why it is difficult to specify it. It depends entirely on the character of the offence and of the party with whom you are dealing.

Mr. DEVLIN: I just imagine that would be the case, and therefore I think there is a great deal to be said for what my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Trahan) advances, that you should have a maximum and a minimum penalty so that you can work in between the two.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to making the maximum $200. The penalty is very moderate, particularly if you are dealing with corporations.

Mr. VERVILLE: If I understand the object of this Bill it is to protect a certain class of people to a certain extent against another section of the community. Those against whom the penalty is aimed can well afford to pay it. Anybody who does not observe the regulations should be fined, and heavily fined, because sometimes it

happens in the case of a large corporation that it will pay a very large fine and not observe the law at all. I have seen that occur in the past.

On section 6—Dominion Council of Health.

Mr. ROWELL: I would suggest that "three" be changed to "five" in the fifth line of this section, relating to the number of members to be appointed.

Mr. BELAND: Is there any special reason why the number should be increased?

Mr. ROWELL: It has been represented to me, since the Bill was drafted, that on such a council it may be very desirable to have, say, the President or Chairman of the Canadian National Society of Social Hygiene, or a man of that type. Then it is contemplated, I understand, to form a national organization for the purpose of combatting venereal disease. If such an organization were formed it would be a very proper thing to have the chairman of it on this board. Furthermore, having regard to the very deep interest which organized labour is taking in this Bill and in its promotion; I think it would be desirable to have a representative of labour on the board. And there certainly should be a woman representative, for very good reasons. I have, therefore, thought it wise to increase the number of representatives from three to five, so as to make it possible to include representatives of those interests that are so directly concerned with matters of public health.

Mr. BELAND: Is it contemplated to give any remuneration, beyond expenses, to these five members of the proposed council?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is not contemplated to give them any remuneration.

Mr. McMASTER: I suggest a verbal alteration which may not be necessary, but will perhaps tend to indicate more clearly what is contemplated. I propose to insert in the second line from the bottom the words "in respect of this Act." The section will then read that the Council "shall be charged with such duties and powers in respect of this Act as the Governor in Council may prescribe."

Mr. ROWELL: I have no objection to the amendment, although that is what the section means in its present form.

Mr. KEEFER: Before we leave section 6, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact in substance this clause was the result of a resolution of the medical conference held in 1866. My hon. friend the member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) was too modest the other night when he was seeking not to give to his own profession the credit for this Bill his profession deserves. I have had something to do with the medical profession in connection with this Bill, and have also assisted the President of the Privy Council with respect to it, and I have found out that the first demand for a Public Health Act came from the medical profession. It was in March 1866, when an epidemic of cholera was threatening the country. A medical conference was called at Ottawa, and during its session the following resolution was passed,—and hon. members will see how much in substance it corresponds to the section under consideration :

> On the Government devolves the duty of the general organization, of the gathering of the forces, of the promulgation of general information, of the external surveillance. It is its duty to keep a grave watch and to defend the approaches if they can be defended. It is also its duty to institute a Central Board of Health with whom all other boards and even individuals can correspond.

I congratulate the medical profession upon having, as a result of their consistent labours, at last secured a Public Health Act that, I think, meets with the approval of everybody, notwithstanding the abuse in the public press. I do not belong to the medical profession, and therefore I feel, with my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), that we can refer to it with perfect impartiality. We sometimes read in the press slurs upon the profession, and rather slighting reference to allopathists. If I undersand this Bill at all it is going to the very root of the medical profession, and if its aims are achieved one might almost find the medical man like Othello, out of a job. The whole object of this Bill is not curative, it is preventative. What does it advocate, and what do the medical profession advocate? Pure milk, pure water, pure food, pure drugs and hygienic conditions. And it seems so strange, under the circumstances, to notice criticism of the medical profession in the public press in any part of the country.

Mr. McMASTER: The press men, when they get sick, call in a doctor just the same as we do.

Mr. KEEFER: I did not know that was the situation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Or call in the undertaker.

Mr. KEEFER: Before leaving the subject I would like to congratulate the House

upon the passage of legislation which in my judgment will confer more benefit upon the workers of this country than any other piece of legislation this House has enacted. Health can be bought by the rich, but it is those without large incomes who are the sufferers from the contagious diseases against which this Bill is directed. Therefore, I think this Bill, when it goes into effect, will do more in the long run for the welfare of the workers of this country than any other piece of legislation that has been passd by this Parliament.

Mr. MANION: I must take exception to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Keefer) that I tried to take away from the medical profession any credit for this Bill. I remember my words very distinctly, and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look them up in Hansard he will find that what I said was that the labour organizations were among the first to advocate the creation of a department of public health. Those were my words and I adhere to them.

Mr. KEEFER: The medical profession were the first to advocate it, in 1866 in Canada.

Mr. MANION: I do not dispute that, and I presume that if the hon. gentleman went back a couple of thousand years he would find an even earlier advocate in the person of Aesculapius. I did not say the medical profession were not the first, but I did say that the labour organizations were among the first in their advocacy of this measure. The hon. gentleman would have acted with more fairness if he had quoted me as pointing out that the medical profession were supporting the establishment of this department whole-heartedly and very high-mindedly, because that was the statement I made.

Mr. DEVLIN: Before the section passes, I would ask the President of the Privy Council whether, in view of the uncertainty that exists throughout the country, he can state who will be the minister at the head of this department, whether it will be a medical practitioner or a layman?

The Western papers contain statements to the effect that the hon. Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) is to be appointed. Would it be a breach of confidence on the part of the hon. minister to enlighten the House?

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid I cannot add anything to what I said last week in regard to that matter.

Section agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL: This will be added as section 7:

> Nothing in this Act or any regulation made thereunder shall authorize the minister or any official of the department to exercise any jurisdiction or control over any provincial health officer or any provincial or municipal board of health or other health authority operating under the laws of any province.

Amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 7 now becomes section 8.

On the schedule:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I called the attention of the House the other day to the fund administered by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I presume that the schedule would be the proper place to add "Chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes?"

Mr. ROWELL: The Canada Shipping Act, Chapter 113, Sections 406 to 408 inclusive, I think should be added to the schedule.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What becomes of the fund to the credit of the Health Branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries? I understand that a considerable amount of money has been collected from ships at the various ports, and that the fund so formed is for the purpose of caring for sick seamen. I would like to know if the hon. minister has considered the destination of that fund, or whether the Minister of Health to be appointed will have charge of it.

Mr. ROWELL: As the fund is collected for administration under the general provisions of the Act, I did not think it was desirable to take its collection out of the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who now administers it under the Act, but I think there is no doubt the fund must be applied to the purposes specified in the Act and would be available for paying the expenses of these hospitals just as it is to-day. The effect of the change, that is, the placing of sections 406 to 408 of the Canada Shipping Act in this schedule, would be to place the actual administration of the hospitals under the Department of Health, as those are the sections which specify the particular minister who shall administer the hospitals. I think the money would still go in exactly the way it goes to-day, and as it should go.

10 p.m.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It has been impressed on the attention of the Marine Department for years that something should

be done for sick seamen owing to the fact that this money had been collected from ships at our ports and had accumulated to a large amount, and that in many places hospitals had not been provided. My object in putting my question to the hon. minister is to find out if the new department will look after sick seamen in a better way than that work has been done in the past.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I would move that the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, the Inspection of Canned Foods Act, and the Penitentiaries Act be included in this schedule. I do not think any argument is needed for including the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, because this is the only natural place for it. Many diseases, such as tuberculosis and anthrax, affect both animals and men. I might point out that diseases are intensified apparently by going through the animal kingdom, and the human being contracts them in an aggravated form. The Inspection of Canned Foods would naturally fall under the work of this department, also the penitentiaries. Very often we have the feeble minded and the partially demented in our penitentiaries, and they require medical supervision.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not care whether you include the inspection of penitentiaries and of canned foods, but I do object to animal diseases being put under this organization, because I think the work is remarkably well handled as it is, and it belongs properly to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: I might point out to the hon. member the fact that tuberculosis in the animal kingdom is increasing rapidly. I am speaking from memory and subject to correction, but I think the percentage last year increased from 2.9 to about 3.6. That does not look as if that particular branch was being very well handled.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. member need not point that out to me; I know as much about it as he does.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Then I am surprised at the hon. member making that argument.

Mr. ROWELL: The Acts to which my hon. friend (Mr. Peter McGibbon) refers are now being administered by three separate departments of the Government: the Animals Contagious Diseases Act by the Department of Agriculture, the Penitentiaries Act by the Department of Justice; and the Food Act by the Department of Trade and Commerce. The transfer of these services to this department involves an important question not only of policy but of administration. There is power under the clause we have already passed for the Governor in Council to transfer the medical administration under any one of these Acts to this department, should it appear expedient to do so. In view of that fact I would suggest that the hon. member should not press the amendment at the present time. The matter will be considered by the Government in due course.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: In view of the minister's remarks, I withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn, and schedule agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. ROWELL: I move that, in accordance with the suggestion which was made when the Bill was previously in committee, the preamble be amended by adding at the beginning thereof the following words:

Whereas it is expedient for the preservation of the health and the promotion of the social welfare of the people of Canada that a Department of Health be established in the Dominion, therefore

Amendment agreed to and preamble, as amended; agreed to.

Bill reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways) moved that the House go into Committee to consider resolution to provide for the incorporation of the Canadian National Railway Company:

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I suggest to the hon. gentleman that we have done a good deal of work to-day? I—with my hon. friend—have been in attendance at three sittings to-day, including those of the Special Committee to revise the Railway Act. I submit that my hon. friend should not press his resolution to-night.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no desire to press the resolution if there is objection to my doing so. I simply wanted to advance the matter one stage so that the Bill could be introduced and proceeded with. I hardly think that there would be any objection to the resolution; it is merely to provide for the incorporation of a com-

pany to operate the whole of the railway systems which are under the control of the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the Canadian Northern?

Mr. J. D. REID: The resolution provides for the incorporation of a company to operate the Canadian Northern railway system, the Government railways and such other railways as the Government may purchase or acquire. If we purchase the Grand Trunk, it will be operated by this company. That is the object of the Bill to be founded on the resolution.

Mr. BUREAU: I think there is another object to the Bill.

Mr. ROBB: The minister would make greater progress by acceding to the request of my hon. friend who is leading the Opposition (Mr. Lemieux). We on this side do not share the minister's view that this is a simple Bill; it is really a Bill to confer upon the Governor in Council the rights of Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely.

Mr. ROBB: The people of Canada are the shareholders, but if there is any deficit the Government of the day seem to have all the say. I do not think the minister will get this through quite so quickly as he imagines.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have no intention of asking the House to sit one minute longer than hon. gentlemen wish. When I rose at ten minutes after ten to move that the House go into Committee to consider this resolution, I did so at an hour which is early compared with the hour to which the House has been sitting. However, as the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and the Chief Whip (Mr. Robb) ask me not to proceed. I accede to their suggestion.

Mr. McMASTER: It is very difficult to follow a resolution which is in the form of one sentence spread over a page and a half of the Order Paper. When the Orders of the Day are printed, would it not be possible to have this resolution so divided up that the eye may follow it with greater ease?

Mr. J. D. REID: I will suggest that it be printed that way to-morrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let it be divided up into paragraphs.

Mr. BUREAU: And let the word "Order in Council" be printed in capitals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister will understand that I am not opposing unduly the procedure which he intended to follow this evening; but really the day has been too long.

Mr. J. D. REID: I quite understand that. But I do not want any hon. gentleman to have the impression that I was trying to press business at a late hour. I withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Friday, April 11, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Return to an Order of the House dated April 7, 1919, showing:

1. The total amount of the domestic Dominion War Loans subscribed to date.

2. The amount thereof subscribed by each province of the Dominion.

3. The amount of deposits in the banks at the close of the fiscal year next prior to the date of the first of such loans.

4. The amount of deposits in Canadian banks according to the last issued statement, and the date of such statement.—Sir Thomas White.

Copy of Order in Council P.C. 690, dated 2nd April, 1919, re agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the King of Roumania respecting credit for $25,000,000.—Sir Thomas White.

PEACE CONFERENCE—CANADIAN PLENIPOTENTIARIES.

Hon. NEWTON WESLEY ROWELL (President of the Council): I beg to lay on the Table, Order in Council dated the 10th day of April, 1919, requesting His Majesty to issue letters patent to the Right Honourable Sir Robert Laird Borden, the Right Honourable Sir George Eulas Foster, the Honourable Arthur Lewis Sifton and the Honourable Charles Joseph Doherty, as Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries in respect of the Dominion of Canada with full power and authority to sign any treaties concluded at the Peace Congress.

The House will be interested in knowing that the treaties concluded at the Peace Conference will be signed in respect of Canada by Canadian Plenipotentiaries.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 67, for the relief of Gladys Agnes Wilson Hawkins.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 69, to amend the Criminal Code respecting Prevention of Fire.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

HUTTERITES ENTERING CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): I should like to call the attention of the Government to this article which appeared in this morning's Citizen:

Winnipeg, April 10th.—On receipt of a report that a new colony of Hutterites is coming into Canada with the permission of Government authorities and that three cars of their effects reached Emerson, Manitoba, last night, the Great War Veterans' Association to-day sent a strong protest to Sir Thomas White in Ottawa. The protest says that the Association—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member should put his question without reading a newspaper article in extenso. I would call attention to the fact that as the article refers to a protest it is not in order that it should be read now.

Mr. MOLLOY: Has the Government taken any action as to the telegram reported to have been sent by the Great War Veterans of Manitoba?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The telegram referred to has not come to my attention.

MONCTON AND BUCTOUCHE RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. A. T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to complaints that have been made in the press and elsewhere as regards passenger accommodation on the Moncton and Buctouche railway, which is now part of the Government system of railways. It is reported that fifty per cent of the passengers have to stand for hours on account of the necessary accommodation not being provided. Has the minister knowledge of these matters, and if not, will he make inquiries and furnish the necessary accommodation.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): This is the first intimation I have had of any trouble on the line mentioned. I will take the matter up at once with the management and if there is any trouble, I will have it remedied.

[Mr. Rowell.]

PEACE TREATY—LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. HOWARD PRIMOSE WHIDDEN (Brandon): Has the Government any information concerning the probable date when the Peace Treaty will be ready for ratification and is there a possibility of the Government setting aside a time for consideration by the House of the League of Nations Covenant.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): We have no official information as to the date upon which the Treaty of Peace will be signed. I am not aware that the date has been fixed. Yesterday an order was made for the printing of the Covenant, and at a later date it will be open to the House to discuss the matter, if it so desires.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Will members of the House have an opportunity of seeing the Peace Treaty before it is signed on behalf of Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think not. When the Treaty is ready for signature I should think it would not be possible to have it discussed by the several legislatures of the countries concerned. It is very desirable that the Peace Treaty should be signed as soon as possible after it has been agreed upon by the five great powers, in order that peace may be restored to the world. I apprehend what my hon. friend has in mind: that the various countries are to be bound by the decisions of the Peace Conference, and that it would be advisable, if practicable, to have the Treaty discussed by the several legislatures concerned. But I do not believe that such a course is practicable, nor am I aware that it has been adopted in connection with former peace treaties. Under the constitution of the United States, treaties have to be approved by the Senate, but as regards the present treaty I think—I am simply giving my own opinion—it will be signed by the plenipotentiaries appointed for the purpose. Whatever subsequent ratification may be necessary by the different legislatures will be given effect to.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Is it the intention of the Government to secure a number of megaphones to be used by the leaders on the Ministerial and Opposition benches, so that private members will hear something of what is going on?

Mr. BUREAU: Ear-phones should also be provided.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Can the Acting Prime Minister throw some light to-day on the all-absorbing question of daylight saving? I have been informed that we shall have daylight saving after recess.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I am surprised at my hon. friend being so intensely interested in what, after all, is a very temporary matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is breaking up homes in Ottawa.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I made inquiries to-day and ascertained that the decision of the Railway Commissioners will probably be given immediately. After the decision has been published, I shall inform the House as what I have to suggest.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

THIRD READING OF BILL.

On motion of Hon. N. W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council), Bill No. 37, respecting the Department of Health, was read the third time and passed.

CADADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Acting Minister of Justice) for the second reading of Bill No. 38, to amend the Canada Evidence Act:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): If this Bill has not yet been printed in French, I do not think we should discuss it now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should not like to say that it has not been printed in French, although the letter 'F' does not appear on the Order Paper. I have known cases where Bills have been printed in French and distributed, without the letter 'F' appearing on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before a Bill can get its second reading, the rule is that it must be printed in both French and English. The letters 'E' and 'F' on the Order Paper are not a positive index as to whether that has been done. If the Bill has not been printed in French, we may not proceed.

Motion stands.

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT, 1908, AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 40, to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.

Mr. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill does nothing more than define the term "Roman Catholic" as used in the present Act. There is no definition in the Act as it now stands, and there is a certain class of Catholics who decline to be known as Roman Catholics. Consequently, a definition is necessary. I have an amendment to propose when we are in Committee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—"Roman Catholic" defined:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move:

That section 1 be amended by striking out the words 'head of the Roman Catholic Church' in lines 9 and 10, and substituting therefor the words 'Holy Roman See.'

Sir SAM HUGHES: I cannot hear a word.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This may not be very easily understood by my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are Roman Catholics who belong to the Eastern Church and Roman Catholics who belong to the Western Church, and I am informed that in order to unite them they want to have placed in the Act the official title of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, and that official title, recognized by both branches, is "Holy Roman See."

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would my hon. friend kindly tell me that again? Seeing that the Minister of the Interior could not tell me what the Holy Roman See was, I shall appeal to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to enlighten me on that point.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are two branches of the Catholic Church—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —of the Roman Catholic Church: the Western branch and the Eastern branch, and in respect to these young delinquents the members of the church asked—

Sir SAM HUGHES: With the assistance of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes—the members of the church have asked to be allowed to give the official name to the head of the Roman Catholic Church. The official name is the "Holy Roman See."

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would be very glad if the Minister of the Interior would explain to me what is meant by the " spiritual jurisdiction of the head of the Roman Catholic Church."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I had better explain the Bill and then the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) will understand it. The Juvenile Delinquents Act now provides for taking care of juvenile delinquents in homes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What homes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are church homes. If a juvenile delinquent is a Protestant the Act provides that he shall go to a Protestant home. If he is a Roman Catholic he is taken care of in a Catholic home. A difficulty arose in connection with the working of the Act in consequence of the fact that there was no definition of the Roman Catholic sect, or branch, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) says, known ordinarily as Greek Catholics. They refused to be described as Roman Catholics and consequently they were being discriminated against under the Act, as they were described as belonging to a class to which they did not belong, and, not belonging to that class, there was no supervision over the children. The Act is now being amended so as to define " Roman Catholic " in such a way as to include them. They are anxious to have this amendment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who are " they?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: That branch of the Greek Catholic church. They have secured incorporation from this Parliament under the title of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Canada. This amendment will have the effect of placing their children in the same position as Roman Catholic children because it defines "Roman Catholic" in terms wide enough to include them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not define Methodist wide enough to include them also?

Mr. MEIGHEN: These people desire that their children be placed in Catholic institutions.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Have you any evidence of that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, they have asked for the Bill. They are Catholics; they recognize the authority of the Pope, or rather of the Holy Roman Catholic See.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, they do not.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: They inform me that they do and that they desire to be included so as to secure the privileges of that communion. It is they who are asking for the Bill and for this amendment because they recognize the head of the Roman Catholic Church as head of the Holy Roman See. They are not of the Roman Catholic Church but they recognize the Holy Roman See as the head of their church the same as he is the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

Sir SAM HUGHES: H-o-l-y!

Mr. DAVIS (Neepawa): I think that if the situation were understood it might clear the way for the consideration of this Bill. There is a Greek Catholic Church as well as a Roman Catholic Church. Some 250 years ago there was an effort made in Poland to get a union of the two rites. There are people who are known among Greek Catholics as Uniats and who are willing to accept the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church. These people are known in the western provinces to-day as Greek Catholics in communion with the Church of Rome, and, in so far as they are concerned, I see no objection to the Bill going through. But, as far as the Greek Catholics are concerned, I think the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) is right; they do not recognize the authority of the head of the Church of Rome.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then, they do not come under the Bill; they are not affected.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not know that this Bill was going to be taken up to-day; otherwise I would have looked into it with more interest and paid more attention to it than I have. But it might as well be understood here that there is an attempt being made through Parliament by an organization of the Roman Catholic Church to get control of a number of people who are not Roman Catholics, or to control their children. This is the old story; world-wide; nothing new about it whatever.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: They are trying to save the children.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We will not enter into that aspect of the case now. Whether a man calls himself a Roman Catholic or not, Parliament is going to legislate by this Bill to take away his children and send them to a Roman Catholic institution in case they should come before the court, and in doing so Parliament is interfering with the absolute free will of the subject by forcing him to have his children placed in a

Roman Catholic institution whether he is a Roman Catholic or not. There has been an attempt made on the part of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries, ever since the thing was formed in the fifth century after Christ—because it was not until the fifth century after Christ that it was ever heard of—an attempt which has been going on for generations, to get control of the Greek Catholics, of the people of Greece, Turkey, Macedonia and the States of the Balkan peninsula. The attempt is being made to secure control over the people of those Balkan States and to bring them in under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church, as Greek Catholics owing allegiance to the See of Rome. The game is well understood by those who have studied it up. I am not finding fault with the Roman Catholic Church for pushing their propaganda, but I am finding fault with the Parliament of Canada in yielding to that propaganda by legislation of this kind. We might as well talk frankly about these things. I cannot agree with the opinion that I see in the press of the country that matters of this kind should not be discussed in Parliament at all. Nor do I agree with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) in the view that questions concerning religion should not be brought up in Parliament at all. Are we to stay quiet and let these corporations come in and get control all over the country? Not at all. This is the place to fight it out, to call a spade a spade, to talk in plain Anglo-Saxon, and that is what I propose to do. It is generally understood—there is no secret about it—that the assassination of the heir apparent to the Austrian throne was brought about because he was persona non grata to the Church of Rome, because he was a liberal in religion and not an ultramontane. It is generally understood that the policy of Germany, had she been triumphant in this war, was to make herself mistress of Belgium, Poland, and Lithuania, and the large additions of Roman Catholics to the German Empire by the carrying out of that policy would result in the Roman Catholic population of that empire becoming vastly greater than the Protestant population, with this addition also: that in the states now controlled by the Bolsheviki the Greek Church would be weakened and Russia would be brought under Rome's influence, Italy would be restored to the church, France would be restored to the church, leaving outside its control only the two great powers of Great Britain and the United States, but resulting in the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Pope of Rome over Christendom to the extent which I have mentioned. The aims of the Roman Catholic Church are well known; there is no secret about it at the present time. It is practically well known, and generally understood that the "hidden hand" interfered with the enlistment of splendid boys who were anxious to fight for their country in the late war—interfered with the enlistment of those boys all over the country.

I certainly object to the spirit of this measure which states that whether any such person as is referred to in this Bill calls himself a Roman Catholic or not he is to acknowledge and be subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the head of the Roman Catholic Church. Why should we legislate for the jurisdiction and control by the Church of Rome over the future of such people as these who do not belong to that church? I am by no means satisfied that the operation of these homes is as beneficial as it should be in the public interest. It seems to me that these organizations are getting their hands in everywhere and trying to establish themselves wherever they can get a foothold and that in this Bill they are trying to get a recognition that does not belong to them. I certainly object to the passage of this Bill, at all events until such time as the whole matter has been looked into and the House has been placed in possession of full information on the subject.

Mr. BURNHAM: I would ask the Acting Minister of Justice if he is aware that by a recent decree the word "Roman" has been stricken out of the title of the Catholic Church. So that now instead of being "the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church" it is "the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church?" This change may make a very serious difference with respect to the Bill before the Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me deal with the matter in this way for the benefit of the hon. member for Victoria and of the Committee: The Juvenile Delinquents' Act does not make anybody a Protestant or a Catholic. It provides two classes of homes to which children may go—one class for Protestant children, and one class for Catholic children.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I not—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just let me finish—

Sir SAM HUGHES: But I would like to—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member can only interrupt an hon. member who is speaking if he gets permission.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am well aware of that, but I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am in order, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot put a question when the hon. member who is speaking objects.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He did not object.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood him to object.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the minister objects to the question being asked—

Mr. BUREAU: He did so; he said, "Let me finish."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would have preferred not to be interrupted at the moment, but now that I have been I will await the question of the hon. member for Victoria.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Never mind, you can go on now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was saying, when interrupted, that the Act provides two classes of homes to which children who are delinquents may be sent, its intention being that Protestants be sent to Protestant homes and Catholics to Catholic homes. As long as that is the case, as long as it does not attempt to admit any child who could possibly be a Protestant to a Catholic home objection could not be made by the hon. member from Victoria. In the same way if the Act does not attempt to send any child who is a Catholic to a Protestant home, it could not be objected to. By what stretch of the imagination could any person come to the conclusion that under this Act a Protestant could be sent to a Catholic home? The Bill defines a Roman Catholic as meaning and including any person who acknowledges and is subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy Roman See. That is all. If such a person makes that acknowledgment he is not a Protestant. I really do not pretend to be an authority on such matters, but the alphabet would teach me that. It may be he is not a Roman Catholic. If so we do not make him such, and do not attempt to; it is pure nonsense to suggest that we do. But he is a Catholic, and as between the two classes, the Protestant and Catholic it is undoubtedly the Catholic institution to which he should go, if that child is of a parentage that recognizes the authority of the Holy Roman See. It may be he is a Greek Catholic. It may be he is in the class defined by our Act of 1913 incorporating the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Canada; but if he is a Protestant, belonging either to the Protestant Greek church or any such ecclesiastical body, he does not recognize the authority of the Holy Roman See and cannot be affected by the Bill.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: How are the Jewish children provided for?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the Act here and can look up its provisions. They are not affected by this Bill, but I think there are other provisions in the Act which have reference to them.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think there are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Possibly not.

Mr. JACOBS: Now that the point has been raised I think it would be well when we are making amendments to the law to see to it that some provision is made for the care of Jewish children in Jewish homes. It would appear from the discussion as though there were no Jewish juvenile delinquents, but I wish to say, as a matter of fact, that there are. We look after such delinquents, and customarily they are placed with Jewish families.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, no. My hon. friend is wrong. Jewish delinquents are placed in the Boys' Farm and Training School at Shawbridge.

Mr. JACOBS: I am referring to private and not public homes. They are put in private homes and looked after. I think it might be well when we are making these changes in the law that there should be some recognition in this House that we have Jewish juvenile delinquents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The point does not concern the Bill, but I promise to take the matter which the hon. gentleman has brought to my attention into my consideration. I will have it reviewed in the department and speak to him again about it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the first place I wish to resent the use of the word "Catholic" as it is being universally applied in this House. There are a great many people in connection with the English Church who resent the use of the word as applying only to the Roman Church. A great many of the so-called English Catholics regard themselves as just as important a body as the Roman Catholic Church. When you have

reference to those people they consider themselves just as much Catholics as do those persons who belong to the Roman Church. Therefore if the Acting Minister of Justice wishes to adhere to constitutional usage he will take cognizance of that fact. There are not only Protestant Catholics but there are millions of other Catholics who do not belong to either organization, and I fail to see why the child of any man who is not a recognized Roman Catholic should be sent to a Roman Catholic institution. There are public institutions in the country, supported by the municipalities, that are undenominational. That is where such children will go, and this game of grabbing children and bringing them up in this or that faith should be stopped. This kind of business has done more harm than good. The Government ought not to recognize any such ecclesiastical jurisdiction as is proposed here; the people concerned should be free to select their own religious faith.

Do not let any church have an opportunity of grabbing this or that child owing to the fact that the father does not know what church he belongs to. If the Roman Catholic Church gets a child under this hybrid organization of the Greek Catholic Church, that child goes to Rome just the same and Rome gets an additional voter. There is no use trying to get around the fact that this measure is not for the good of the child. I would suggest that the Bill be held over for further consideration to give us an opportunity to get behind the scenes and secure the real facts of the case. This Bill has been smuggled in from the Senate; I never heard of it until a moment ago. It is being rushed through the same as that clause was rushed through a year or two ago in the Military Service Act in connection with divinity students.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want the Committee to think that any attempt is being made to rush this Bill through. It has already been through one House of Parliament.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They are asleep in the Senate the same as we are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reason "Roman Catholic" is used here is because it is the term used in the Act; consequently that is the term that must be defined. Let me read section 19 of Juvenile Delinquents Act and then the effect of the definition will be seen:

> No Protestant child dealt with under this Act shall be committed to the care of any Roman Catholic children's aid society or be placed in any Roman Catholic family as its foster home; nor shall any Roman Catholic child dealt with under this Act be committed to the care of any Protestant children's aid society, or be placed in any Protestant family as its foster home; but this section shall not apply to the placing of children in a temporary home or shelter for children, established under the authority of a statute of the province, or, in a municipality where there is but one children's aid society, to such children's aid society.
>
> If a Protestant child is committed to the care of a Roman Catholic children's aid society or placed in a Roman Catholic family as its foster home or if a Roman Catholic child is committed to the care of a Protestant children's aid society or placed in a Protestant family as its foster home, contrary to the provisions of subsection 1 of this section, the court shall, on the application of any person in that behalf, make an order providing for the proper commitment or placing of the child pursuant to subsection 1 of this section.

Now it became necessary to define the term Roman Catholic on account of members of the Greek Catholic Church not recognizing themselves as Roman Catholics.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not say "Greek Roman Catholic Church?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because there are no Greek Roman Catholic homes. Those people want their children to come in these homes. They recognize the Holy Roman See as their spiritual head; therefore the definition is necessary. It is so clear that I cannot understand any person—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know, I am dull of apprehension myself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only on some things.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like the hon. minister to explain how he knows that the Greek Catholics do recognize the Holy Roman See, as he terms it, or the Pope of Rome?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they do not recognize the Holy Roman See they will not be affected by the Bill; but they are asking for it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who are they, some heelers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I told the hon. gentleman a moment ago; I will tell him again. The word "they" refers to the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Canada, as incorporated by this Parliament in the Statutes of 1913, chapter 191.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not put in that name, the Ruthenian Greek—I cannot get the rigmarole off?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may be others who recognize the Holy Roman See, but, if not, they are not affected by the Bill; but

once they do recognize it, would the hon. gentleman try to claim them as Protestants?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Here is a child brought before the court; who is to determine whether that child belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, or the English Catholic Church; is it the people who are engineering the show?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not affected by this Bill one way or the other.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Pardon me, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That point is not affected by this amendment. The determination that is exercised under the original Act will still obtain. There is no difficulty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am aware there is no difficulty because people are asleep. Hundreds of these children are shipped off here and there. But democracy is abroad to-day, people are getting wide awake to this sort of thing; they know that these churches have to a large extent been a blanket on the progress of humanity, and they are putting the churches in the category where they belong; they are treating them as corporations, which have neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. They have come to the conclusion that the State should look after its orphans; and the municipal, provincial and Dominion authorities are looking after them, and are doing it well, too.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 38, to amend the Canada Evidence Act.

He said: I will explain the purpose of this Bill. The present Canada Evidence Act provides that any entry in a book kept in any department of the Government is receivable in evidence if proved by the oath or affidavit of any officer of the department. But it has been held that that provision does not apply to books kept, for example, in the Auditor General's branch, which is not a "Department" within the meaning of that term, nor the books kept by a Commission of the Government, for example, the Railway Commission, the Canada Trade Commission, or the War Purchasing Commission. Very great inconvenience and expense is necessitated as a result, because the proof must be made then by the production of the book itself, and usually by the production of the officer of the department. This is to make the present law applicable not only to departments but also to all branches of the Government service.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, some years ago I remember we had an investigation before a Committee of some land speculation in connection with the Department of the Interior, and the question of filing departmental documents came up before the Committee. If I am not mistaken, the then member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), who was interested in the matter, insisted that the Committee was entitled to see the original. It seems to me that the same rule should apply to a case before a court of the land.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is competent to discuss only the principle of the Bill on the second reading. The hon. gentleman will serve his purpose better and cause the proceeding to be regular if he waits until the House goes into committee on the Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—to make section 26 apply to all offices under Dominion Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Generally, it is not necessary to file the original entries, and possibly inconvenience would result if they were required to be filed in every case. But in both criminal and civil cases it may become of the utmost importance that the originals be filed. In that case, what would happen under this legislation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall give my view of the law, but I do not wish to give it as final. The present Act provides that the production of a sworn copy of an entry in a book of a department shall be evidence of the entry and of the facts stated in it. The amendment says that that provision shall apply to all branches of the Government service. The effect of the present legislation is to enable a litigant to submit certain evidence, namely, the copy of an entry instead of the entry itself, and to be in a position then to say that he has produced evidence of the entry and of the facts noted in it. But the litigant is not now prevented by the present legislation, nor will he be prevented by the new legislation, from demanding the orig-

4 p.m.

inal as well. If he wants to go to the expense of bringing the proper officer from Ottawa, or wherever he may be, and have the book produced, he may do so, but this gives him a cheaper alternative.

Mr. McKENZIE: This legislation does not change the old law; it merely extends it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Extends it; that is all.

Mr. McKENZIE: A man who is putting in a copy of an entry may contend that that is evidence, and the other side may demand the original. In general laws of this kind, discretion is sometimes given to the judge to decide whether he shall accept the copy or grant the request of the other side for the production of the original. Possibly it would do no harm to add to this section the words " unless the court or judge otherwise orders." It would then be open to the judge to say that either party could have further or better evidence if necessary. I do not think any discretion is left to the judge here to order anything more than the certified copy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difficulty with the hon. member's suggestion is this: a litigant who himself was satisfied with a copy of the entry would not know whether or not he was preparing his case properly by relying on a copy. He might come to court with his copy and then have the judge rule that he must produce the original. That might mean an adjournment of the trial, particularly if the trial was taking place, say, in Victoria and the papers were in Ottawa. But as the law will stand when this Bill is passed, if a litigant is satisfied with the copy he goes ahead and gets it, and he knows that that is proof. If, on the contrary, his opponent is not satisfied with the copy, all he has to do is to go to the expense of getting the original.

Mr. McKENZIE: If one is going to rely on a copy of a deed instead of an original, he must give ten or eleven days' notice that he is going to use a copy. It is then open to the other side to refuse to accept the copy and to ask for the original. If the same general law applies to the copy in this case as applies to the copy of a deed, surprise could not happen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we were to adopt that in the Canada Evidence Act as extendable to books of account in the Government service, we would have to consider very carefully an amendment to that effect, because provision would have to be made for notice. I suggest that this point raised by the hon. member stand for consideration in connection with another Bill. He might then, if he thought fit, himself introduce the suggestion.

Mr. BUREAU: Would it not be well to specify that the officer of the department who is to certify to these copies shall be the officer who has been particularly in charge of the books? He might be required to state in the affidavit that the books have been under his charge or that he knows of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is provided here that the officer must be an officer of the department, commission or board. I do not think you can go further than that, because in some cases the books may not be under the special supervision of any particular officer; they may be open to entry on the part of several officers. It would seem to be sufficient that the entry be sworn to by an officer of the department in question. Then it must also be proved that the entry is made in the usual course of business in that office, and that oath must be taken by the officer who takes the affidavit. Consequently, it is necessary in every case that an officer who is familiar with the use of that book take the affidavit.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend says there are books that are not under the charge of any special officer. That would be a very rare exception?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps so.

Mr. BUREAU: There are various branches in each department. I should not like to take from the Superintendent of Dredging a certificate as to something that was done in the office of the architect of the Department of Public Works or vice versa, and yet under this Bill that could be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The present law is not changed in that respect.

Mr. BUREAU: No, but if we are going to amend it, we should improve it, and if we are going to improve it, we should go the whole way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no complaint that it is not perfect as it is.

Mr. BUREAU: Then why amend it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because it does not go far enough.

Mr. DENIS: Has the scope of the section not been enlarged by the insertion of these words:

or in any commission, board or other branch.

I would have no objection to the section reading:

A copy of any entry in any book kept in any office or department of the Government of Canada.

But the words:—

or in any commission, board or other branch.

—are extremely wide and vague. They include practically everything that pertains to the Government of Canada and to every department. I object to such a vague term unless I am told that the same disposition existed in the old law. In that case I would not ask that the law be changed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The words are wide but they are by no means vague. Previously this right extended as to any department; it could be applicable say to a Dominion land office or a timber office in New Westminster, if there was one there. It would be applicable anywhere. That being the case, why should it not be applicable say to the War Purchasing Commission? Every portion of the public service of Canada is a clearly defined area of service, and there can be no doubt or vagueness about it. Why then should one portion of the service of Canada be different from another? This simply gives the right to use a sworn copy of a book of entry if such book is used in the public service of Canada.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the minister kindly read the original section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The original section is this:

(26). A copy of any entry in any book kept in any department of the Government of Canada, shall be received as evidence of such entry, and of the matters, transactions and accounts therein recorded, if it is proved by the oath or affidavit of an officer of such department that such book was, at the time of the making of the entry, one of the ordinary books kept in such department, that the entry was made in the usual course of business in such department, and that such copy is a true copy thereof.

Mr. DEVLIN: That is the same, with the exception of the word "commission."

Mr. DENIS: A wide change is made in the drafting of the new section, because the words "in any office" are new and the words "or in any commission, board or other branch" are equally new.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, intentionally so. If they were not new, there would be no amendment.

Mr. DENIS: I object to enlarging to such an extent the scope of this section, because this amendment makes it cover practically all the books kept in the use of the Dominion Government. We do not know where that is going to stop. For example, the entry book of a man who is keeping wages accounts on a dredge would fall under this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the law now, because he is in the Public Works Department.

Mr. DENIS: If that is the law, it is wide enough now, and we are going to make it even wider. I cannot appreciate the length or the scope of this section drafted as it is. It seems we shall always be at a loss to know what falls under the section and what does not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. gentleman suggest any institution that would be in doubt? What is the difficulty of telling whether any service or institution is or is not part of the public service of the Dominion of Canada.? That is all a question of who issues the cheques.

Mr. McKENZIE: The difficulty here is that the certificate of any department of Government should not be taken as evidence unless it is a permanent, fixed department of Government. These boards are in existence to-day, but twenty years, or ten years, or perhaps three years hence many of these boards or commissions shall have wound up their business and gone out of existence. They will be no longer a branch of the Government, and the difficulty would arise that, although they were a branch of the Government when this Bill was passed to-day, to-morrow or a year or more afterwards they will not be a branch of the Government and would their certificate then be admissible as evidence? The minister should take care not to recognize in connection with this draft any branch of the service that is not permanent. If it be found that the Auditor General's Department is not within the old section, I can readily understand the necessity of bringing it in, because so far as we all know it is an absolutely fixed department of Government. But the Food Board, the Fuel Board, the War Purchasing Commission, are all for war purposes and will disappear with the war. I do not think the minister would care to say that the certificate of an officer of any of those boards, after they had wound up their business and dissolved, should be recognized as evidence in the courts of the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's remarks might have point if we were pre-

venting any litigant from getting the original, but we are not; we are merely giving him an amendment which he can use. We do not provide for certificates; we provide for a sworn copy of a book of entry. Why would not a sworn copy of a book of entry of the Food Board be just as fair evidence in a court as a sworn copy of a book of entry of a Dominion land office out in Grand Prairie? There is no difference in the world. The temporary character, if it is temporary, of a commission, does not in any way affect the strength or sufficiency of the evidence. If a man is an officer of a Food Board, that is a public service board, not an institution for private profit, so as to give an incentive perhaps to manipulating entries. All we say is that, as that is a public service board, the sworn copy of an entry shall be evidence. That is, I presume, based upon the assumption that the public service is honestly carried on, and that the incentive to wrong-doing does not exist with the man carrying it on as it does in a private concern. It is just as applicable in every respect to any part of the public service as it is to the Department of the Interior or the Department of Public Works. Another principle is this: We do not want the books of the public service out of use by being used as evidence in courts all over the country.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Food Board or any other board or commission that has finished its work returns its commission and is dissolved. It goes out of business as a branch of the public service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But we need the records here.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are you going to hunt for a man who was an officer of that board or commission to get a certificate from him? If so, where are you going to find him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We say, if there is an officer who can make that affidavit, all right. We do not say that he must make an affidavit whether he is in a position to or not.

Mr. McKENZIE: Suppose that the books of the Food Board, when the board is dissolved, pass into the hands of some department of the Government. To what officer should I go for a certificate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is nobody to give it, you cannot get it; so the amendment would not apply.

Mr. McKENZIE: It might be absolutely necessary to have a certificate, and I would be willing to take the certificate of an officer of the department in whose custody the books were. I do not think it is necessary to mention these commissions at all, because their books will be turned over to some department of the Government from which department a certificate could be got. Suppose the books of the Food Board are turned over to the Labour Department, and the certificate of the Deputy Minister of Labour is produced in court, the judge might say: "I cannot see any connection between the Department of Labour and the Food Board, and it is necessary for you to produce a certificate from an official of the Food Board." I would be perfectly satisfied if the Act were so constructed that a certificate could be got from an officer of the department which took over the books.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I apprehend that is the effect of it. For example, there are some commissions that are portions of a department. Consequently any officer of that department can take an affidavit, provided he knows that the entry was made in the usual and ordinary course of business, and that a true copy has been made of it. There are other commissions, the more permanent ones as a rule, that are not under any department. The War Purchasing Commission for instance has not been under any department, and I do not think the railway commission, strictly speaking, is under any department. Consequently, it would be necessary to apply to an official of one of those commissions, and consequently, this Act must be applied to them.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Railway Commission is a permanent one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true, but if the others are of a temporary character the hon. gentleman's objection cannot be taken, because the officer of the department himself can make the affidavit.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why name these commissions at all? I see no necessity for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just to save expense.

Mr. McKENZIE: The only necessity for the amendment, if I understood the minister correctly, was to include the Auditor General's branch. Now this Parliament will be sitting from year to year, and if there is any need for widening the scope of the Act the need can be met as it arises. The only difficulty the minister has now is that the Auditor General's branch is not covered by

the present Act. Why not amend the Act to include that branch, and deal with further difficulties as they arise? The Canada Evidence Act is a pretty old one and I have never heard any complaint against it. I have always thought it was doing very well, but if it is found defective, we can amend it as the need arises. But do not say good-day to the devil before you meet him. I think that would be a much safer method, particularly when you are dealing with practice, for this has to do, not only with evidence, but with practice and procedure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems to me this is the simpler way. There is the same reason for this enactment in one branch of the service as in another. It will mean greater convenience and a saving of expense. The originals are open to be produced, and there is no obligation to make the affidavit.

Mr. BUREAU: The objection taken by my leader gives greater force to what I have suggested. We all know that there are commissions which are only of a temporary character. When those commissions have finished their work, their books will be turned over to some department of the Government, and will be in the care of an officer of that department who keeps books of a similar nature. This section provides for a certificate that the entry was made in the usual and ordinary course of business of such office. Now the man to whom these books are turned over cannot very well take this affidavit. I think it would cover the case if we said that the officer in charge of the books can give a certificate that a correct copy of the entry has been made. When a commission has ceased to exist, it is not possible for the officer of the department to which the books are turned over to certify that the entry has been made in the usual and ordinary course of business of such commission, but he can certify that a true copy of the entry has been made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the officer in whose charge the books come later cannot take an affidavit that the entry is made in the usual and ordinary course of business, the section would not apply to him. It would have to be done by the officer who could take the affidavit, and that is just what my hon. friend wants.

Mr. BUREAU: In that case the officer of the department would have to appear before the court, and the litigant would be put to considerable expense, which is what we want to avoid. If we saw that a certificate shall be given by the officer in charge of the books it would not be necessary to summon him before the court with a lot of books.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be making the Act far wider than we intended, and the leader of the Opposition himself is moving to make it narrower. I do not think we should make the Act so wide as that. I do not think a man who merely has the custody of the books and knows nothing about the entries should be allowed to make that affidavit. He could give a certificate, but he could not make an affidavit. Suppose the Food Board is closed, and its books are in the custody of the Department of Trade and Commerce. It will not be suggested that the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce should be allowed to certify or give evidence that an entry made in the books of the Food Board by somebody else two years before when they were not in his charge at all was made in the usual and ordinary course of business, and was consequently a correct entry, and that his certificate should be an effective evidence of that entry. That would be going too far to meet my commendation.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not asking that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If not, something pretty close to it.

Mr. BUREAU: What we want is the contents of the books as evidence. Why should not the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, for example, certify that the copy produced is an exact copy of what the book contains, and if necessary, supplement that certificate with an affidavit? That would give you as much information as the books themselves, the only difference being that one would be a copy, and the other the original. This certificate ought not to contain these words because he cannot say that the certificate, supplemented by an affidavit, would be sufficient evidence for the court.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is going a lot farther than I suggested we ought to go. If a man makes an affidavit and swears that the entry was made in the ordinary course of business, that is the extent to which we are asking the committee to go. The leader of the Opposition says that is too far. My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) says it is not far enough. I am in the happy position of being in between the two.

Mr. BUREAU: This section would only apply to living commissions. If a commission had gone the law would not apply?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section will apply to both. It deals with the books of the public service and the entries contained therein.

Mr. BUREAU: Of a commission actually in existence, but if the records of the food board are transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, this would not apply to any extract you might make from the books of the food board?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not unless there was somebody who could take that strict affidavit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think this drafting is very poor English. The words "in any office" must give the judicial interpretation to the clause. It says:—

A copy of any entry in any book kept in any office or department of the Government of Canada, or in any commission, board or other branch of the public service.

The words "in any office" must be understood in all those different places. If these commissions and boards are absorbed by departments they certainly have no offices and there is nothing kept in any office belonging to them; consequently there is no application of the principle of the amendment at all. I think the minister would be well advised if he would take that into consideration and see if he could not do without the use of the words "commission and boards."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would rob the Act of a very useful portion if I did so. I do not see any bad English in it, or that it could be improved, nor do I feel like recommending to the committee to strike out the words "or in any commission, board, or other branch of the public service." I think the strictest affidavit should be demanded, but the use of an affidavit as to every portion of the public service is based on the same principle as its use as to a part of the public service.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I not understand the minister to strike out the words "commission" or "board"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. DENIS: If we are not to understand that a copy can be made better than the original, I think the clause should be amended by adding to it the following words:

Provided in any case the original book containing such entry is still in existence and can be produced in support of the copy.

Supposing the original book has been destroyed, there would be no proof possible without a provision of this kind. If the original book has been destroyed, and by that fact proof of the contents of the original book has become impossible, are we going to make a copy of the book better than the original, or are we going to allow the original to live again or to be revived in the copy? This might lead to great injustice and fraud. Supposing copies are taken to-day from books which actually belong to a commission or board, now in existence, or out of existence but whose books are still available. Supposing different copies are taken from those books either with or without any special intention. It may afterwards happen that these books are destroyed by fire or otherwise. With this Bill as it is drafted, in a month, or a year, or in ten years from now, any witness could come along and say: Here is a copy taken from such and such a book which was then in existence but which does not exist any more. Then we would have to take it for granted that this copy was, as it purported to be, a true copy and was the actual representative of the entry that was made in the original book. We would have no possible means of ascertaining whether it was true or not. If the party who was using this copy wanted to commit a fraud of some kind, it could easily be done. I am presenting this argument on the principle of the statute of fraud which exists under the old French law and which was made to cover instances of this kind. The minister pointed out that there was no objection to using a copy with the object of giving it the same meaning and the same weight as might be attached to the original because the original could always be produced by a person who would think of denying the authenticity of the copy. The argument was well in point and it convinced me, but it does not bring me to the same conclusion when the original is destroyed and we have to take it for granted that it will be sufficient for any witness to come along and declare that this is a true copy. Such copy will then remain in the record as proof of an original book which does not exist and the asserted authenticity of which cannot be contradicted. I am not saying this with a view to criticising the minister but I would ask him as an eminent lawyer to give consideration to this point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid the acceptance of the point would do violence to the first principle of evidence. The hon. gentleman says that you should not be allowed to use a copy unless the original is

in existence at the time of use. Very clearly, the original must have been in existence at the time of use. Very clearly, the original must have been in existence at the time the copy was made or the affidavit could not have been taken. Now suppose the original has been destroyed or lost since. Upon what principle should we say that the sworn copy could not possibly be used as evidence in court? Why it is the best evidence that exists, and it is the best evidence that always must be used. It would be far better, of course, if the original were available and could be summoned in the event of a dispute as to the entry, but if it cannot be made available and if we have got the best evidence that there is, why rule out that evidence? What would be the result? You rule out the sworn copy and what have you left but the memory of some man who was in office and whose testimony could be produced in court. The hon. gentleman could go further and rule that out. If his amendment is right you might just as well relegate one class of evidence into oblivion with the other. However the rule in court is to take the best evidence that is available. Because the best is not quite good enough, do not destroy it. Yet that is the purpose of the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Section agreed to, and Bill reported.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the motion of the Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways) the House went into Committee—Mr. Boivin in the Chair—on the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the incorporation of Canadian National Railway Company, under which the railways, works and undertaking of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System may be consolidated, and together with the Canadian Government railways, may be operated as a national railway system; and to provide that the Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient, not less than five nor more than fifteen, to be directors of the said company, and upon such nomination being made the persons so nominated, and their successors, and such other persons as may from time to time be nominated by the Governor in Council as directors, shall be incorporated as a company; that provision be made for the tenure of office, removal and vacancies of directors; for annual meetings, for capital stock, with or without shares, vested in the Minister of Finance on behalf of His Majesty; for the location of the head office; for payment of directors by the company in such sums as the Governor in Council may approve; for limited responsibilities of the directors; for the making of by-laws and organizing the company; for an executive committee of the Board of Directors; and to provide that whenever under the provisions of the Railway Act, or any other statute or law, the approval, sanction or confirmation by shareholders is required, such approval, sanction or confirmation may be given by the Governor in Council; and further to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time by Order in Council entrust to the company the management and operation of any lines of railway or parts thereof, and any property or works of whatsoever description, or interests therein, and any powers, rights or privileges over or with respect to any railways, properties or works, or interests therein, which may be from time to time vested in or owned, controlled or occupied by His Majesty, or such part or parts thereof, or rights or interests therein, as may be designated in any Order in Council, upon such terms and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time decide; such management and operation to continue during the pleasure of the Governor in Council, and to be suject to termination or variation from time to time, in whole or in part, by the Governor in Council; that should His Majesty at any time heretofore have acquired or hereafter acquire the stock or the controlling interest in the stock of any railway company, or of any other company having corporate powers or properties which may be conveniently exercised or operated by the Company, the Governor in Council may transfer, or cause to be transferred, such capital stock or any part thereof to the Company, or may by proxies or otherwise enable the Company or any nominee of the Governor in Council to exercise the voting power thereof at any meeting of shareholders, upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine; and further to provide that the provisions of the Railway Act and of the Expropriation Act, with certain exceptions, and where not inconsistent with the proposed legislation, shall apply to the Company; that provision be made as to the signatures to and deposit of plans for lands taken under the Expropriation Act, and the compensation payable therefor; that notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or any other Act, the provisions of the Railway Act respecting the operation of a railway (as distinguished from the provisions of such Act respecting the construction or maintenance of a railway) shall apply to such of the Canadian Government Railways as would but for the passing of this proposed legislation be subject to the Government Railways Act, during such time as the operation and management thereof is entrusted to the Company under these enactments; that provision be made for actions, suits or other proceedings by or against the Company, and for appeals, and defences available to the respective corporations, including His Majesty; and also that notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, all expenses incurred in connection with the operation or management of the Canadian Government Railways under these provisions shall be paid out of the receipts and revenue of the Canadian Government Railways, and in the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the said Minister to be included in the estimates submitted to

Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year; and in the event of a surplus existing at the close of any fiscal year such surplus shall be paid into the said Fund; that provision be made for the fiscal year of the Canadian Government Railways; for declaring any of the Companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System to be works for the general advantage of Canada; for the abandonment of any line with the approval of the Governor in Council, and upon the recommendation of the Board of Railway Commissioners; and, with the consent of a majority of the registered security holders affected, dismantling or disposing of the same; for the extension of the time of commencement and completion of any line of railway of any Company comprised in the Canadian Northern System; for agreements with other Companies; for acquiring any securities issued by, or make advances to, or receive advances from, the Canadian Northern or any other Company in the Canadian Northern System, with other provisions relating to such advances and loans; for constructing and operating railway lines, branches and extensions with the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals; for the use of the name "Canadian National Railways" as collective or descriptive designation of all lines of railway or railway works under its control; and for the change of name of any Company comprised in the Canadian Northern System or of any other Company of which the properties or the controlling interest in the stock is vested in or held by His Majesty; for the issue of bonds, debentures, debenture stock, perpetual or terminable, or other securities; for the deposit and registration of mortgages, and instruments in any way affecting mortgages under section 140 of the Railway Act; for the Company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to acquire, hold and dispose of shares in the capital stock, bonds and securities of any railway company or other specified company; and for the construction or operation of the railway along highways, streets or other public places with the consent of the municipality.

Mr. BUREAU: This resolution occupies nearly two pages of print and it is so constructed as to form really only one sentence. If the Chairman is required to read it all in one breath, can he stand it? I do not think he can.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the Committee will dispense with the reading of it.

Mr. BUREAU: The resolution deals with a variety of subjects, and should be divided into paragraphs. As it stands it is very difficult for any one to comprehend without considerable study, especially one whose mother tongue is not English.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is proposed to incorporate a company to be called the Canadian National Railway Company, which will operate the existing Government railways, the Canadian Northern system. and any railway which may hereafter be acquired by the Government. The Bill to be introduced after the passage of this resolution will contain thirty clauses.

Mr. BUREAU: And this resolution consists of but one phrase.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Bill provides for the appointment of a number of directors, and deals with capital stock, head office of the company, and various other matters.

Mr. BUREAU: If the members of the Committee were in possession of copies of the Bill it would be a good help. I suppose the Bill is based on this resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. I would like to have the resolution adopted so that the Bill might be printed and distributed among the members, thus enabling them to study the details of what is proposed.

Mr. BUREAU: But if we adopt the resolution we commit ourselves to all that it contains. There are certain features of it which are not in the public interest, to which I am absolutely opposed, and against which I desire to enter a protest.

Mr. J. D. REID: By adopting the resolution, hon. gentleman commit themselves to the principle of incorporating a company or organization to operate all the Government railways, but not to the details of the proposed legislation. There will be sections bringing the Government lines under control of the Railway Commissioners, and making the position of the Government lines correspond to, say, that of the Canadian Pacific, in so far as control by the Railway Commissioners is concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: If there is nothing proposed here that differs from the organization of an ordinary railway company I have no objection to offer. But I would remind the hon. gentleman that the general Railway Act gives ample power with respect to every imaginable position in which a railway company may find itself. I do not object to the incorporation of a special company to take over the management of a national system of railways, but surely if the existing legislation is ample for the regulation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all other railway lines which have come into existence since it was incorporated, it ought to be sufficient with respect to the Government railways or any new lines which may hereafter be brought under Government control. Outside the ordinary procedure which is followed by any private company when it wants the authority to operate a railway, I do not see that any special legislation is needed here.

Mr. J. D. REID: I had the solicitors of the department prepare this Bill on the lines suggested by the hon. member; that is, taking as a model the charter of a privately owned company like the Canadian Pacific railway, and altering it as necessary to make it applicable to a Government owned railway. Possibly when the Bill comes before the House we may have to change its form, but the whole object of this measure is to organize a company to operate all our Government railway systems, and to take in other railways that we may purchase or lease in the future. Of course, it would be much better for the members to have the Bill in its printed form as I have submitted it. I do not think this resolution commits hon. members to the details of the Bill that I have in mind, but I suppose the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is right in stating that it may possibly commit them to the policy of a different organization for carrying on the administration of our railways. It is necessary to have some changes; for instance, one of the clauses of the Bill which will come up for discussion deals with the operation of the Intercolonial railway. In the past the revenues of that railway have been deposited to the credit of the Hon. Receiver General, then a certain amount each month has been sent to Moncton, to be paid out by the officials there. Now, the revenues of the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental and our other railways will, according to this Bill, go into one fund, and the operating expenses will be paid out of that fund. I do not see how we can possibly operate our railways as a uniform system unless we adopt some such plan. Then the Intercolonial railway will have to be put under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners; and there are many other matters in connection with our Government railways. All I ask is to have the resolution passed so that the Bill may be printed and gone into thoroughly, and if it needs amendment I will be very glad to consider any suggestion from hon. members.

Mr. BUREAU: We will see how we get along.

Mr. McMASTER: It does seem to me that before we take up this resolution we should have some clear cut pronouncement from the Government as to what the future railway policy of this country is to be. Are we to have a policy of public ownership; or are we going, as far as we can, to have a policy of private ownership? I quite understand that at the present time the Government have been forced to take over certain railways, and they may be forced to take over others. But this is a matter of extreme difficulty and one which demands the greatest care, attention and study, and we will be able to understand it a great deal better if we can have a clear cut pronouncement.

Mr. J. D. REID: Whether we want to or not we have got public ownership to the extent of thirteen or fourteen thousand miles of railway, and the object of this Bill is to provide a means of operating as one uniform system the various railways composing that mileage. Therefore the introduction of this proposed Bill would not affect our present position so far as public ownership is concerned in relation to our present Government railways. The passing of this resolution does not really pass the Bill; the latter is there for the Committee to consider. There will be plenty of opportunities to discuss the question of policy mentioned by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) when the Railway Estimates are before the House. I have Estimates to the amount of about $80,000,000 to be passed in connection with our Government railways, and then will be the proper time to bring up the question of policy. This Bill is only to provide for the operation of the railways already under our control, and whether we want public ownership or not we have got it in relation to those lines. I do not think that there is the least chance of transferring our present Government Railway system back to private ownership, and consequently we have to provide some means of operating that system.

Mr. McKENZIE: Last year the hon. Minister of Railways put a resolution on the Order Paper asking the House to vote some millions of dollars to be expended by his officers out of the revenues of the Government railways without the expenditure being passed upon by Parliament. That resolution raised such a storm of protest from both sides of this House that the hon. minister withdrew it. Now we have the same thing this year in the form of a Bill. A Bill is to be introduced to form a company, and that company is to take charge of all the revenues of our Government owned railways and spend those moneys according to its best judgment, without having regard to the will of this House at all. I am absolutely opposed to any proceeding of that kind It may be inconvenient and may involve

a lot of work to have this House deal with details of that kind, but I submit, Sir, that we as representatives of the people cannot pass over our responsibilities to any irresponsible body. I was never very much in favour of public ownership, but it does not matter whether I am in favour of it or not, I fully agree with the hon. minister that we have this state of affairs on our hands now and we have to make the best of it. But I feel that I am responsible to my constituents to see that the expenditure of public moneys is such as to give the country the best possible value, and whether the expenditure be on wharves or harbours or railways, I submit that we, as representing the people of Canada, should have our hands on the purse strings and that not a dollar of public money should be expended except as authorized by this House. That is my view, and I think it is only proper to state it to the hon. minister; and I am not talking here for anybody but myself at the present moment. I cannot agree to the principle that public moneys are to be passed over to an irresponsible body in the shape of a corporation, which after it is incorporated will have full discretion, and we will not have the slightest control over it at all. That is not my idea of public ownership. Public ownership means that the people, represented by the members of this House, shall have control over those expenditures, except as they may delegate their powers to some board or commission of management. Politics is the science of government. When people say: "We must take this matter out of politics," they mean that it shall be taken away from patronage, graft, or mismanagement. I am willing that works of this kind shall be taken out of politics in that sense, but I do not agree that the people who own and operate enterprises shall have nothing to say about their management. Politics must exist in public ownership in so far as that involves the fullest possible control by the people. If this proposed organization is put in charge of the railroads owned by Canada, that is the end of our control over them. I am bound to tell the minister that I cannot commit myself to this proposal.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern Railway Company, owned by the people, are collecting their revenues and making expenditures without any orders from and without any Act of Parliament. The different railways owned by the Government have different ways of collecting revenue and making expenditures, and it is necessary to get one uniform system. Let us, therefore, get the Bill before the House in order that we may have a discussion on each clause. The proposals embodied in the Bill may not meet with the wishes of the House or of the Committee. In my judgment, it is the best way of handling the situation, but the House may think differently, and I am willing to amend the Bill in any way that the House may think appropriate.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the object of the resolution, then?

Mr. J. D. REID: Under Rule 77, any Bill involving an expenditure of public moneys must be preceded by a resolution. That is the only reason why the resolution is on the Order Paper.

Mr. McMASTER: I hope the minister will not think me unduly insistent when I ask for a declaration of the policy of the Government. Public ownership, whether we wish it or not, has been imposed upon the people. If we were holding the railways only with the idea of disposing of them to private companies in, perhaps, as short a time as possible, one particular kind of organization might be better than another; but if we made up our minds to adopt the permanent policy of the public ownership of railways, some different system of organization would be necessary. The Government therefore, should state clearly whether they are for the principle of Government ownership as a definite policy for Canada. I know that that involves a heavy responsibility. There is a tremendous amount to be said on both sides of the question; if it were important that my views should be known, I should be sorry to have to declare myself at the present moment either for or against the principle. But after all, that is the responsibility of the Government; the port that they are steering for should be made known to the people before we are asked to vote for a resolution of this kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know just how many years ahead the hon. member thinks we should place ourselves in order to determine the port. I think the Government is well advised to take its bearings by ports that are in sight, not to fix a policy with reference to yet unborn decades. So far as there is any necessity of stating policy, the Government's policy as to railways has been stated and repeated over and over again. As to the roads that we now own, our policy is to continue to own them and to operate

them; we have no intention of selling them to any private corporation. Certain roads we do not own. The Grand Trunk Pacific is one; our policy as to that has been brought down to the House, and we are engaged in the carrying out of that policy. The Grand Trunk is another; we have stated repeatedly our policy as to the Grand Trunk; we have stated what we are doing. The Canadian Pacific is another; the Government has not intimated to Parliament any intention of acquiring the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not know what more the hon. gentleman desires; I certainly do not know what more is necessary to the consideration of this resolution. Every time the subject of railways is mentioned in Parliament, is the Government, as to its policy, to see years or centuries ahead? All the Government has to do is to adjust its course with reference to circumstances now known; we have stated our course with reference to all railway circumstances now known. All that is necessary to a consideration of this Bill is a determination of the question whether it is the part of wisdom to operate such roads as we now and may in the future own under the system set out and by the principle clearly defined in this Bill, namely, by the establishment of a holding and operating company, the Canadian National Railways.

5 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: We own railways; we are meeting, so to speak, as shareholders. When we are considering anything bearing on the management of the roads which we own, we have a right to know where we stand as a body of people owning a certain property. We have taken over the Canadian Northern, with its various branches and ramifications.

Would the minister be able to tell us just what responsibility the Canadian people have assumed financially in taking over that road? The minister would, of course, have no difficulty in giving us the mileage of the road, and he might tell us if we are operating the full mileage that we took over. What does he think the rolling stock of the road is now worth, and does he say that the road is fairly well equipped as regards rolling stock? How much money have we expended on equipment since we took over the road, and how much money does he think necessary for operation and equipment during the current financial year? How do receipts and expenditures balance as regards the operations of the Canadian Northern as apart from the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental? What is the whole indebtedness that is now upon the Canadian Northern, and what is the present indebtedness per mile, without taking into account any assets, because whether there are assets at all or not, is another matter?

Without repeating what I have said about the Canadian Northern, I should like to have the same information as regards the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. The people of Canada, and in particular hon. members here, when we are dealing with this very important subject and entering upon further management of the railway and thinking about a change in the management, should be furnished with full and complete information. Laying information of that character on the table of the House is a very poor way of giving it to hon. members, because they really do not get it at all, as it is not easy to get copies made of documents that are laid on the Table and filed in one of the offices of the House. Such information should be brought down, read in the House and put upon Hansard. In that way every hon. member and also the newspapers would have an opportunity of seeing it. This information should be put at our disposal before we commence to discuss seriously the future policy of Canada as regard public ownership and operation of railways. I do not profess to be a railway operator, but we have for a long time been accustomed to the machinery that we had in managing the finances of the Intercolonial railway. Many people may smile at the Intercolonial railway and say that it was not a success, but it has been doing a great deal of good and has been a splendid institution for the whole of Canada, particularly older Canada. That, however, has nothing to do with the matter of getting in the revenue and paying out the money necessary for operating the road and for its extensions and rolling stock. We in the House are used to that system; we understand it; we know how it is operated. For myself, I cannot understand why the rest of the railway should not be operated, so far as finances are concerned, under the same method. There may be a better policy and a better way of making money; but as regards the incoming of revenue and the outgoing of expenditure, I do not see the necessity of amending the machinery and making things more difficult. I am in favour of a simple, straightforward, clean-cut way of dealing with public matters, so that he who runs may read, and I am op-

posed to complications. I understand that I can be answered as regards this, that there are securities, such as bonds and other floating liabilities, that are now outstanding in connection with the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific and that are now being carried along by the machinery of those companies, and that it is necessary to keep that machinery going in order to keep afloat those securities. Any person who holds those securities as against any of those companies would be only too glad to accept the undertaking of the Government, wherever we have to meet in full those responsibilities. Wherever we are not responsible at all, we should wipe those things out of existence and not bother further with them, if that is all that is standing in the way. This method of carrying along and seeing to the operation of twenty or thirty companies in connection with property owned by one body, namely the Government of this country as representing the Canadian people, is extremely clumsy. They should all be put under one management, so that we would all know what we are doing and how the matter stands. That is why I am in favour of a simple and comprehensive method of operating the road, with only one ownership and one paymaster.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) asked what responsibility we took in connection with the purchase of the Canadian Northern railway. As a lawyer he knows that we simply purchased the stock, and there is no obligation other than to continue to operate the road. He is entitled to and must have the information he requested in connection with the whole railway system, comprising the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental. But I do not see how that affects this resolution, as we can furnish that information when we take up the Estimates or when we are in committee on the Bill to be founded on this resolution. The way he suggests of operating all the railway systems that we now have or may have hereafter is the way in which we have been operating the Intercolonial railway in the past, that is, by the Department of Railways. The hon. member knows that there has been a great deal of criticism on the part of the people on account of the Intercolonial railway being operated by that department. No matter what minister was in charge, there were always insinuations that there was patronage and favouritism. How could the hon member expect a department of railways to operate 15,000 or 20,000 miles of railway? I should not like to have the job. The Intercolonial railway was enough for any one man, and I do not know what will happen if the Department of Railways has to operate this whole mileage. It would not be in the interest of the railways or of the public. These railways should be operated by a board of the very best men in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under the department.

Mr. J. D. REID: Certainly, they are practically officials of the department.

Mr. McKENZIE: The directors of this company will not be.

Mr. J. D. REID: They will be appointed by the Government, and we should have men in whom the people would have the utmost confidence. They must make their reports to Parliament, and when this Bill is before the House, if it is necessary to insert in the Bill other clauses than those I have provided regarding the furnishing of reports, we can amend the Bill accordingly. I submit, however, that it is hardly fair to ask that this resolution stand. Before the Bill founded on this resolution is taken up again I can give all the information that has been asked for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope that when the Bill is brought down my hon. friend will restore to Parliament some of its rights. I have observed the phraseology of the resolution and notice that in almost every three lines the Governor in Council is practically given authority to run the whole national system of railways. We are at the beginning of a new era in railway operation in Canada. I understand that the great railway systems in this country are to be nationalized, and I appeal to my hon. friend to respect the rights of Parliament more than has been done in the past. If the people of Canada are to control the large railway systems, it seems to me Parliament should have a say in the matter; it should not be left entirely to the Governor in Council. The resolution provides, for instance, that "the Governor in Council may from time to time by Order in Council entrust to the company the management and operation of any lines of railway or parts thereof, and any property or works of whatsoever description, or interests therein." Surely Parliament should be consulted when new systems of railways are to be acquired. It is the people who are paying for the acquisition of these railway systems, and

the Governor in Council should not have exclusive authority in these large matters.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Bill will not give the Governor in Council power to acquire railways without Parliament being consulted. We could not take over the Grand Trunk Pacific, for instance, without first getting the approval of Parliament. Our object is this: After having acquired a railway system, the stock will be transferred to this company, our own company, which will operate the road.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should not Parliament, instead of the Governor in Council, determine the way it shall be operated?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is a question for the House to decide.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a question that we want explained on the resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: If we acquired the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific we should have to introduce legislation for the approval of Parliament, and Parliament would have the power to say whether the road should be operated separately or not. If, however, we acquired the Grand Trunk Pacific in the same way that we acquired the Canadian Northern, this present legislation would give the Governor in Council power to declare the road a part of the national system. If we did not have that power, the road would have to be operated separately from the national system.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have studied the phraseology of the resolution, which I find very obscure. Although I hope my hon. friend is right, it seems to me that I am right. If we are to have a new system of state-owned railways, the Government should come to Parliament with a clear-cut measure—with a new charter for the taxpayers of Canada—and the right should be reserved to Parliament, who are the elect of the people, to pass upon such important legislation. It is legislation not only for a few years, but for all time to come. I am really alarmed at the powers which the resolution seeks to give to the Governor in Council, and the way it ignores the representatives of the people.

There is another point. The resolution provides:

> —and also, that notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, all expenses incurred in connection with the operation or management of the Canadian Government railways under these provisions shall be paid out of the receipts and revenue of the Canadian Government railways, and in the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the said minister to be included in the estimates submitted to Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year.

I am afraid this is not in accordance with business principles. In an important matter of this kind, involving thousands and thousands of miles of railway, we should have a clear-cut system; we should know what our requirements and our estimated expenditure will be. The directors should not be empowered to spend any moneys that have not been provided for by this Parliament. I stand for the rights of Parliament and, I repeat, I am positively alarmed at the liberties taken by the Government at the expense of the Parliament of Canada.

Another feature of this resolution which I hope my hon. friend will explain is this: Are we or are we not going to acquire a certain number of railways? We are acquiring two transcontinentals, practically, and their branch lines. I see that the resolution provides for the abandonment of any line with the approval of the Governor in Council. My hon. friend must explain what is the meaning of that feature of the resolution. You cannot expect, if you acquire a transcontinental, that you will run only the paying sections; you must run trains not only on the main line but on the branch lines as well. Would it be fair to the people if, after you have acquired the transcontinentals or the main lines, you should then, by a stroke of the pen, without consulting the representatives of the people in these special districts, abandon some of the branch lines? You provide for this in the resolution. Here is the phraseology:

> That provision be made for the fiscal year of the Canadian Government railways; for declaring any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System to be works for the general advantage of Canada; for the abandonment of any line with the approval of the Governor in Council, and upon the recommendation of the Board of Railway Commissioners; and, with the consent of a majority of the registered security holders affected, dismantling or disposing of the same.

This strikes me as being a very dangerous power, and I hope that when my hon. friend comes before the House with his Bill he will make it clearer than it appears by the resolution. By all means let my hon. friend restore to the Parliament of Canada the rights which are being invaded by this resolution. I know that you cannot run the Government without Orders in Council and

without the Governor in Council, but when you are framing a new policy of a most important nature, namely, the nationalization of the railway system of Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific railway, you should come, so to speak, with a new charter and not take unto yourselves the whole wisdom of the people. We have not yet surrendered our rights. We speak for the people of Canada. The question of transportation is one of the utmost importance, and the people should have their say. I know that wide powers should be given the Board of Directors, but that board should be amenable to the representatives of the people. Otherwise it could not be the people's railway; it would be the railway of the board of directors governing and directing entirely the administration through Orders in Council. If the people are willing at present—and I think they are in that mood; it may only be a passing mood—to give their consent to the principle of nationalization, they are not going to surrender their right to have a say in the matter of administration. When the Bill is introduced, respect for the rights of the people should be more pronounced than is apparent from this resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is unnecessarily alarmed. When he reads the Bill he will find that it does not proceed along the line suggested by him. He objects to the money for operating purposes being paid to the company and not to consolidated fund account as in the past. Of course, there are only the two ways of doing it—either pay the money into consolidated fund or to the railway company. If you pay into the consolidated fund, as has been done in the past with the Intercolonial and Transcontinental, you must come to the House with an estimate of expenditures and the money will be paid out from time to time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not?

Mr. J. D. REID: If we do that with the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and, if we take it over, the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of the money being paid into the corporations as has been done in the past, or into one corporation, it will have to be paid into the consolidated fund and then we will have to pay that money out from time to time according to the calls made. It would hardly be workable, in the interest of the railway or the country, to pay such a large amount into the consolidated fund and then pay it out again, as we did with the Intercolonial railway. But this is a matter for the consideration of the Committee, and if there is any objection to the plan proposed, or if the Committee think that the other way is better, we can change it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The difficulty is that the minister has no check on the expenditure. How is he going to control the payments if the matter is left altogether in the hands of the railway company?

Mr. J. D. REID: The expenditures were made in that way on the Intercolonial railway. What difference will it make whether the money for operation is paid into the consolidated fund or to the credit of the company? If paid into the consolidated fund we would simply have to pay out each month so many millions of dollars to their credit and let them spend it in operation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Intercolonial is not in the same position as the Canadian Northern; it is directly under Government management.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know. We could check the expenditure when the accounts were laid on the table of the House at the end of the year. If necessary we could have that in the Bill.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: In the meantime the money is paid out.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was on the Intercolonial, too. The revenue was collected and we did not know anything about the expenditure until a year afterwards. However, both ways of doing it can be considered when the Bill is before the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is this difference, that on the Intercolonial system we discuss what is to become of the money before it is paid out. Under the system now proposed we would be discussing the matter after the money is paid—a very striking difference.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course there will be an item in the Estimates for expenditure upon our railways, and the railway situation could be discussed each session. It is a big question, and I want the assistance of every member of the House to determine whether there could be any improvement in the proposed method of dealing with it. But before that is done I must introduce the Bill in what I consider to be the best way.

The hon. member has raised a question

in regard to the possible abandonment of railway lines. That question is very important, because if we take over the Grand Trunk railway it may not be in the interest of the country that we should operate parallel lines. I have in mind the stretch of line between Kingston or Napanee and Toronto, where three railways are operated. The Grand Trunk has a double track system through this territory, also the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern, and all the lines run side by side and in close proximity. It may be in the interest of the country to take up one of those lines.

Mr. BUREAU: I suppose that is to enable them to get in and out of cities.

Mr. J. D. REID: No, the line is two hundred miles long.

Mr. BUREAU: And do the lines run side by side?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, within five hundred feet of each other. Now, as a protection or safeguard, the Bill will contain provisions that in the event of the abandonment of a line of railway the consent of a majority of the security holders and of the Railway Commission must be obtained.

Hon. gentlemen will see that a railway cannot be abandoned simply on the authority of an Order in Council; the Board of Railway Commissioners must say whether that railway is necessary or not in the interests of the country, and whether or not its operation should be discontinued. I have spoken of the railways operating between Toronto and Napanee, but there may be other places in Canada where it is not in the public interest that the operation of two or three parallel railway systems should be continued.

Mr. McKENZIE: The provision that the consent of a majority of the owners of the railway securities must be obtained simply means the Minister of Finance. That is no protection at all.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is a legal question, and as to that I would not pit my opinion against the hon. gentleman's. If there is anything in his contention the defect can be remedied in the Bill itself.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would like to say a word or two with respect to the question of financing the Canadian National railways when they become organized, as we hope they will be. If hon. members will separate in their minds the question of operating costs from the question of capital expenditure they will be able to arrive at a conclusion as to the only means by which a railway can be financed in its operation. I am not familiar personally with the methods which have been followed in the past in regard to the Intercolonial, but from a perusal of its records I do not think the system that has been followed on that railway has been of such an ideal character that it should be taken as a pattern for the future. If we are going to acquire and operate twenty thousand miles of transcontinental railway lines, for the Parliament of Canada to undertake to vote in its estimates each year the funds sufficient to carry on the operation of those railways satisfactorily will be utterly impossible. The operating costs of a railway bear an exact relation to the amount of traffic that is moved. It runs, as a rule to from sixty-eight to seventy-eight per cent of the gross income, and the gross income of Canadian railways, indeed of railways all over the world, varies from year to year to the extent of millions of dollars, nay, tens of millions of dollars. The income and operating expenses of the Canadian railways in 1919 may not be any greater than seventy-five per cent of what they were in 1918, being entirely dependent on the commercial prosperity of the country. How then are you going to determine, twelve months ahead, what it would cost to operate the system of Canadian National Railways? What should be done is for the operating officers to pay the operating costs out of the revenue as it is received. That is the method which is followed by every railway company in Canada or in any other part of the world. Take the annual report of any one of our great railway companies and you will not find either the stockholders at the annual meeting, or the directors at the monthly meeting, undertaking to determine what funds are to be paid out for the ensuing period for operation. The stockholders at their annual meeting confirm the recommendations of the directors as to the capital expenditure; and it seems to me, when we are proposing legislation, that before anything definite is done in connection with incorporating a company or a board of trustees to manage and operate the Canadian National Railway System, we should provide that the fixing of the amount of capital stock, the projection of new lines, the acquisition of new railway stock, and all these things should be passed upon by Parliament as representatives of the people, and at the same time should make a com-

plete review of the operation of the road for the preceding year to see what our employees—because they will be our employees—have been doing with the money they have secured from operation, giving us a complete statement of the operating expenditures and revenue returns. If hon. gentlemen will examine the question I believe they will find that that is the only method by which they can successfully transmit to any independent or semi-independent body the operation of our Canadian National Railways.

Now, a point in connection with the authority which is vested in the Governor in Council, and the elimination of politics. We may become as idealistic as we like, but in the final analysis the Governor in Council, as the executive of Parliament, will have to be responsible, and it is through them that authority will have to be transmitted to the board of management of the operating company. You can designate it in any terms you like, but in the last analysis the Government must be responsible, and if the management of the railways is not efficient, it is not the management that the Canadian people are going to criticise, the Government and Parliament will be held responsible by the people. We cannot delegate that responsibility to anybody else. As a layman with a limited knowledge of railway matters, I cannot see that Parliament is delegating any of its authority, because the Government is responsible to Parliament for its every act, and if Parliament is not satisfied it has the means to chastise the Government.

Mr. NESBITT: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) with reference to the financial matter, but not with reference to the other part. I had hoped that the Government would adopt the principle of appointing a commission of, say, five highly qualified railroad men to manage our national railways on a business basis, those men to be nominated by the Cabinet, but appointed by Parliament, and with the Finance Minister ex-officio, the whole body to be subject to Parliament only. So long as the management is under the Governor in Council, so long will every employee who feels aggrieved know that all he has to do is to appeal through his political friends or otherwise to the Governor in Council for some remedy. The Governor in Council is too close to the management to eliminate political influence, and as long as that influence is allowed to creep in, my judgment is that you will not, and can not, have successful management. Unless you can in some way eradicate the influence of politics, or of members of Parliament, from the business management, as is done by the Canadian Pacific, you will not have successful management. As long as the management is under the control of the Governor in Council you will have politics and members interfering.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Assuming that the Government and Parliament do appoint such a commission, and that the Government and Parliament find, as many railway companies have heretofore found, that they have been mistaken in their selections and have apponited such a class of men, for instance, as the owners of the Grand Trunk selected to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific, then what?

Mr. NESBITT: At the next session of Parliament put them out for cause. Just like the Railway Board is now constituted; its members are not subject to dismissal, except for cause, during their ten year term.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: That is just exactly the point. Parliament might appoint these men and keep them there so long as they are efficient; but Parliament can never delegate its authority to those men absolutely; Parliament through the Government, must retain authority to dismiss these men if they are not doing their duty.

Mr. NESBITT: I did not think for a moment that Parliament would not have that power.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. BUREAU: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a couple of questions of the hon. Minister of Railways first. The principle of public ownership of Canadian railways is that the people of Canada own and operate those railways through officers, and whatever deficit there may be at the end of the year the people have to pay. Now, the people are represented by their members of Parliament, are they not? And the members of Parliament are the proxies of the shareholders of our public owned railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is right.

Mr. BUREAU: I find in this resolution a principle which overthrows that. It states:

—and to provide that whenever under the provisions of the Railway Act, or any other statute or law, the approval, sanction or con-

firmation by shareholders is required, such approval, sanction or confirmation may be given by the Governor in Council.

May I ask the hon. minister the reason why Parliament should delegate to the Governor in Council the power which they ought to exercise here in performing those duties which they assumed to perform and fulfil when they were elected?

Mr. J. D. REID: Does the hon. member mean in connection with operation?

Mr. BUREAU: The resolution says:

That whenever by the Railway Act or any other Act the approval, confirmation or sanction of the shareholders of the company is required, this approval shall be delegated.

I assume that my proposition is correct, that the shareholders are the people of Canada, and that the proxies of the people of Canada are the hon. members who sit in this House. Then why should the hon. Minister of Railways ask us, as members of Parliament, and as proxies of the people, to delegate to the Governor in Council the power that is given to us by the Railway Act or any other Act whenever we should take the responsibility of acting?

Mr. J. D. REID: What part?

Mr. BUREAU: The fifth line from the bottom of the page of the long sentence which is composed of 1,127 words.

An hon. MEMBER: Thirteen hundred.

Mr. BUREAU: I missed 200; it does not make any difference.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is power to acquire the securities of other companies?

The company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to acquire, hold and dispose of shares in the capital stock, bonds and securities of any railway company or other specified company.

That is what the hon. member means?

Mr. BUREAU: No. It is at the bottom of the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER: This bears out my suggestion of yesterday that this long sentence should be cut up into paragraphs.

Mr. J. D. REID: What that means is this: the shareholders are the people of Canada. You could not call Parliament together every time it was necessary to have a meeting; therefore the Governor in Council would have to give the necessary approval.

Mr. BUREAU: I know what it means; that is why I object to it. Your Act is certainly going to provide for annual general or special general meetings; you are not going to call Parliament together for the purpose of ratifying trifling things. But when the law provides that the ratification, confirmation or sanction of the shareholders is required, it is only in extreme and important cases—

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman can see at a glance what that means. If we acquire stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and want to transfer it to this company, it is done by the consent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the false theory that my hon. friend propounded a moment ago. If you are going to purchase the stock of a railway company to acquire the road you ought to provide in the law what you are going to do with the railway and how it is going to be operated. And then you will have to amend this Act, if you now lay down the principle that under this Bill the Governor in Council shall have the right to say how the railway so taken over shall be operated.

Mr. J. D. REID: You will see when the Bill is brought down.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

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

After Recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LACHINE, JACQUES CARTIER, AND MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House in Committee on Bill No. 14, respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company—Mr. Lemieux—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—extension of time for construction.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): The Railway Committee amended this section by inserting a provision which we are putting into Railway Bills, namely, that the company must within two years of the passing of this Bill, construct 25 miles of railway, and construct not less than 25 miles more each year until the railway is completed. I have been informed that this line is only about thirteen or fourteen miles long, and I have, therefore, been asked to have this amendment struck out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This is only a loop line, and the amendment is, therefore, not worth

while. I move that the amendment added by the Committee on Railways and Canals be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 55, to change the name of the Canada Accident Assurance Company to "The Canada Accident and Fire Insurance Company."—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 56, for the relief of Eva St. Lawrence Cronk.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 57, for the relief of Helena Clara Gabriel.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill No. 58, for the relief of Gretna Harris Hawkins.—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

Bill No. 59, for the relief of Samuel Burgoyne.—Mr. Smith (Ontario).

Bill No. 60, for the relief of James Arthur McGregor.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of William Lewes Evans.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Richard Wilson Crashley.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 63, respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy.

Bill No. 64, respecting the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tweedie.

Bill No. 65, to incorporate the Northwest Route, Limited.—Mr. Boys.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resumed in Committee on the resolution for the incorporation of the Canadian National Railway Company.—Hon. J. D. Reid.—Mr. Boivin in the chair.

Mr. CAHILL: Before bringing in this resolution I think the Minister of Railways would have done well to follow the advice of the present Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) and also of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) when this subject was under debate in 1917. That this company when formed should be removed as far as possible from political control, they both went so far as to say that Parliament should have the sole control. But here we are undertaking to manage thirteen or fourteen thousand miles of railway, and thousands of employees, as a purely political machine. This legislation would give the Minister of Railways the right to appoint and dismiss directors as he desired. I agree with the hon. member who spoke before recess that this problem should be carefully worked out so that we can get the best possible results from this railway system. It is a huge undertaking. It is the first time in the history of the world that such a large railway system has been put in the hands of a government as a government-owned proposition. The history of public ownership in Australia has been that the roads were managed in the first place by a department of the government, and failed. Then they were turned over to a commission, and succeeded fairly well. Later the roads were taken out of the hands of the commission and put back in the hands of the government, and made another failure, and they are now back in the hands of a commission. The same is true of Italy. All the private-owned roads were taken over by the state, but were afterwards turned over to private ownership after public ownership had failed. The roads were again taken over by the state and managed by a commission; again handed back to private ownership, and again taken over by a commission. The same is true of Belgium. In fact, the only country where public ownership of railways has been a success, so far as I can learn from the books in the library of Parliament and the Ottawa library, is Prussia, where the roads were managed purely as a military machine. It was a success there because every employee of the road was under military rule while in railway employ. They charged exorbitant rates and were able in that way to make a profit for the government.

I do not believe it is the intention that we should go into public ownership of railways in this country as a profit-making business—that we should charge exorbitant rates to make a profit. I rather think that the intention of the Government, if they have a defined policy in the matter, would be to give the lowest possible rates consistent with making the road pay. Regardless of what the management may be, I think it would be the intention to increase the rates until the system paid. Unless they intend to do that they must ask the taxpayers of Canada to make good the deficits, and that brings up the question: Is it right that the taxpayers should make up for inefficiency in management, or because freight and passenger rates were not sufficient to make the roads pay? Personally, I think the people who use the railroads should pay rates sufficient to meet the carrying charges of the roads. If the system is to be handled purely as a political machine, as it is now, it is foredoomed to failure, there is no question about that.

That has been the experience of every nation in the world that has attempted to operate a railway system on that basis. When the minister says it is impossible to take the system out of the hands of the Government, that is true to some extent, but it is possible to leave the system under the control of Parliament and not directly under the control of the minister. For instance, a committee might be set up of ten from the Government and five from the Opposition side, five from the railway employees, and five from the Railway Commission, which would name the directors; the directors in turn would be responsible to Parliament. If you select five men, and they in their discretion decide to select two more, let them have power to do so. Surely out of five or seven men there would not be more than one or two who should be dismissed between the prorogation and the reassembling of Parliament. We ought to get five or six of the best railway men to be had in Canada. I would not advocate going outside of Canada, because I think our railway problems are peculiar to this country. I would pay these men good salaries, as much as, or perhaps a little more than, private roads would pay them, and the roads should be managed at a profit. After the system had been put in the hands of a commission, some conclusion should be reached as to the capitalization of the roads. In arriving at the proper capitalization, a fair basis would be to take the present value. For instance, if the roads have cost the country $8,000,000, but are found by a competent commission to be worth only $5,000,000, adopt that as the basis on which you expect money to be earned.

Then I would suggest that the employees be given the opportunity of participating in the profits. After putting aside sufficient for ordinary maintenance and upkeep of the railways, the employees should receive ten per cent of the first one per cent net earned; on the second one per cent, twelve per cent; on the third one per cent, fifteen per cent; on the fourth one per cent, eighteen per cent; on the fifth one per cent, twenty-one per cent, and on the six one per cent, twenty-four per cent. That would give the employees one per cent of the net profits after the road had earned six per cent clear of running expenses and upkeep. Some hon. gentlemen may say there would be no profits. I am afraid that under the proposed plan there would be no profits. The system should be put in the hands of an independent commission, and should be put on a basis on which it could hope to earn money, because, after all, we must expect to catch up with this thing some time. Then make a division of the profits with the employees, including every man from the directors down, who would be permanent so far as possible and devote their whole time to the road. Divide up one per cent among all the directors, officers and employees of the road, after six per cent had been earned clear of operating expenses and upkeep, and I would say that after six per cent the employees should receive twenty-five per cent of each one per cent net earnings, until the commission decided that the earnings were sufficient to justify a lowering of the rates. In that way the system would be taken out of politics as far as possible, and yet would be subject to parliamentary control. Parliament, after all, is the supreme body in this country, and if we found that the arrangement did not work satisfactorily, something else might be tried. I repeat that the plan proposed in this resolution has been tried in every country that has undertaken public ownership of railways, and has made a failure in every country except Germany.

It is a foregone conclusion that it will be a failure here. I remember that a few days ago the minister was asked in the House what quantity of ties was being obtained from the Northern Construction Company. Hon. members from Western Canada will know who the Northern Construction Company are. They are Mackenzie & Mann, the people who are at the present moment the controllers of the Canadian Northern railway. They have their employees, who have been with them for years, working as contractors and managing the contracts of the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would like to correct the hon. gentleman there. Mackenzie & Mann, the two men from whom the stock was purchased, are not in any way connected with the Northern Construction Company, and, as far as I understand, never were.

Mr. CAHILL: The Northern Construction Company is well known to be the Mackenzie & Mann people who built practically the whole Canadian Northern railway through Western Canada. Any man from Western Canada knows that. When the question was asked here by my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Proulx), the minister said:

> It is not in the public interest to give this information.

We are going to spend tens of millions of dollars on these railway projects, and the

minister is going to ask for $75,000,000 or $80,000,000 this year. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, you can readily understand what the position will be if when we ask him about these expenditures he will reply to us that it is not in the public interest that we should know from whom the company buy their ties, what company is acting as contractors for the construction of the new roads that they propose building, or from whom they are buying their rolling stock or the hundred and one things which railway companies must buy. In the present instance the company bought from some person whose identity the minister does not want to disclose; otherwise he would be willing to answer that question. That is where this railway proposition is going to land us,—it is going to develop into a political machine operated by political parties, and the same people who have been robbing this country for the last quarter of a century are going to continue to get graft out of the Canadian Northern and the Government railways through purchases. If we are going to be in the position that millions will be spent with no way of finding out what the money has been spent for, or who is getting the benefit of that expenditure, you will understand where this railway muddle is going to land us. The hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), in 1917, made a statement which I think is worth referring to because it shows what was in his mind at that time:

> The Dominion Railway Company Board could hardly be self-constituted because it would have to be constituted in the first place by some authority, but after it was constituted the vacancies arising would be filled by the remaining members; in other words, it would be a complete sovereignty in itself—self-perpetuating. It would be outside the control of the Government and outside the control of Parliament—although I am not quite sure as to the latter statement because Parliament, I suppose, has power over anything under its jurisdiction. No it would not be free of Parliament.

I think that is just where it should be. That is practically the same statement as was made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) last year. He said:

> I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I know we all have a common purpose in this, will agree that a great railway system such as that which is now being acquired ought not to be administered directly by any department of the Government. I think we may start with that.

Apparently it was in the minds of both these hon. gentlemen that they should not make this a department of the Government, or that they should not have it directly under the control of the ministers. But we know that they have it in their power by Order in Council to name the directors and to cancel their appointments at will. There should be some safeguard by which these directors will know that if they give good service and value for the money they receive they will be continued in office. You cannot expect to get railway men, even if you pay them $50,000 a year, to accept these positions unless they see some future before them. Every man of the Canadian Pacific Railway system has an opportunity of getting to the top, but there would be no such opportunity under this plan because their names could be withdrawn by the minister at will.

This resolution, if I understand it correctly, which I very much doubt, because there is nobody, even the minister himself, who does understand it, apparently gives power to the Governor in Council to purchase, operate and construct railways and branches of railways. He has power to acquire any railway in Canada without coming to Parliament and he has power to construct branch lines, build betterments, establish divisional points, and make extensions and improvements at the expense of the tax payers. The minister will probably say that he has not as much power as that, but that appears here in black and white, if the resolution means anything—although he is not unlikely to get up and say it does not. It is almost impossible to get anything out of the resolution: in fact, it was suggested here this afternoon that it should have been cut up into paragraphs so that it might be understandable. If it does not mean that he can build and acquire railways, it says so; if it does not mean that he can spend all the unappropriated funds of the Dominion of Canada, it says so. I do not know whether it means that, or whether it means what the minister says it means, which is something entirely different from the way the resolution reads.

I pointed out a few days ago an instance in which, apparently, for the benefit of some private interest, there were some twenty-three engines and engine crews moved from Calgary to a town named Hanna, in Alberta. Calgary is well situated and has ample water, housing accommodation and every convenience for the trainmen. These men were moved to Hanna where they had no water for themselves and they had to keep two trains hauling water fifty miles to furnish the engines out

of the town of Hanna. I talked to a number of railway men in that district, and not one of them could tell me why those engines should be moved. There was a question on the Order Paper asking the minister why the change was made, but apparently it was not in the public interest to answer the question.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Did the hon. gentleman ask the acting superintendent, Mr. O'Donnell, why these engines and crews were moved to Hanna?

Mr. CAHILL: I was afraid he might tell me that it was because Mr. Hanna and some of his friends owned real estate in Hanna, and I did not like to embarrass him. I would like the minister to explain why that was permitted and whether it was permitted by the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: I can hardly think that is a fair statement to make about Mr. D. B. Hanna. He does not own any real estate, and I must resent any reflection on D. B. Hanna, president of the Canadian Northern Railway system. I say that D. B. Hanna is an honest man, one of the straightest men in Canada, and if the hon. member will repeat over his own signature in the newspapers to-morrow morning what he has said here to-night about graft going on in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, I am more than satisfied he will get all the information he wants, and will have no more trouble in so far as making statements of this kind is concerned. I feel—and I think I should make the statement here now—that the men whom we have appointed to manage the Canadian National railways are honest, straightforward men; and I hardly think it is fair for any member of this House to accuse them of graft, and of being dishonest and dishonourable men, unless he will assume responsibility for his statements either in this Chamber or outside of it. If any one can tell us anything that would tend to show that these men are not carrying out their duties properly I, for one, will do everything I can to ferret the matter out, and, if the accusations are established, have the guilty parties removed. But what will kill public ownership in the future, no matter whether it is Mr. Hanna or any other man whom we appoint, is the action of members of Parliament in reflecting on their honesty and character as the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has done. I say that it is not fair for these men whom we place in these responsible positions. I say this although I have no brief for D. B. Hanna or any other member of the board. The hon. member has insinuated that the members of this board were appointed for political reasons. Two members of that board were employees of the Canadian Northern, and I would like to see any man in this House, or out of it, make any statement against the character or reputation of those two officials. Reflections have been indulged in concerning the members of the Railway Board consisting of Messrs. D. B. Hanna, A. J. Mitchell, Robert Hobson of Hamilton, Jones of Montreal, Barnhill of St. John, and Cantlie of Nova Scotia. I only wish these statements were made outside of the House where the men accused could take action to defend themselves. It is, unfortunately, a privilege of Parliament that a member can reflect in this House upon the honour and reputation of an outside citizen, and he cannot be brought to book for his accusations. I repeat that these men against whom imputations have been made are honest and upright men.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cahill) insinuates that we propose to manage these railways under the Department of Railways and Canals. We are not doing that at the present time, far from it. The Railway Board is operating the Government railways entirely irrespective of the department, and there is no interference with them in any way, shape or form.

Mr. CAHILL: Before the hon. gentleman concludes his speech I would ask him who appointed these directors?

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course they were appointed by the Governor in Council. The hon. gentleman says that this board should be run in the same way as the Railway Commission, entirely outside of politics. Very well, who appointed the Railway Commission? They are appointed by the Government. Originally all the members of the commission were Liberal appointees. I regarded them as honest men, and believe they carried on the affairs of the commission regardless altogether of politics. We had confidence in those men because they were men of honour and reputation. We have appointed the directors of this Railway Board, they are men in whom the people of this country have confidence. Yet the hon. gentleman raises an issue about the appointment of that board, whereas the leader of the Opposition wants the Department of Railways and Canals to operate the railways the same as was done in the case of the Intercolonial railway. I think these

two honourable gentlemen should get together and agree on some policy, because at present their views are very divergent.

Mr. CAHILL: So do the members of the Government disagree.

Mr. J. D. REID: The point I wish to make is that the hon. gentleman has reflected on the character and reputation of the Board of Directors that we have appointed. All I ask him to do as a man of honour, which I believe he is, is to state in the public press to-morrow what he has said here to-night, and I will take a chance as to what will happen.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like the minister to answer the questions put to him before he starts to talk about his appointees. And when he asks me to reconcile my views to those of other hon. gentlemen on this side, I would ask him and his colleagues in the Government to reconcile their differences. Why, the leader of the Government is on record as opposed to the very principle that the hon. gentleman is advocating to-night. Yet the hon. gentleman gets up and flails the wind with his arms about somebody making false statements. The Railway Commission were appointed in the very way that I want these men to be appointed.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Board of Directors of the National Railways were appointed in the same way as the Railway Commission.

Mr. CAHILL: The members of the Railway Commission are not at the beck and call of the Governor in Council, the Minister of Railways, or anybody else. They are appointed for ten years, and I want these Directors who are managing the Government railways to be appointed in the very same way. I am not making any reflection upon Mr. Hanna. I am sure it would be resented in the country were I to suggest that Mackenzie & Mann, or Hanna, ever did anything in Canada that was not above reproach. It would be regarded as an awful calamity and bring a storm of criticism about any man's ears who even suggested that Mackenzie & Mann ever did anything out of place in this country. And when my hon. friend gets so heated it is evidence to me that he intends to continue just as he has been doing in the past. When he talks about Mr. Cantlie in Nova Scotia, somebody else in Hamilton, and somebody else on the Western Prairies, as being directors, I tell him that they are directors when they are called together. I do not believe any one of them would pretend to know more about railway business or railway management than any other ordinary citizen. They are not railway men, and they will only take their advice from Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann's appointee, through the Minister of Railways—D. B. Hanna. Why does not the the minister tell us what he proposes to do with these branch lines? Why does he not tell us that he wants them taken out of politics instead of getting up and indulging in a harangue and defending Mackenzie & Mann, D. B. Hanna, or somebody else? The people of Canada do not care a hoot whom you have so long as you appoint efficient railway men to manage these railroads and make them pay. If you put these roads in the hands of efficient railway men, then you may expect at some time to get good service, and you may expect to get the railroads out of the mire that they are in at present. Instead of doing that, however, the minister will blandly get up here from year to year, as long as he is privileged to sit on the Treasury Benches, and ask from thirty to eighty million dollars to pay deficits in the operation of these railroads. What interest has Hanna, or anybody else, in the efficient management of these railroads so long as he is at the beck and call of the Minister of Railways. His position is only good while he lives up to the instructions received from the minister, not a moment afterwards. I say that these men should be absolutely free from political control, and should be placed under the control of Parliament, so that if they do not serve the country properly, Parliament's attention may be directed to it and a change effected. The system which the minister has adopted is simply repeating the same mistakes that have been made in every country that has adopted the public ownership of railways. Every one of them has handed the management of the railways over to the political machine. Even in France, as late as 1908, when the authorities took over the North Western Railroad, they increased the employees twenty per cent on that road in the first two years of Government operation, until it was taken out of the hands of a member of the Government and placed under the control of a commission. This is a fair subject of debate, Mr. Chairman, and we should give the best possible attention to the question of how our national railroads are to be managed, because I can assure my public ownership friends that if our national railway system is used as a political machine to furnish political jobs, we are going to have a huge

deficit every year, and our people will become disgusted and say: Let us get rid of this thing and hand it over to somebody else. I think we have a fair chance to make this railway system a success. It may be true that we are a little over-built, but our lines run through a good productive country, and if we have a sane policy we will soon catch up to our railroad development and have sufficient traffic to make the system a success, unless we install the wrong kind of management and, as the hon. minister has pointed out, appoint a grocer of Montreal, an iron manufacturer of Toronto and another one of Nova Scotia. These gentlemen, I understand, are getting $2,000 a year each for the time and attention they devote to looking after this $900,000,000 investment. It is not reasonable to expect any man to devote sufficient time to an undertaking of such magnitude for that remuneration. You must get the best railroad men obtainable and put them in charge with as little political interference as possible. If you do not do that, if you adopt the hon. minister's plan to spend all the unappropriated funds of the Dominion, and allow him to bluster this thing through with the support of his friends at the back of him, you will end in a worse position than we were when we took over these roads. It has cost us more during the past year than in any previous year, and at the rate we are going on our deficit in a period of ten years will far exceed the amount we paid Mackenzie and Mann. I am not advocating the continuance of that plan. We have the opportunity in our own hands. Let us put our national railway system on a sane business basis and try to get the best we can out of it. If the rest of the ministers would show as much gall in attempting to put anything through as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does—

An hon. MEMBER: He cannot beat you for it. We would like some of your own nerve.

Mr. CAHILL: As I understand it, the resolution has not yet been read and is not before the House. I think before it comes up for discussion the hon. minister would be well advised to take this long-winded resolution, capture the draftsman who is responsible for it, and then take it to some person else and see if he cannot put it in such shape that the hon. minister can at least attempt to explain what it means.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt): The resolution is before the Committee.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Mr. CAHILL: It has not been read, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been read as far as it will be.

Mr. HALLADAY: Either the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has been ill-advised, or he is trying to put something over on the House to-night that he does not think will be contradicted by some one who knows. I happen to live in the little town of Hanna, and I can tell the hon. gentleman why the trains have been pulled out of Calgary and put into Hanna. It is because that is the point from which the railway can be operated the cheapest. As far as water goes, the railroad company happen to have a dam at Hanna now which stores enough water to supply the railway for two years. The water backs up for about a mile, it is about two hundred yards across and in the neighbourhood of about thirty feet deep in the centre. I am very pleased that the hon. gentleman has given me a chance of advertising my own business to-night. I happen to be the official townsite agent for the town of Hanna. I have sold practically every lot, and I am here to tell the House that the Canadian Northern Railway did own that townsite, but I know every lot owner there and I can state that Mr. D. B. Hanna does not now and never did own one lot in that townsite. If the balance of the hon. member's arguments are as strong as on these two points I would advise the House not to take too much stock in them.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have listened very earnestly and intently to the discussion on this resolution. I was very much surprised, indeed, at the case as presented by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He pointed out that this resolution, extensive though it is and contained all in one sentence, has in almost every second line a reference to the Governor in Council or to Orders in Council. As the representative of the constituency of South Renfrew I came here with the feeling that I would be consulted occasionally on matters of importance to the country and to my constituency, but to my surprise day after day we are treated to a dose of Orders in Council and proposals for Orders in Council. We were assured that once the emergency conditions incident to the war were over legislation of this kind would cease and this House would return to normal conditions. We are to-night engaged in discussing a resolution to make provision for the years after the war, and I see that the same spirit prevails in it. There seems to be no provision whatever

from start to finish, save one exception, whereby the people's representatives will be consulted in regard to the management of our national railways. The only exception, Sir, is when there has been discovered, as we are assured there will be, a deficit in the operating expenses. I have gone over this resolution and have extracted the following matters that will be attended to by Order in Council.

The Governor in Council will have power by Order in Council to nominate the directorate. The Governor in Council will also have power to incorporate the company. The Governor in Council will also have power to arrange the tenure of office of the directorate. The Governor in Council will also have power to remove the directorate. The Governor in Council will also have power to annul meetings and to arrange annual meetings. The Governor in Council —if the Bill that the hon. Minister of Railways proposes bringing down is based on this resolution—will also have power to arrange the capital stock of the company. The location of the head office is also left to the Governor in Council. If members to your right, Mr. Chairman, do not object now to this matter being left in the hands of the Governor in Council, they will when they find that the matter has been arranged over their heads—and there will be some trouble in store for the Minister of Railways. The people's representatives should have at least some say in the matter of the location of the head office; it should not be left entirely in the hands of the Governor in Council. The payment of the directors is left to the Governor in Council; the people's representatives are not to be consulted with regard to that matter. The Governor in Council will be charged with the appointment of the executive. The Governor in Council may transfer property or do what he pleases with it —I would almost like to use an adjective in this connection, but perhaps it would not be parliamentary. The Governor in Council may acquire new property without saying why, wherefore, or by your leave. Funds belonging to the Government railways may be expropriated by Order in Council. The abandonment of property may be accomplished by Order in Council without any consultation of the people's representatives. The minister referred to the possibility of this being done. I assure him that he would be wise in his day and generation to consult Parliament in that matter, because vested rights will be affected. Towns and villages have sprung up along the railway lines, and if railway accommodation is taken away from these places the value of property will be depreciated and the rights of the people seriously affected. The Government cannot play ducks and drakes with the railroads without consulting Parliament.

The Governor in Council may construct new lines without consulting the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled; may issue bonds and debentures, arrange mortgages, dismantle or dispose of roads—all by Order in Council. The Governor in Council has almost the power of omnipotence in his hands; he is a law unto himself; his powers are almost beyond the limit. The Minister of Railways and Canals is vested almost with the power of a god. I do not want to impute improper motives to him, but this resolution is a pretty extensive order, and I for one do not intend to endorse the proposal. I have often taken home and slept over a letter written in a hasty moment, and invariably that letter has never been mailed. I suggest that the Minister of Railways take this resolution home with him to-night and sleep on it. If he does, I am sure that he will bring down a more sane and sensible proposal than the one he has put before the House.

I notice also that the Minister of Railways proposes to arrange capital with or without shares by Order in Council; to make by-laws by Order in Council; to arrange proxies at the annual meeting by Order in Council—I do not know that he has omitted anything which it would be possible for him to do by Order in Council. That is not to be wondered at, as this resolution is made up of the longest sentence I ever read; in a page and a half, semicolons are the only marks of punctuation. The minister also intends by Order in Council to make agreements with other companies and to make money advances to the Canadian Northern railway. This disposition of affairs is, in my judgment, the nearest possible approach to omnipotence on this side of the grave. The only matter reserved to the elected representatives of the people is that of paying deficits—there is cold comfort in that. This matter affects the future welfare of our country. Hon. gentlemen who vote for this resolution or for any Bill which may be based upon it are simply voting away the rights that our forefathers fought for and handing them over to the Governor in Council.

I almost feel like moving an amendment to the resolution, which would have the

effect of striking out all of the words of the resolution after the word "resolved." On second thought, however, I shall merely make a suggestion by way of something else for the Minister of Railways to sleep over. I would suggest that all the words after the word "resolved" be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor:

That this House do now prorogue and that the business of the country be carried on, according to the Union Government practice, by Order in Council.

9 p.m.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does the hon member suggest that each of these powers asked for under the resolution should be submitted to Parliament?

Mr. PEDLOW: Certainly not, but the more important ones—I referred to them during the course of my remarks—should be submitted to Parliament.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: If not through the Governor in Council, what means does the hon. member suggest by which the Parliament of Canada may express to the board of management or the board of directors of the operating company of the Canadian National railways the determination of Parliament to carry on along any particular line, with regard either to the construction of new lines or to methods of operation?

Mr. PEDLOW: I suggest that the Government submit to Parliament from time to time such matters as the location of the head office. I am sure the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) would be one of the first men to object if the head office were located at the city of Quebec. I would also suggest that the Governor in Council refer to the Parliament of this country any proposed acquisition of new properties before they confirm the proposition. I would also suggest that they refer to this Parliament any proposition for the abandonment of any railway property, before abandoning it. I suggest also that the Minister of Railways submit to this House any proposition he has for the construction of new railways, before going ahead with the work. I would suggest also—and I might say this is in reply to the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson)—that before the minister disposes of any railroads in this country, he refer the matter to this Parliament for its consideration and determination. I would also refer several other matters that I perhaps have not at my finger ends at the moment, but they are, I am sure, such matters as would suggest themselves to such an experienced railroader as the hon. member for East Algoma.

[Mr. Pedlow.]

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would like to make one or two observations with regard to this matter, just for the purpose of endeavouring to get some of my hon. friends down out of the air as regards the management of the Canadian National railways. The Governor in Council, in relation to the management of the Canadian National railways, are in exactly the same position as the directors of a railway company, and if the shareholders of the privately-owned railway desire to have their wishes carried out, they are going to do that through their board of directors and their executive officers. If my hon. friend will look into this matter carefully, he will find that the Governor in Council are simply taking to themselves the authority to carry out the expressed will of Parliament, whatever that will may be. I particularly wish to refer to what the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) said as to the moving of train crews from Calgary to Hanna. He made a direct and specific charge against the management of the Canadian National railways. Personally, I cannot recall ever having had the pleasure of meeting any of those men; I do not know anything about them. But I do know the man who was responsible for moving the train crews from Calgary to Hanna, namely Acting General Superintendent O'Donnell, who is superintendent of the Canadian National railways at Winnipeg. If the hon. member for Pontiac has any criticisms to offer as to Superintendent O'Donnell as a railroad official, I should like him to make them in this House or out of it. I have known Mr. O'Donnell from the time he began his railway career. The hon. member stated that water had to be hauled fifty miles into Hanna. The heavy traffic is in and out of Hanna. How far will the hon. member suggest that one of those 180 per cent locomotives would run with one supply of water? If the work is going to be done out of Hanna, the water must be brought in, it does not matter what system is used to get it in, nor does it matter whether train crews are located in Hanna or not.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) said that he knew the hon. member for East Algoma would object to the head office going to Quebec. The head office of the greatest railway system in the world and the one I admire the most is in the province of Quebec, and I do not care whether the head office goes to Timbuctoo,

because that does not make a particle of difference.

Mr. BUREAU: It might be too far out.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The whole question in connection with this is—how are we going to control the men whom we put into positions of responsibility as regards the management of our railways. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) says: Appoint them for ten years and remove the management from politics. Supposing we put in for ten years a board of management, and the first year we find they are inefficient, that they are the type of men who have been exploiting this country in the management and operation of railways—what are we going to do with them?

Mr. CAHILL: I think the hon. member misunderstands me if he says that I said ten years. I did not mention any such period. I said that the railway commissioners were appointed for ten years.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I understood the hon. member said he wanted them appointed on the same basis as the railway commissioners who are appointed for ten years. If we are going to appoint them, we must not pledge ourselves to appoint them for ten days, unless they are going to do the work properly. All this Utopian talk of removing the management of the Canadian National Railways from politics might just as well be forgotten. We must put in control men whom we think to be efficient. If they do the job, let us support them; if they do not do the job, let us find somebody who will. And, if the people of Canada are going to have the railways operated right, they will send to the House of Commons men who will see that these men do their work properly. That is the only way by which it can be done.

One word with regard to the present Board of Directors. I do not believe I would know one of them if I were to meet him on the street. How many men on the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific railway are practical railway men in the sense that they could take hold of the railway and operate and manage it? The president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a lawyer who was taken into the office of the ex-president, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and trained as an executive officer pure and simple. What are all the others? They are not practical railway men in the sense I have mentioned, but men of sufficient capacity to find men who can operate the road. And in the final analysis, if the Canadian National railways are to be operated successfully, we must have at the top one man who is a practical railroad man, who has the final say, and we must surround him with a group of intelligent, earnest men, willing to place their services at the disposal of their country, and to apply themselves to whatever projects they have in mind, who will find specialists in railway operation. Let me again ask the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), in all his declarations with regard to inefficiency and incompetency on the part of the men who are operating the Canadian National railways what about Mr. Hungerford, Mr. Warren, Mr. Brady, Mr. Hayes? Will he say these men are inefficient, incapable? I happen to know some of the men who are engaged in the operation of the road. They may not have the Canadian National railways into the complete system in which we would like to see it; they may not be the right men, but they should be given an opportunity of showing whether they are or not.

Mr. CAHILL: Without political interference.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Let us get right down to bed rock on this matter. Let the hon. member mention one case in which there has been political interference in the operation of the Canadian National railways since this Board of Management was selected. Let him mention one case in which they have been interfered with in the selection of an officer under them, or in what they are doing in their efforts to co-ordinate and put into a successful position so far as operating is concerned the Canadian National railways, and then we shall know where to start from. Will the hon. member do that?

Mr. CAHILL: I might refer the hon. member to about 1916 or 1917 when the—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is before the Board was appointed.

Mr. CAHILL: But as long as the Intercolonial was controlled from Ottawa, there was political management—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Better answer the question.

Mr. CAHILL: —and while there was this political management, there was the Minister of Railways sitting in the House of Commons—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sit down.

Mr. CAHILL: —opposing members on the floor of the House, and the Minister of

Railways, still a member of this House, apparently lost his position as Minister of Railways.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I asked the hon. member a specific question. He has charged the president of the board of management of the Canadian National Railways with incompetence and grafting, and has charged the Government with political interference with the present board in the management of the railways. Now it is fair to ask the hon. member to state one instance in support of his charge. I do not know whether these charges are true or not. The hon. member may be in a position to floor me in a minute, and if he is I will join hands with him in an effort to clean the thing up. But I ask for one specific case.

Mr. CAHILL: What particular thing are you referring to?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: It is for the hon. member—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. It is absolutely impossible for two hon. members to speak at once.

Mr. CAHILL: The hon. member will have to sit down for me to answer.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I submit that until the hon. member can point to one instance where the present management of the Canadian National Railways has been actuated by anything but a desire to serve the public, it is absolutely unfair for him to make the charges he has made here to-night. Let me emphasize what the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) has said. If we are ever going to get men of the capacity we require to manage these railways—men of the type managing the Canadian Pacific, for instance—we must make up our minds to stand behind them honestly if they serve us faithfully, and not make charges against their honesty or capacity unless we are in a position to back those charges up. The biggest proposition that the people of Canada ever grappled with is the management of these railways, and we have to get men of the right sort to manage them. But do you think we will get men of the right sort if they are going to be hounded from one end of this country to the other as political heelers and grafters? Would you get a man of the type of Lord Shaughnessy, the late David McNicol, MacTier, Murphy, Scully or Coleman to enter the public service of this country so long as men will stand up here and traduce their character without offering one scintilla of evidence in support of the charges they make? I do not think you would, and I repeat, until these men have shown their incapacity—I do not know whether they are the right men or not to manage the road—it is our business to support them in their work.

Mr. BUREAU: When the Committee rose at six o'clock I put two questions to the minister. I suppose he will claim he has answered one. I desire now to know why he has left the fixing of the salaries of the directors to the Governor in Council? We fix the salaries of the judges, the railway commissioners, and the civil service commissioners in this House, and I should like to know—I am asking merely for information—why we should not fix the salaries of these directors.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Bill provides that the Governor in Council shall fix the salaries. Of course, the Government will be responsible to the House. It is a debatable question, I admit, whether they should be fixed by Parliament or by the Governor in Council, but we can discuss that matter in committee on the Bill, and if it is the general desire of the committee the Bill can be amended.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not criticising at all. The Bill will no doubt come up for a second reading to-morrow, which will not give us time to study the matter. I say that we are departing from the practice that has been followed by Parliament heretofore in connection with the railway commissioners, the civil service commissioners and the judges, the members of the highest tribunal in the land; and I should like a reason why Parliament should not fix the salaries of these directors.

Mr. J. D. REID: The reason why it is left to the Governor in Council is because the people are the shareholders, and the shareholders are the ones who elect the directors and fix their salaries.

Mr. McMASTER: The shareholders elect the directors.

Mr. BUREAU: We are the shareholders, in this Parliament. We hold proxies from the people.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite understand the difficulties of my hon. friend. This legislation is very complex, and it is just as well that from the beginning we should stand fast by the principles of parliament-

ary government. In my humble judgment, there are many objections to the details of this legislation, some of which I pointed out this afternoon, but my main objection is against the use by the directors of the new company of moneys from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada without any parliamentary vote.

Mr. J. D. REID: It must be voted afterwards.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, locking the stable after the horse is gone—and I say that with all due respect. I think the minister appreciates my argument. He will realize that the amendment I am going to move will not prevent him from putting this new organization into shape. I understand that at this session he will ask Parliament for a large amount of money, running into the millions of dollars, for the administration and operation of the railway system. I am quite sure he has received from Mr. Hanna and the other directors an estimate of the cost of administrating and operating the system during the next fiscal year. Parliament will provide a fund to administer and operate the whole system, and I think it is enough for us to create this new power, with all the privileges we are conferring on it, without surrendering all our rights to that directorate.

As regards the financial end of this administration, we should stand fast by the principle that no money is going to be spent without first having been voted by Parliament. That is an elementary principle that should appeal to both sides of the House. I would therefore move, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to this resolution. I regret the resolution is not paragraphed and numbered as Bills usually are, because I cannot see at what line this amendment comes, as the resolution is too long and too compact in its arrangement. But I would move to amend the resolution about two thirds down the page reading:

> And in the event of a deficit occurring at any time during any fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the said Minister to be included in the estimates submitted to Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year.

As I propose to amend it, the clause would read as follows:

> And in the event of a deficit occurring at any time during the fiscal year the amount of such deficit shall from time to time be payable by the Minister of Finance provided that said amount is paid out of moneys voted by Parliament.

Striking out the words:

> Out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, the amounts paid by the said minister to be included in the estimates submitted to Parliament at its first session following the close of such fiscal year.

This is a question of principle with me. I cannot surrender my rights in that way.

Mr. J. D. REID: Let me explain to the hon. member the position we would be in if that amendment carried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You are going to create a fund for next year.

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You are going to ask Parliament for a huge appropriation for the running of the railway. You are able to get an estimate from Mr. Hanna and the directors.

Mr. J. D. REID: We do not propose doing that at all. There are two ways of operating this system. One is, as suggested by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), the way we have been operating the Intercolonial railway. That would mean placing in the Estimates the amount that it would take to operate the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial. The other is to follow the method by which the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific are operated now. The receipts would all be collected by the railway and the cost of operation only would be expended from that fund. For the building of new lines we would have to get a vote of Parliament. We started out on the first of April this year with the Canadian National Railway system. Suppose that during this present fiscal year we should have a deficit of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 on what we called the Government railway system prior to taking in the Canadian National railways, and another $10,000,000 of a deficit on the Canadian Northern, a total deficit of $15,000,000. As all the money that we have for operating the railway is collected by the railway, we could not meet these deficits until the next session, and we would not have money to operate the railway or to meet the deficits that would arise from month to month. A deficit does not come at the end of the year. In the month of April you will probably have a deficit, and so on during the twelve months. That clause is put there in order that we may keep the railway in operation, and, at the next session of Parliament we will come down for a vote. If this amendment should carry it would mean that the rail-

way would have to be closed down because we could not get any money to operate it. The directors have no power to borrow any money as they go along. Let us take this question up clause by clause and discuss it. I do not want to hurry or rush the Bill through. I court discussion of every clause of it in order that we may see whether we can put it in better shape than I have it. My whole desire is to get the very best Bill possible in order to ensure the successful operation of this railway system. If we get all the railways together, and it looks as if we will, we will probably have a billion dollars invested in them. I appeal to the members of this House to go into the Bill clause by clause and see if there is any way we can improve it. I appeal again to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) not to press his amendment because its adoption would make it impossible to operate the railway inoperative. We could not carry it through to the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I grant that my hon. friend is in earnest in this legislation. The country is in a mood to stand by a system of railway nationalization. While it may be a passing mood, and while the country may not be disposed later on to maintain the system, it seems to be in favour of it at the present time. My hon. friend knows that there are men in the Grand Trunk system who know almost exactly, twelve months in advance, what the earnings, the surplus or the deficit will be. Does my hon. friend believe that the board of directors or the managers of the Canadian Pacific do not know what the traffic will yield during the next year? My hon. friend may think it is a matter of guessing but it is not. The president of the Canadian Pacific last year, in his report, based on the information that was conveyed to him by his officers all along the line, pretty well estimated the business during the current year. So it has been in former years. The officers of the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern could tell my hon. friend what the approximate earnings of the road for the next twelve months will be. We are going into this nationalization business; why not start right? Why not tell the people at once what the approximate deficit will be for the next fiscal year? It is easy. My hon. friend will have access to the books of the Grand Trunk Pacific? It is almost certain that the officers of the Grand Trunk system will be the officers of the Government.

The minister has retained almost every official of the old Canadian Northern Railway System. I share the confidence that my hon. friend has in Mr. Hanna. I have known Mr. Hanna for several years, and I think he is one of the ablest railway men in Canada, possibly in America. Mr. Hanna knows the Canadian Northern Railway System from A to Z, and I can assure my hon. friend that if he were to ask that gentleman to-morrow to give him his views as to the probable earnings of the system for the next fiscal year, Mr. Hanna would be in a position to give him that information pretty accurately. So that it is relatively easy for the hon. gentleman, as the head of the Railway Department, to ascertain what it will cost to administer and to run the railway system during the next fiscal year. After all, the people are entitled to that information, and though the truth may not be palatable to them, it is just as well that they should get this estimate, and not give a board of directors the wide powers which he is conferring by this resolution. The principle involved is for me an elementary principle, and one which, if defeated by such legislation, would mean practically the annihilation of parliamentary control. I stand fast by my rights as a member of the House. I represent the people, and as such I wish, and claim, to have the control of all the moneys to be spent by the Government, whether it is for a small breakwater on the coast of Gaspé or for a big transcontinental railway system. I do not care what the amount is, what must be considered is the principle involved. Why, should my hon. friend be afraid to ask for such powers to be conferred on a board of directors, which after all must come under parliamentary control, because we ourselves have created the organization.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: Can the hon. gentleman name any railroad company in Canada, or elsewhere, that observes the condition laid down in this amendment in regard to making an estimate of the amount of money required to carry on the undertaking for the year?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have not the last annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under my hand, but if my hon. friend will refer to it he will see what are the prognostications, if I may use the expression, of Mr. Beatty. In any railway of that magnitude, the president, after having consulted the chief officers of all sections of the road, would be able to say approximately what the expenditure would be for the ensuing twelve months.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report again he will find that that expenditure is the expenditure on capital account, and it is the only subject in regard to which Mr. Beatty will venture to lay an estimate before the Board.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I believe the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is perfectly sincere, and I think the House is anxious that the whole situation should be clearly understood. Therefore, let me submit a question like this: Assuming there is a difference of one hundred million bushels of the grain crop that has to be moved out of the Northwest this coming season from what is anticipated. Assuming that the Canadian National Railways are confronted with the proposition of handling a crop similar to the of 1915. What would happen to any estimate the directors might make as to the costs of operation? Every dollar that is spent on the operation of the railway—and I am repeating what I said this afternoon, and which is perfectly obvious—has a direct relation to the amount of traffic to be moved. Now the amount of traffic that is moved from year to year varies, according to the industrial condition of the country, the crops to be handled, and everything that goes to make up the traffic. If one looks back over the reports of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk railways, he will find that the operating costs varied, sometimes to the extent of ten or fifteen million dollars, one year from the other. The operating cost of every railway in Canada was increased by millions, due to the award of the Board of Adjustment which sat in connection with those railroads. That is liable to happen in the middle of any year. What would be the result if a twenty-five per cent increase in the rate of wages paid to the employees was forced upon the management of the Canadian National railway, in the middle of a season Parliament not being in session, and they being tied down to a certain estimate, which they must not exceed, as to what they should expend from month to month? Every practical man will tell you that such a thing is utterly impossible for them to carry out: the railway management simply go on spending the revenue as they get it. Should there be an operating deficit it will be found that the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and all other lines, have a fund somewhere from which they can draw in the event of one month not being as good as another. But to require the management of the Canadian National Railways to make an estimate of operating expenses a year ahead is practically impossible.

Mr. PEDLOW: I remember distinctly that during the last session of Parliament a resolution involving the same principle which is under discussion here was placed upon the Order Paper by the Minister of Railways. I also remember distinctly that the resolution in question was finally withdrawn, which means that operations were continued during the year on the old basis. I would like to know from the minister what the experience has been of the past year's operations on that basis?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Intercolonial was not handed over to the new management until about the latter part of the year or the first of January, and the cost of operating for that period was taken out of the funds voted by Parliament. What is really meant by the amendment before the committee, if I understand it aright—and if not I am open to correction—is that the revenue for the fiscal year of the Canadian National Railways and of any other railway which may be taken over is to be deposited to the credit of the Receiver General, and whatever the costs of operation may be (whether it be two, three, or four hundred million dollars) should be voted in an estimate submitted to the House. I do not see how that can be worked.

Mr. PEDLOW: How did it work out last year?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern System worked in the way it always has done.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The minister has not explained why it is not possible to apply the same system to the other Government railways that he is applying to the Intercolonial Railway. As I understand that system, the minister makes up his mind before the opening of the fiscal year how much he will need for the operation of the Intercolonial during the ensuing twelve months, and Parliament votes that money. That system has worked out well in Canada for a great many years.

We are now proposing to allow these new railway directors to expend as much money as they please; there is to be no check on them whatever. They may run our national railway system in the most extravagant way, and Parliament pledges itself at the end of the year to pay the bill. Would it not be more business like for these directors to come to Parliament and say: We esti-

mate that our earnings for the coming year will be so many million dollars, but we feel certain that we will not be able to operate the road on those earnings, and we will want so many more million dollars to pay our bills before the end of the year. Then the people would know what they had to pay. By the system proposed we are throwing the whole matter into the hands of the board of directors and are losing control by Parliament altogether. I have always felt that the statement made by the Minister of Railway at the commencement of every fiscal year was very important; he outlined the business of the Intercolonial Railway for the year and told us what he expected to get in revenue and what he expected to have to spend. By this system we are abandoning that good policy which has been pursued for a long time, and the hon. minister has not given us any good reason for its abandonment. Before he turns down the amendment of my hon. friend—which I am inclined to support—I think the hon. minister should tell the House why he cannot apply to our National railway the system which has been in vogue on the Intercolonial.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: While I am to some extent in sympathy with the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and consider it good in theory, it seems to me that the principle it enunciates is impracticable, for this reason: Unless you were a weather prophet it would be almost impossible to forecast the earning capacity of a great transportation system such as we are operating. The winter we have just passed through illustrates what I mean. The mild season has been the most effective fuel controller that we have had for years, and it not only saved coal in our homes, but it saved coal in the operation of the railways; and it also resulted in a gain of millions of dollars in our western country through not having to remove snow. In some winters there has been a great expenditure of money to keep our roads open even in Western Canada, where our snowfall is not usually as heavy as in the East, and that expenditure is something very hard to estimate. We who have lived in the western country a number of years know that it is almost impossible, particularly at this season of the year, to forecast the crop. Growing wheat successfully depends altogether on weather conditions, and in some years we will have probably 100,000,000 bushels more to move than in other years. So I do not see how it is humanly possible to forecast within even a few million dollars the probable earnings and operating expenses of a railway system such as we are handling. It seems to me that if we voted a certain sum of money as forecasted, probably during the course of the year, we would be faced with a deficit of from five to ten million dollars, and if we have no means of making good that deficit how are our operating officials going to pay expenses and keep the system running?

Amendment negatived; nays 36, yeas 16.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite see why there was such strong objection to the amendment of the hon. member for Maisonneuve which has just been voted down. There can be no good derived from experience at all if we are to be forever groping in the dark in matters of this kind. Surely, after nearly fifty years experience with over one thousand miles of Government railway managed by successive ministers, we should by this time have some fairly reliable data of operating costs per mile per year. There is not a business firm in this country that has been in operation for half that length of time but can tell from year to year within a very small fraction what have been their operating costs and what they are going to be next year. Take a big city like Toronto, the civic authorities are able to estimate the cost of running the city each year. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway, the management can tell more than a year ahead what the system is going to cost. I can very well imagine that if any of us were present at a meeting of the shareholders of that company, and that question were asked, an estimate would be made and submitted to the meeting. There is no disposition on the part of hon. members on this side of the House to closely figure what the hon. minister might require for the running of his road. We are willing to give him a million dollars leeway if he wants it; it does not make very much difference, because if he does not require it it will not be expended. He says he has honest officials; we believe he has, and we believe there will be an honest effort made to run the road economically. But we want to have the right to say how much shall be expended and how much set aside for operating expenses, allowing an ample sum to meet contingencies. That is all; we are not desirous of cutting down the amount and crippling the running of the road; there is no such

suggestion; but we do not want to leave a free hand for the expenditure of public money without any parliamentary check. I would like to tell hon. members, and particularly those who have only been in this House for the last seven or eight years, that when my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, sat in Opposition when the older Conservative members were sitting in Opposition they made an outcry against spending the money without the vote of Parliament. My good friend the member for East Lambton (Mr. J. E. Armstrong), the railway expert of the Conservative party, was loud in his objections. But how have the mighty fallen! These gentlemen who had such a great respect for the representatives of the people in those days, and who were pernickety about the expenditure of even a fifty-cent piece if it was not first voted by Parliament, now want to launch upon the expenditure of millions about which the people of Canada have absolutely nothing to say. It was a good, sound doctrine that they were preaching then, and it is a good, sound doctrine for Liberals to preach to-day. I stated very clearly and explicitly in the earlier part of this discussion that I had only one opinion on this matter: That no moneys of the people should, in the absence of an emergency, be expended unless the expenditure is first passed upon by Parliament. I asked the minister for certain information about the standing of the Canadian Northern and the other railway systems which we own. I suggested that that information be put on Hansard before the second reading of the Bill is moved, so that members of the House may see what the real situation is. I notice that the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Papineau) put a question to the minister some time ago concerning the indebtedness of these roads, in the following words:

1. On what date did the Government take possession of the Canadian Northern Railway System?

2. What is the total amount of the liabilities of said railway system, which the country assumed on taking possession?

To which the following answer was given by the Minister of Railways:

1. The Government received the controlling interest in the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway, on October 1, 1917.

2. The Dominion of Canada purchased the stock in the Canadian Northern Railway, but did not assume the outstanding liabilities which remained as debts of the company. According to the Government auditors the total outstanding liabilities as of October 1, 1917, including funded debt was $434,312,747.34.

That is not a satisfactory answer, or one that the Canadian people will accept. When a man buys a house with a mortgage on it, he must pay the mortgage off before he owns the house. We paid 10 p.m. a certain amount of money for stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and when we took over that stock we also took over the debt on the road. The people of Canada, therefore, should know what sort of bargain they made when they bought this property and what are its commercial chances for the future. We are paying the running expenses of the road; we are paying for rolling stock and improvements; we own the road just as much as we own the Intercolonial, and we must pay all bills in connection with it. The old Canadian Northern system as a company has no real, live existence except in matter of name; we took everything they had and we have to pay their liabilities. The question is, what did we take over; what value do we get for the responsibilities and liabilities we assumed? These are matters upon which I expect the minister to give us full and complete information before he moves the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I should like to put on Hansard a statement made by Lord Shaughnessy the last time he appeared before the annual meeting of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as president, with regard to the operating costs and income of that system. He said:

Compared with the returns for the calendar year 1916 the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Directors now before you for consideration and approval shows an increase in gross revenue from transportation of $12,660,000, but this amount was more than absorbed by the working expenses, which increased $16,590,000, so that the net income from transportation in 1917 was less by $3,930,000 than it was in the previous calendar year.

Notwithstanding the larger volume of traffic in 1917, it will be gathered from the statistics incorporated in the Report that there was a substantial decrease in traffic train mileage and loaded car mileage, indicating still further improvement in operating efficiency. In normal times this should be reflected in the working expenses, but its effect was minimized by the higher scale of wages and the enchanced cost of fuel and other materials required for the maintenance and operation of the railway that prevailed during the year and that added $15,250,000 to the operating expenses.

This is a statement put before the stockholders after the event. It could not have been put before them before the event. I am confident that if any hon. member will take pains to inquire carefully into the situation, he will find that the Cana-

dian Pacific management never undertake to say within five or ten million dollars what is going to be expended in operating costs. Without any question they do make a complete statement as to capital expenditure, and the House of Commons of Canada should see to it that the directors and management of the Canadian National railways submit for our consideration their programme with regard to such expenditures. But the operation of railways can be carried on only out of earnings, unless we are going to do as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) suggests, namely at the beginning of the year vote a large block of money that we are sure will cover every contingency, without having any details whatever and without knowing how it is going to be expended, and then say, as we said to the officers of the Intercolonial in the heyday of their existence: Go to it; we will take care of the deficits when they come in at the end of the year.

Mr. BUREAU: The resolution reads:

For constructing and operating railway lines, branches and extensions with the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

I do not object as to the branches, because the Railway Act provides as to what length of branches can be constructed under a charter. When a company desires to build a railway, they have to come before Parliament in order to get a charter. I understand that the Governor in Council may have to deal with the branches, but is there any particular reason, if the management desire to build a railway, why they should not ask the permission of Parliament to build it so that the matter would come befor the Railway Committee and be discussed there, thus giving every member of the House an opportunity of stating whether he approves the location, and of pronouncing upon the advisability and advantages of the construction?

Mr. J. D. REID: When we have the Bill before us, I will go into the matter more fully. The old Canadian Northern Railway have charters for extensions, which charters have been in existence for some years. Those extensions are now being constructed and a number of them will be completed this year. Plans must be approved in the usual way, just as is the case with the plans of other railways. With regard to the construction of new lines or branches——

Mr. BUREAU: That is the power that is given here.

[Mr. G. B. Nicholson.]

Mr. J. D. REID: —the Canadian National Railways will have power to extend, but we shall have to come to Parliament for any moneys with which to build those extensions. Money that is received from operating the railways, we permit them to apply only to operating expenses. If there is construction, they have to come to Parliament for the money. There is a section with regard to bonds, but they have to come to Parliament for this money. This clause does not give power to the management to go ahead and build lines without coming to Parliament. If I cannot show that such a proviso is in the Bill, we can amend the Bill accordingly.

Mr. BUREAU: After the Bill is introduced and distributed, how much time shall we have to look over it before it is rushed through?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not propose rushing it through. If it is introduced to-day, I do not expect to bring it up again until after the Easter adjournment. Hon. members will therefore have all of next week and part of the week after to consider the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister surely does not expect that we are going to study a railway Bill during the holidays.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will give the hon. member plenty of time.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Has the Government paid for the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway?

Mr. J. D. REID: So far as I understood, it was all paid for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the stock has all been paid for except a block which is pledged with the Government of British Columbia——

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN—as against the construction of a certain line in that province by the Canadian Northern. That, not being deliverable as yet, has not been paid for.

Mr. CAHILL: The clause which the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was discussing states that the management have power to construct subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. If the minister is satisfied that this is a mistake and if his intention was that they should come to Parliament, then it would be well to change the wording from " the approval of the Governor in Council " to " the approval of Parliament." Would the minister be willing to adopt that change?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not change that now, because I think the hon. member, when he sees the Bill, will see that the point he raises is covered.

Mr. CAHILL: This is a very important resolution we are voting on, and we are doing so without very much information. If the minister is not sure that what is in the resolution is what he is going to have in the Bill—

Mr. J. D. REID: What this means is just what I stated. In every railway Bill a clause is inserted providing that the plans must be approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals. Notwithstanding the fact that a charter has been granted by this Parliament, the plans must be approved by the minister.

Mr. BUREAU: A railway company has its plans deposited with the Minister of Railways and Canals, and approved, after the charter is granted. The minister says this is to allow the company to build railways on charters already granted by this Parliament?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not change it to read:—

—For constructing railways for which charters have already been granted to the Canadian Northern.

Mr. J. D. REID: If the Government takes over the Grand Trunk Pacific, then another Bill will be necessary.

Mr. BUREAU: That could be covered by inserting in the Bill:—

For constructing lines which already have been approved by Parliament and for which charters have been granted.

Mr. CAHILL: If the minister is not quite clear as to whether he wants that clause left in the resolution in that way or not, I would move an amendment that it be taken out of the resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would like it left in. I cannot change it in the resolution tonight. I prefer the resolution as it is, because I do not understand the clause as the hon. member suggests it. Of course, if the hon. member wishes to move his amendment he can do so.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the Government to go on constructing branch or other lines of railways by Order in Council with the approval of the Minister of Railways and without consulting Parliament? They have in this resolution absolute power to do so, and if there is any money in the treasury of Canada to spend one of the things on which they can spend it is the construction of branch lines or other lines of railway. If it is not the intention of the Government to build branch or other lines without first submitting the proposition to Parliament for approval that clause should not be in the resolution.

Mr. J. D. REID: I mentioned that a short time ago. Of course, we have no intention of building branch lines or constructing railways anywhere without first coming to Parliament for a vote. When a vote is asked for, a full explanation is always given of the Government's proposals.

Mr. FAFARD (L'Islet) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) a moment ago read a report from Mr. Beatty relating to the Canadian Pacific. I have here a very short article giving the results arrived at by the United States Government with state ownership of railways. It is as follows:

New York, April 7.—For the month of February it is announced that the railways of the United States under Government operation show a deficit of over thirty-six million dollars, notwithstanding increases in fares and reduction of service by curtailing trains and packing the cars.

This actual loss, added to the hundreds of millions of loss in the previous twelve months, which must be made up by taxation is creating widespread hostility to Government ownership. Writing of the results of Government control of the railways the New York Sun says: "Price fixing and Government ownership have had such exhaustive trials as would have been totally impossible in times of peace. In many cases, as notably the railroads, the experiments were made under the most favourable circumstances and with a degree of public toleration if not approval that normally would have been impossible.

"In every case, without exception, the experiment has been ruinous to the socialistic theory. Service was not improved. It was rendered inefficient and unreliable to an incredible extent. To crown all, in order to maintain this mad carnival of abuse, crushing taxes have been laid upon the people and new burdens of taxation and debt loom up ahead, along with a total disorganization of business. These are the blessings that Government price fixing and Government management of public utilities have brought to the country. There is no single case that can be quoted to the contrary.

"Both political parties admit that the nation would vote overwhelmingly against Government ownership. Even the papers that advocated the policy, and politicians who supported it, now admit it was a terrible error."

In view of the fact that both political parties in the United States are against Government ownership and that in the

month of February, the shortest month in the year, the railways of the United States under Government ownership showed a deficit of over $36,000,000, I think this resolution should be very carefully reconsidered.

Resolution reported, read and concurred in.

Mr. J. D. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 70, to incorporate the Canadian National Railways Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADOPTION OF OTTAWA TIME FOR SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): Before moving the adjournment of the House, I wish to refer to the judgment just delivered by the Railway Commission on the question of the order of the Railway War Board as to the change of time on the railways. As hon. members will know from a perusal of the judgment, the position taken by the Chief Commissioner, concurred in, I believe, by Mr. Commissioner Nantel, is to the effect that the fixing of standard or local time is, in so far as the determination of the broad question is concerned, a matter of provincial jurisdiction, and that the only jurisdiction which the Board of Railway Commissioners has is exercisable only when they are convinced that interference on their part is necessitated by the public protection or safety or the public convenience. Founding their opinion upon that basis, the judgment is that they cannot interfere with the time fixed by the Railway War Board. That being the case, I beg to suggest that the House on adjournment to-night, having regard to the convenience of members of Parliament, and having reference, of course, only to the sittings of this House, do adjourn until Monday at three o'clock, local time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I must congratulate my hon. friend and the Government generally upon the timely decision they have taken. It is true that the judgment is not very clear. I read it this evening. It covers about thirty pages of foolscap, and the conclusion is that the commission has no jurisdiction. At all events, the members of the House will appreciate the fact that the Government has come to terms with common sense by adopting the time which is accepted outside of the main entrance of the House of Commons; so that henceforth, when it is three o'clock outside of the main entrance, it will also be three o'clock in the House of Commons.

Mr. PROULX: I should like to ask whether it is the Government or Parliament that fixes the time of the sittings of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The time is fixed for the sittings of the House merely by the authority of the House itself, but it may be done, I apprehend, merely by a statement from the Speaker of the House as to the hour the sittings shall take place. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Meighen, seconded by Mr. Rowell, that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. DENIS: That is not the motion; the motion is that the House do adjourn until Monday at three o'clock, city time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has put the motion as it was understood by the Chair:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Passing from the little fun we get out of this matter, I suppose that the decision that has been reached by the commission was arrived at after careful deliberation, and contains much learning which might be of value to this House and to the country at some future time. I think the decision should be printed in Hansard. I am serious about it. These gentlemen appear to have given it every consideration, I notice that authorities are quoted, there is a great deal of learning in the judgment and at some future day it might be of importance to this House and the country if this copy should be lost. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House that it should be made available by having it placed upon Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to that. The decision is as follows:

Daylight Saving; Change of Time.

The Chief Commissioner:

Under an interim judgment issued herein the railway companies, who had issued circulars advancing the time of their clocks to become effective at 2 a.m., on the morning of March 31st, and which action had been taken by the railway companies so as to enable them to carry on their former operations and maintain their passenger connections and freight operations with the American roads, who had already advanced their time,—were required to appear before the Board to show cause why the cir-

culars issued should not be cancelled and standard time maintained on the railway systems.

A hearing was held in Ottawa on the 1st instant, when judgment was reserved. Further representations were made by members of Parliament opposed to daylight saving, with a view of having the matter opened up and, if necessary, further hearings held.

In view of the action I think the board ought to take, I am of the opinion that no further hearings are necessary or would serve any useful purpose. When the interim judgment was issued, no consideration whatever had been given to the debates in Parliament which took place when the Bill of 1918 was passed, and this for obvious reasons.

In construing statutes the question is not what was or was not said in debate. In almost every instance opposing views can be found in any debate. It is by reason indeed of divergence of opinion that debates are necessary. It is the action of Parliament as crystallized into law that has to be construed. The question, then, is not what members of Parliament intended to say. The issue, therefore, is not to be determined by inferences and findings that may be drawn from a number of divergent opinions expressed in debate and by speculation as to the result of these divergent opinions on the minds and intentions of the majority, i.e., members who, while voting, do not take part in the debate.

On the other hand, the question is what did Parliament intend by what it said. While the members speak in debate, Parliament has spoken only through the Act. As a result, in the construction of statutes, weight is not attached to the opinion of individual members of Parliament. Ramsay, J., in Bank of Toronto v. Lamb, 1 Q.B. at p. 186, says:

"In referring to the Acts of the legislature we express almost an excessive deference for them; but we compensate ourselves for this lip loyalty to the words of the statute by disregarding wholly the sayings of the individual legislator."

Cases dealing with the subject may be found collected in Gosselin v. The King, 33 S.C.R. 255. The Chief Justice, at p. 263, says:

"I deem it expedient, however, to say a few words upon the question raised during the argument of the reference by counsel to the debates in Parliament for the purpose of construing any statute. Such a reference has always been refused by my predecessors in this court and, when counsel in this case began to read from the Canadian Hansard the remarks made in Parliament when the Canada Evidence Act in question was under discussion I did not feel justified in departing from the rule so laid down, though, personally, I would not be unwilling, in cases of ambiguity in statutes, to concede that such a reference might sometimes be useful. The same rule is observed in England."

Since the interim judgment was issued, however, a new Daylight Saving Bill has been introduced in the Senate. It has been read the second time, and is now being considered by the Senate in Committee. This coincides with the view taken by the House of Commons, the resolution submitted there reading:

> "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to re-enact at once c. 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight Saving Act, 1918.'"

It is therefore apparent that both Houses of Parliament consider the question in the light of an expired Act instead of in the light of existing legislation which merely requires action by the Governor in Council to be made operative during the present year for general purposes, and action by the Board to be made operative for railway purposes.

As a matter of law, under all ordinary canons of construction to be followed in determining rights as between parties, my opinion that the Act of 1918 is still in effect remains unchanged.

Different action, however, has been taken in constitutional cases where the issues involved are large and general in their application, and are not confined of necessity to individual rights. Here, the issues cannot, in any sense, be described as personal. They are entirely general in their application; the whole country is affected.

This distinction is pointed out by the then Chief Justice of Canada in the Gosselin case already referred to. Reference is made by the learned Chief Justice to Mr. Lefroy's work, where judicial opinions are collected, wherein the general rule has been more or less disregarded in the construction of the British North America Act. Reference may be made to Lefroy's book (The Law of Legislative Power in Canada), pp. 17, 18, 26, 27, 54, 194, and 195.

The Supreme Court itself, in re prohibitory liquor laws, 24 S. C. R. 170, not only considered debates accompanying the submission of the resolutions of the respective legislatures, but, to some extent, adopted statements contained in them as the basis of the judgment in that case delivered. Reference may be made to the judgment of Gwynn, J., at p. 206.

In view of the action, therefore, of both Houses and the peculiar character of this question, I have examined the debates with a view of ascertaining whether or not, as has been alleged, the intention of Parliament was to enact a law which was not limited only in operation to a period to be prescribed in each year, but ceased to have all force on the expiration of the year 1918.

As might well be expected, divergent views are expressed. In the Senate I find that the Honorable Mr. Bostock, at p. 77 of the Debates, says:

> "It says: 'This Act shall be in force during the present year for such time as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.' That refers to the present year, but of course it can be put in force by the Governor in Council in another year. It is left in his hands. But, as I said before, we are now accustomed to legislation by Order in Council, so we understand the situation."

Honorable Mr. Beique, referring to Section 3 of the Act which was relied upon as limiting the whole force of the statute to the single year, says, at p. 92:

> "This Act shall be in force during the present year for such time as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council. That is, during this year. That is so worded because this year has commenced. But when the Bill becomes law it will remain on the statute-book until it is repealed. The Bill is a permanent Bill on its face, and I think should be interpreted as such."

On the other hand, the contrary opinion was urged both by the Honorable Sir James Lougheed, Government Leader in the Senate, and by the Honorable Mr. Ross. The Leader in the Senate, in whose charge the Bill was, at p. 96 is reported:

"If after the expiration of this year it is decided to continue it, it can be continued simply by declaring that this Act shall continue in force.

"Hon. Mr. Dandurand: Through another Act?"

"Hon. Sir James Lougheed: Through another Act."

A motion to make the matter plain was negatived in the Senate, not on the ground that is was desirable that the Act should be a permanent Act, but on the ground, as I read the record, that the Bill as already expressed made it clear that the Act ceased to be effective at the conclusion of the year 1918.

The Honorable Sir George Foster was in charge of the Bill in the House of Commons. At p. 196 he is reported as follows:

"This Bill is for this season only. My hon. friend from Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) will not need to come back next year, if the Bill does not work well, to have it repealed. Its effect ceases at the end of the season, and the duration that is given to it is in the choice of the Governor in Council; it will be proclaimed in and for the length of time that is necessary."

It would occur to me that the expressions of opinion of the honorable members in charge of Bills, in cases where the debates of Parliament can be considered (and, in view of what appears to be a common misunderstanding in both Houses, I think they ought to be in this case), are entitled to the greatest consideration. The statements of members in charge of Bills are statements which other members would naturally rely on. Over and above this, last year the Bill was a Government measure, and the interpretation placed upon it by the two members of the Cabinet having it in charge would largely represent the understanding Parliament had of the subject.

If, under the particular circumstances of this case, the ordinary question can be reversed, so that consideration is to be given not to what was intended by what Parliament has said, but what Parliament intended to say, there appears to be no doubt whatever but that Parliament understood that the Daylight Saving Act should expire with 1918.

The Board is not only a judicial but also an administrative body. The powers of the Board, under the Act, in many directions are extremely wide. Not only are they largely discretionary, but they have in certain instances been well defined to be legislative in their character.

Ought the Board now to take jurisdiction under the Daylight Saving Act, however absolute it may be in law, under circumstances which make it clear that, in so far as members of Parliament are concerned, such jurisdiction should not extend beyond 1918? I have come to the conclusion that to put the question is to answer it. Whatever the legal situation may be, under the circumstances the Board ought not to exercise that jurisdiction. This is a democratic country governed entirely through its representative assemblies. The question here, as already pointed out, does not affect rights as between parties, but an issue affecting the public as such. The wishes of Parliament, whatever those wishes may be, ought to prevail.

It is further obvious that in exercising the powers conferred on it by Section 5 of the Daylight Saving Act, the Board, in any event, ought to consider the action taken by the Governor in Council under section 3.

In my opinion, the Board under all the circumstances, can take no action under the Daylight Saving Act of 1918.

Standard or local time is determined in Canada by provincial law. The underlying basis is the Greenwich time, which is the mean time of the meridian of Greenwich, adopted in the first instance as the standard time by English astronomers, and is now the zero meridian of the world.

As an hour is equivalent to each fifteen degrees of longitude, the Atlantic standard meridian 60, which passes through Sydney and Glace Bay, is, Greenwich time, four hours slow.

The eastern standard meridian 75 is slightly west of Cornwall, and between Ottawa and Montreal; the central standard meridian 90 is some thirty miles west of Fort William; mountain standard meridian 105 passes a little to the west of Regina; and the Pacific standard meridian 120 is a short distance east of Kamloops.

Each successive standard meridian is one hour later than Greenwich, and as a result the Pacific standard meridian is eight hours slow of Greenwich time. The time of each standard meridian, theoretically, governs half an hour on each side thereof.

Most of the different provincial parliaments have found it impossible to give effect to time as required by proper meridian-reading practice. No difficulty existed in Nova Scotia, which, of course, is entirely within the half hour of the 60 meridian.

Prince Edward Island, although also entirely within the area controlled by the sixtieth meridian, by its Act intituled "An Act to Alter the Present Method of Reckoning Time," being Chapter 21 of the Acts of 1889, adopted Intercolonial standard time, which was 12 minutes and 29 seconds fast of the local time of the meridian passing through the provincial clock in the Law Courts Building, Charlottetown.

On the representation of the Intercolonial Railway authorities and of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they had determined upon the adoption of Atlantic standard time in the operation of railways in the province, and in order to prevent confusion and inconvenience to the public, New Brunswick, by its Act, Chapter 5 of the Statutes of 1902, adopted Atlantic standard time.

I have been unable to find any statutory provision dealing with the question in Quebec.

The Ontario provision is found in Chapter 132 of the Revised Statutes, 1914.

This Act provides that whenever an expression of time occurs in any Act or in any Rule of Court, by-law, deed, or other instrument, heretofore or hereafter enacted or executed, or where any hour or other period of time is stated orally or in writing, or any question as to a period of time arises, the time referred to or intended shall, unless it is otherwise specifically stated, be held to be "standard time". The Act declares that as regards that part of Ontario which lies east of the meridian of 90 degrees west longitude, standard time should be reckoned as five hours behind Greenwich time, and as regards that part of Ontario which lies west of the meridian standard time should be reckoned as six hours behind Greenwich time.

As the ninetieth meridian is the central standard meridian, it will be observed that under this Act the operation of the eastern standard meridian is carried half an hour farther west than it ought to, theoretically. The Act has been amended by Chapter 20 of the Acts of 1918, Section 25, as follows:

"(4) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations, and may from time to time amend, modify, suspend, repeal, and re-enact such regulations varying the reckoning of standard time as defined by subsections 2 and 3 hereof.

"(5) Such regulations may authorize the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board to fix the time-tables of all railways subject to its control, and to make such other orders as may be necessary for the convenient carrying out of the provisions of this Act, in so far as may be necessary or convenient for carrying out the said regulations."

In Manitoba the question is covered by the Interpretation Act, Chapter 89 of the Revised Statutes, 1902, Section 8, s.s. (r) reading:

"The time used upon the Canadian Pacific Railway and known as central time, being the time of the ninetieth meridian of west longitude, is hereby declared to be the standard time of this Province, and when any statute heretofore or hereafter passed refers to any particular time of day, such standard time shall be considered to be meant."

In Manitoba, again, theoretical requirements are not, therefore, followed, as the Manitoba Act carries the time of the central standard meridian through the whole Province, while theoretically, time based on the central standard meridian ceased between Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg and at a point some twenty miles west of Winnipeg.

In Saskatchewan time is governed by the Interpretation Act, Chapter 1 of the Revised Statutes, 1909, Section 6, s.s. 33, which reads:

"The time known as 'mountain standard time' (being the local time at the one hundred and fifth meridian of west longitude and being seven hours behind Greenwich time) is hereby declared to be the standard time of the province; and when any Act refers to any particular time of day such standard time shall be considered to be meant."

As a matter of fact, instead of the time of the one hundred and fifth meridian being observed throughout the province, that time commences at Broadview and Bredenbury.

The provision as to Alberta is to be found in the Interpretation Act, chapter 3 of the Statutes of 1906, section 7, s.s. 22, which reads:

"The time known as 'mountain standard time,' being the local time at the one hundred and fifth meridian of longitude, is hereby declared to be the standard time of the province; and when any Act refers to any particular time of day such standard time shall be considered to be meant."

The provision relating to time in British Columbia is contained in the Interpretation Act, chapter 1 of the Revised Statutes of 1911, section 26, s.s (43) which reads as follows:

"(a) Where an expression of time occurs in any Act of the Legislature, whether heretofore or hereafter passed, or in any Rule of Court, by-law, deed, or other legal instrument, whether heretofore or hereafter made, passed, or executed, or whenever any hour or other period of time is stated either orally or in writing, or whenever any question as to a period of time arises, the time referred to or intended shall, unless it is otherwise specifically stated, be held to be what is known as Pacific Standard time, reckoned as eight hours behind Greenwich time."

Not only is time, as theoretically correct, not being observed by legislation, but as a matter of fact time changes on the railways have not, in the past, observed the provincial enactment. To illustrate; The New Brunswick standard time is fixed by the sixtieth meridian. This carries the time of the sixtieth meridian some eighty miles west of its proper operation. The Intercolonial does not change its time in New Brunswick, but carries the time of the sixtieth meridian to Mont Joli, an appropriate divisional point in Quebec, while the Canadian Pacific, in changing its time at St. John, changes it some 70 miles east of the westerly boundary of the area theoretically controlled by the Atlantic standard meridian.

In Ontario time changes on the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways at Port Arthur and on the Grand Trunk Pacific at Armstrong, while the Ontario Statute continues the time of the meridian 75 degrees west longitude to the meridian of 90 degrees, thereby continuing that time for some 35 miles more westerly. The time of this meridian, theoretically, ceased between the meridians of the eighty-second and eighty-third degrees, at or near Woman River on the Canadian Pacific and Secord on the Grand Trunk Pacific, while, as a matter of fact, time on the railway changes approximately 40 and 55 miles east of the meridian of 90 degrees.

Without further elaboration, eastern standard and mountain times all govern farther westward than the theoretical limit. To add one further example: theoretically, mountain time should stop and Pacific time commence about at Bassano instead of at Field. The points at which time changes in the past have been made are the result, not of theories but of the conditions required by and the demands of public safety and railroad operation.

In some of the provinces legislation dealing with daylight saving has been passed. British Columbia has adopted the measure for this year.

The provision in force in Prince Edward Island is as follows:

"1. This Act may be cited as the Time Saving Act.

"2. During the prescribed period in each year in which this Act is in force the time, for general purposes in this province, shall be one hour in advance of the time as fixed by the Statute 52 Victoria, Chapter 11, Section 1.

"3. This Act shall be in force in each year during such time as the Summer Time Act of Canada is in force.

"4. Where any expression of time occurs in any Statute, Order in Council, Order, regulation, rule, or by-law or in any deed, time-table, notice, advertisement, or other document, the fixing of the time with respect to which is within the legislative jurisdiction of this province, the time mentioned or referred to shall be held, during the prescribed period, to be the time as fixed by this Act." Chapter 2 of the Act of 1918.

It will be noted that this provincial action is predicated on the Dominion Act, and treats it as continuing.

In Nova Scotia the former statute adopted for standard time the standard Atlantic meridian (the 60th). By the provincial statute of last year the following provisions are made:

"2. Where an expression of time occurs in any statute, act, enactment, law, order in council, rule of court, order, by-law, rule, regulation, deed, or other instrument heretofore or hereafter enacted, executed, or made, or where any hour or other period of time is stated either orally or in writing, or any question as to a period of time arises, the time referred to or

intended shall, unless it is otherwise specifically stated, be held to be the time reckoned as prescribed by or under this Act.

"3. (1) The Governor in Council may in each year by proclamation published in the 'Royal Gazette' prescribe that as regards any period in such year between the thirty-first day of March and the first day of November, such period to be specified in the proclamation, time shall be reckoned as three hours behind Greenwich mean solar time.

"(2) As regards any period in each year between the thirty-first day of March and the first day of November in respect of which there is no such proclamation and as regards the period in each year between the thirty-first day of October and the first day of April time shall be reckoned as four hours behind Greenwich mean solar time.

"4. Unless it is otherwise specifically stated—

(a) The expression 'month' where it occurs or is stated as in the next preceding section mentioned means calendar month;

(b) the expression 'year' where it occurs or is stated as aforesaid means calendar year, and shall be equivalent to the expression 'year of our Lord.'"

Ontario's amendment has already been set out.

The suggestion has been made that as Greenwich time controls the standard time in every province, and that as the British Parliament has advanced Greenwich time for one hour, daylight saving automatically came into effect in Canada. This is not the case; Greenwich time has not been altered. It could not very well be. The effect of the Summer Time Act of the United Kingdom is to declare that during the prescribed period in each year in which the Act is in force, the time, for general purposes in Great Britain, shall be one hour in advance of Greenwich mean time.

No reference is made to, and I have been unable to find any Dominion Statute dealing with the question of time, other than the Daylight Saving Act, which, for reasons already set out, I do not consider.

Under the Railway Act no direct jurisdiction is given the Board to compel railway companies to adopt any specific time. As a matter of fact, the railways have never fixed their time either according to the standard meridians or standard time as adopted by the provinces.

The points selected for change of railway time are either terminals or divisional points, where the necessary change can be made with the least danger to the travelling public, and are well known to all train crews.

The Provincial Parliaments have no direct jurisdiction over Dominion lines as such, but if it be assumed that Dominion railways are bound by provincial enactment passed in regard to time (and in my opinion they are not), it will be observed that, under the Provincial Acts, speaking generally, standard time shall be taken as the time governing unless it is specifically stated to the contrary. The railway companies have given specific notice that they operate on the new or fast time.

The Acts, on their face, refer to the expression of time in statutes, rules of court, and legal instruments rather than to the time to be observed by commercial corporations and the like, even though such commercial corporations may at the same time happen to be public utilities, although in some instances the Act covers the question whenever the matter of time arises whether stated orally or in writing unless it is specifically stated that standard time shall not govern.

The only province in which the question of railway time seems to have been considered is in Ontario, where specific authority is given to the local Railway and Municipal Board to fix the time tables of all railway companies subject to its control, and make such other orders as may be necessary for the convenient carrying out of the provisions of the Act, in so far as may be necessary or convenient for the carrying out of the regulations. This provision is similar in character to section 5 of the Act, I treat as lapsed, conferring powers on the board.

In dealing with the subject it is plain that the Parliaments of both Canada and Ontario were of the opinion that it was necessary to clothe their Railway Boards with special powers in order to confer a jurisdiction upon them. This of itself, particularly when the Act of last year is treated as lapsed, would not discharge any direct jurisdiction which might be found elsewhere.

A general jurisdiction is conferred on the Board by Section 30 of the Railway Act. The section gives specific powers. It also gives a general power to the Board in the matter of protection, appliances, methods, etc., practically a general jurisdiction to provide for the safety of the travelling public, and a general jurisdiction as to anything sanctioned or required by the Special Act or by the Railway Act.

There is no provision, either in any of the Special Acts or in the Railway Act, relating to the standard time. There is a provision as to time tables. Under Section 307 of the Railway Act, the company may make by-laws, rules, or regulations respecting the hours of the arrival and departure of trains. The board has required companies to make changes in their service only after giving certain notice to the public.

The Board is also given a direct jurisdiction with reference to the construction and operation of rolling stock by Section 268, which reads:

"The Board shall endeavour to provide for uniformity in the construction of rolling stock to be used upon the railway, and for uniformity of rules for the operation and running of trains."

The Board has also power to make regulations in connection with the working of trains, such as designating the number of men to be employed, providing for the use of coal instead of wood, and providing generally for the protection of property, and the protection, safety, accommodation, and comfort of the public and of the employees of the company in the running and operating of trains by the company.

A further obligation is also placed upon railway companies by Section 270, which provides that all regular trains shall be started and run, as nearly as practicable, at regular hours, fixed by public notice.

I am of the opinion that the Board's general powers are sufficient for it to make any regulation required for the protection of property and the protection, safety, accommodation, and comfort of the public and of the employees of the company. It has no jurisdiction which will enable it to legislate the standard of time, as such, that the railway companies shall use.

The question, then, for the Board's consideration is whether or not the change that the railway companies have made in their running time tables is improper having regard to the protection and safety of the travelling public

and the railway employees, and the accommodation and comfort of the public.

I now consider the question from the standpoint of public safety and convenience. In so far as the accommodation and convenience of the public is concerned, the companies take the stand that when railways in the United States advanced their running time one hour, it was necessary, in the interests of the accommodation and convenience of the travelling public, in view of the large amount of international business, for Canadian lines to do the same.

The companies put in evidence an estimate showing that one hundred trains were daily engaged in this business, and that the minimum daily average number of passengers was 10,000, a large and appreciable section of the travelling public.

It was argued that unless time on Canadian railways was advanced train connection in American territory would be lost, and that on the movement into Canada trains would be held up for an hour.

Members of Parliament opposing the adoption of dayight saving by the railways, admitted the necessity of maintaining international connections, but pointed out that this difficulty could be obviated entirely by the Canadian Railways simply changing the running time of the trains directly engaged in international business, and connecting trains, by advancing the time of these trains one hour, and that it was not, therefore, necessary for the railways to adopt daylight saving time.

In so far as these connections are concerned, the point is perfectly well taken. Undoubtedly a train on the old running time scheduled for 8 o'clock, if the running time table be advanced to 7, makes just the same connections with American lines using summer time and gives just the same accommodation as if the time table itself were not changed but the clock instead.

In so far as the convenience and accommodation of the travelling public are concerned, either remedy would be equally efficient. In either case the necessities of the travelling public are properly observed. As a result, the action of the railway companies is not against the accomodation and convenience of the public, but on the other hand that accommodation and convenience did not of necessity compel that action, as the time tables might well be changed instead.

A further consideration intimately connected with the matter of public convenience is the fact that by far the greater number of urban centres have adopted summer time locally. I know of no law under which the Board could in any way review this action, or which would prevent municipalities, any more than individuals, keeping what time they desire.

However this may be, the cities in any event claim that their clocks have been advanced as of right, and are insistent in maintaining the benefit of summer time for their citizens, irrespective of Dominion legislation standardizing summer time, or whether it be adopted in rural districts or on the railways.

The companies in their case urge that it is their duty to meet the convenience of the travelling public, and that that convenience means the convenience of the majority of the travelling public. The estimate made by the companies as to the proportion of passenger traffic places it at 75 per cent urban and 25 per cent rural respectively, thus showing a large majority of passengers in the urban class. Mr. Sutherland, M.P., was of the opinion that this percentage was too high. The figures are not by any manner of means exact; they are estimates, and the Board has no statistics which would cover the question.

There is but little doubt, however, that the majority of passenger earnings are earned in the urban centres, and that the great bulk of the movement is either into or out of urban centres. It is also true, of course, that a large part of this movement to urban centres is supplied by rural districts. The convenience, however, of those having business to do in the cities, whether they come from a rural district or from another urban municipality, is best served by trains which fit into the business day at the point of destination rather than trains which arrive an hour later.

Having regard to the convenience of the travelling public at large no order cancelling the new time schedules can well be justified.

It is but fair to point out that it takes some time to rearrange time-tables. The lines, in some instances, are particularly busy. Changes in the running time of a large number of trains that would be affected have to be carefully worked out. The mere printing and rearrangement of the time-tables of itself takes time, and if the time is set back and new time-tables printed, a period of at least three weeks should be allowed for the purpose.

The companies also insisted that in the interests of public safety it is practically impossible to do anything else. In short, their position was that trains crossing over the border under different times would result in the train crews having to make calculations on two different times on the same run, and that this would be an entirely improper operation and involve undue hazard both to the travelling public and to the train employees.

The evidence of Mr. Crombie, of the Canadian National Railways, in part reads:

"The discussion has largely hinged in the past in connection with such subdivisions as are handled by one train despatcher with two different times prevailing on the one subdivision as would be the case if the railroad lines in the United States were obliged to use the Federal time and the railroads in Canada were obliged to retain their old time. But, in addition to the hazard which arises from the confusion in the train despatcher's mind, there is the confusion which will arise in the minds of train and engine men. One gentleman says he is here to represent the engine men and perhaps he will speak directly for them, but as an operating man I would like to say the discussion has been to a considerable extent upon the risk to passenger trains; but the risk to passenger trains arises from the operation of the freight trains more than from the operation of passenger trains. There are two fundamental reasons for that greater hazard: One is that the freight trains are, of course, more numerous than the passenger trains, therefore the hazard is greater; the other is that passenger trains are handled by the senior men, who have had long years experience and are thoroughly well tried out before they are given the responsibility of passenger trains. The freight trains are operated by the junior men. In the case of our own line, the National Railways, for instance, on first subdivision east from Winnipeg, which is one of the very heavy outlets for grain from the West, where the train service will amount anywhere

from 10 to 30 trains per day, you will quite readily understand that in the grain rush season, when we are employing more train men than we are at the quiet season, there will be men set up as we say, men promoted from brakeman to conductor and from fireman to engineer, to take care of the additional movement, and in place of those promoted men you will bring on green men from below. Trains are operated either by rights given them on a time-table, or by rights given them by the train despatcher in train orders. Passenger trains are operated under time-table rights. The freight trains more largely, or chiefly, are operated by rights and orders from the train despatchers in such language as this:—Run extra from Winnipeg to Fort Frances. Now that is all the order that the freight train may receive. That confers the right on that train to make that movement, and with time-table rights trains moving on that same subdivision, passenger trains in other words, it is up to the freight train to work his own passage according to the time-table, the watch in his hand, and his judgment as to what speed he can make, taking into consideration the capacity of his engine, the weight of his train, the distance he has to go, and the grades he has to overcome. You can quite readily recognize that with junior men, perhaps for the first time set up as conductor and engineer, if, in addition to watching the time, they must figure out and think, is my watch American time or Canadian time; then he takes his time-table and says in regard to this particular part of the road, are these figures Canadian time or American time; and then exercises his judgment as to whether he can go 8 miles in the time between the time shown on his watch and the time on the time-table, and figure out the weight of his train as against the grade. For an inexperienced man there is considerable responsibility. As an operating man, I want to support what has been said here this morning, that I would be very loath indeed to take the risk of operating under these conditions where we require that man to carry in mind at a certain section of the road all that I have said. He cannot tell by the clock. He must consider, Am I Canadian or American, is the time-table Canadian or American."

Representations were also made by different brotherhoods interested. Mr. Lawrence appeared for the Locomotive Engineers. He was not interested in the question of daylight saving as such one way or the other, but took the stand that one time only ought to be observed in railway operations, and urged that for this reason daylight saving time should be adopted on Canadian lines.

The same position was taken by Mr. Best, on behalf of the Locomotive Firemen. Mr. Best wired other officials of his organization as follows:—

"Advanced time in the United States directly affects railway employees engaged in international service. No corresponding legislation in Canada. Question before Railway Commission tomorrow morning ten o'clock. Uniform time seems esential to safe operation. What have you to offer?"

Two ansewrs were filed, one from the representative at Brockville, a point from which trains operate into the United States, as follows:—

"Uniform time is absolutely necessary for safe operation of trains in international service."

[Mr. Meighen.]

While the answer from the representative at Winnipeg was—

"Your wire received. Favour uniform time on all railways."

Mr. T. J. Coughlin, who appeared for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, said:

"While we can work under two times it is not a safe proposition. It is a second chance for a man to make a mistake. Whatever you adopt let it be uniform, let there be one time."

The difficulties and dangers consequent on change of time seem to be somewhat exaggerated, the zone of danger unduly extended. Operating conditions everywhere are not affected. If it were possible to change time latitudinally as done at longitudinal points, at divisional stations with changes of crews, there is no reason why changes of time on the latitude when understood should be any more dangerous than changes of time on the longitude which we now have.

While the paramount issue of safe operation requires as few changes as possible, and while that result is best secured by the operation of one time in both Canadian and United States territory, the real point of danger is on subdivisions where two times are necessarily used.

The companies in their case treated the situation under the supposition that time would have to be changed whenever the border of the respective countries was passed, and this rule was applied in their evidence, for example, the Canadian Pacific has a line running from Farnham to Newport. The line here crosses at mileage 26.3 into American territory. It returns to Canadian territory at mileage 32.5, and returns again into American territory at mileage 43.4, continuing in American territory to Newport, mileage out of Farnham 58.4.

From the manner in which the case was argued, from the railway standpoint, time would be changed as follows: From Canadian to American, from American to Canadian, and from Canadian to American in this short run. As I see it, this is really unnecessary. I cannot imagine that the slightest difficulty would be raised under the American law to the Canadian railway, the trains of which are despatched from Farnham, maintaining its Canadian time through the one division.

In like manner the difficulties that have been raised in connection with the New York Central operation running into Ottawa could easily be obviated. The movement in this case is from Tupper Lake into Ottawa. The run in Canadian territory is only some fifty miles. There are no important intermediate stations on it, and no points at which complications would arise between Canadian railways if this comparatively short run in Canada was operated on American time, thus obviating any change in time on this run.

If, as a principle of general application Parliament should determine that in this country summer time cannot be adopted and no time except that made standard by provincial Act can be used, I am of the opinion that the time at the despatching headquarters of any international division, in the interests of public safety, should apply throughout that division, for example, on the Grand Trunk line to Portland, despatched out of Montreal, Canadian time ought to be maintained to Island Pond, Vermont. Island Pond is a divisional point and is the end of the line of the Canadian crews. The time at this point would become American.

The same practice would apply to the operation of the branches to Moore's Junction, Massena Springs, and Alburgh Junction. Conversely, the Boston and Maine running into Canada despatched from White River Junction would maintain American time to its Canadian terminal at Sherbrooke.

This practice could not apply, however, generally. For example, on New York Central trains running into Montreal, the time would have to be changed in transit on the one division at Adirondack Junction. The same considerations apply to the service on the Delaware & Hudson System, which connects with the Canadian Pacific at Delson Junction, and to the Canadian Pacific, Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo, and New York Central trains operating between Toronto and New York via Buffalo.

Another important movement is that of the Canadian Pacific, Montreal to St. John. The changes here, however, can be made at divisional points. In order to do this American time would have to be adopted in Canadian territory at Megantic and carried as far as McAdam Junction in New Brunswick.

In Western territory, applying the principle above stated, there would seem to be no reason why the Canadian National System should not be operated on slow time in American territory. This would necessitate no change of time whatever on that movement.

On the movements from Winnipeg south different considerations apply, and the time would have to be changed. The service running from Neche into Portage la Prairie is despatched from American territory, as is also the service from Wakopa to Brandon. If the lines maintained American time to Portage la Prairie and Brandon, no operating difficulty would result.

The Operating Department advises that in regard to Grand Trunk Pacific movements through Northgate and the Canadian Pacific movements through North Portal and Coutts, time can be changed as at a divisional point owing to the fact that the Canadian crews hand the train over to American crews at the border.

I should point out that the Canadian Pacific do not always change crews entirely at divisional points, as the train conductors are not changed at Broadview, although the engineers and firemen are; so that, as a matter of fact, conductors on this line now have to operate on two times.

The international movement is a good deal involved in British Columbia, having particular regard to the operations of the Great Northern. The Legislature of British Columbia, however, has adopted daylight saving.

Giving full effect, however, to these considerations, undoubtedly it is more dangerous to operate railways under two times than it is under a single time, although it well may be that that operation can be carried on without accidents.

Theoretically, there should be no trouble at all in changing time. It is a very simple operation. Theoretically, there ought to be no accidents at all in railway transportation. The rules, if observed, would prevent accident. This, of course, does not apply to cases where accidents occur owing to the destruction of material. A very large percentage, however, of accidents occur owing to what has been termed "failure of the human element," and the effort in railway operation is to reduce the opportunities for failure of the human element to as small a compass as possible.

With this end in view, derails and interlocked signals are insisted on at level crossings and drawbridges. These appliances involve a large expenditure. They would be entirely unnecessary if it were safe to rely on the human element. An ordinary signal would be all-sufficient as long as it was observed. For the same reason, time locks are placed on signal apparatus. Automatic block signals are installed. Double train orders are now issued as against single train orders, so as to provide a check on the mental operations of the conductors, engineers, and operators, and to afford a chance, in case of failure, for correction before disaster occurs.

In order to make this the more certain the rules require the reading of all orders the one to the other by the different officials handling them, and require conductors and engineers to advise the brakemen and the firemen of the contents of all orders received.

As a matter of general experience whenever two times are used in one municipality mistakes are made in appointments and misunderstandings occur. This doubtless is well appreciated in Ottawa owing to the fact that while Parliament observes standard time, the hotels, shops, business institutions, and the general Ottawa public observe summer time. I have no doubt this has proved a great personal inconvenience to members of Parliament owing to the fact that their hotels and the great majority of people they do business with observe summer time.

Railway employees to a large extent live in urban centres, and if railway companies do not observe the local time in effect where the railway employees live and, to a large extent, work, they would be subject to similar inconveniences. But the obligation of the railway crews to correctly observe two times is much more serious than in the ordinary case. Mistakes in appointments owing to conflict of times while vexatious are certainly as a rule not serious. In the case of a conductor or engineer making such a mistake when different times have to be observed on the one division or run, particularly where those in charge of freight trains are obliged to calculate where an opposing passenger train running on a time different from that they are for the moment operating on should be passed, a head-on collision would in all probability result.

It is impossible for the Board to hold that the railways, in adopting the time used on the American lines, have done anything which militates against the safety of the travelling public or the employees working on the trains. On the other hand, what has been done is in ease of public safety.

I have hitherto made no reference to the arguments made by Members of Parliament opposed to daylight saving. This is not because they are not deserving of the most careful consideration, but because they require the consideration of a question which, as I see it, this Board has no right to pass upon. The issues presented were, in substance as to whether daylight saving should be enforced against the wishes of a great number of agriculturists and some inhabitants of cities.

The Board has no jurisdiction whatever to force summer time on anybody, nor, on the other hand, to prevent its use by railways unless such use is shown to be against the comfort, convenience and safety of the travelling public. The matter of settling the time standard of the country has never been dele-

gated by Parliament to the Board. In my humble judgment it ought not to be.

It is unfortunate that the question of public safety has become interwoven with the discussion of the question; unfortunate that unless summer time be adopted in Canada, more or less danger will result to the Canadian travelling public. It is entirely open to Parliament to consider whether or not these circumstances are or are not offset by other disadvantages, or whether the disadvantages, in turn, of summer time in some parts of the country are not overweighed by the advantages of summer time in some other section.

These considerations are not open to the Board. It can only consider time as an incident to railway operation. As already pointed out, local time has never been observed by railways operating in Canada, nor has it been observed by railways operating in the United States. The different points in the United States where time now changes under American law were fixed by the exigencies of railway operation.

I find that in England the practice of the railways, before the English Act of 1880 was passed, which standardized the mean time of the Greenwich standard meridian for England and Scotland, was to run on Greenwich time and pay no attention to local time, and that in some cases clocks, as a result, had two sets of hands, the one showing Greenwich time and the other the time of the locality.

Further, there is no Dominion law giving the Board any basis on which to fix railway time If it had to be sun time it would in most instances depart entirely from local time as fixed by local legislatures, and would bring about chaos. If the railways, again, are to be run on provincial standard time, notwithstanding the exceptions made in the Provincial Acts arbitrary changes would have to be made in former railway practice of many years standing. Again this year, the local time in British Columbia is summer time and if local laws are to be adopted the change in time between British Columbia and Alberta would be two hours. Time changes of necessity are more or less of a nuisance and more or less of a danger to railway operation. The changes worked about by longitude must be put up with, but in order to obviate the necessity of a change brought about by latitude in the future it is possible that Parliament will think the matter of sufficient importance to bring up the question with the proper authorities of the Government of the United States. Daylight saving is a matter for Parliament, and the Board having no jurisdiction cannot pass upon the merits of the issue one way or the other.

H. L. D.

Ottawa, April 11, 1919.

I agree:

A. C. B.
A. S. G.
J. G. R.

The Deputy Chief Commissioner:

The Board is vested only with the powers given it by Parliament. Its duty is to enforce the railway legislation of the Dominion Parliament, and to exercise its judicial and executive powers in the best interests of all, railway companies included.

On April 1 instant, railway companies operating in Canada advanced their time by one hour in order to operate their trains in conjunction with the American roads with which they have considerable international traffic. The railway companies on the other side of the border take this step in obedience to the law of the land, where a Daylight Saving Act is in force for 1919.

The question now before us it to know whether, by so doing, our Canadian railway companies have done anything illegal, and whether the Board should order them to revert to the old time.

In the first place, have we a Standard Time in Canada, established by the Dominion Parliament? It appears that there is not any.

In the year 1918 the Parliament of Canada enacted a law which is called "The Daylight Saving Act," where a Standard Time is mentioned. This Standard Time mentioned by the Dominion of Canada is the "Accepted Standard Time" and does not refer to the Standard Time as adopted by the principal countries of the world.

In my opinion the Act of 1918 has passed out of existence and it goes without saying, that the jurisdiction vested in the Board by it has also expired.

Our accepted Standard Time, therefore, is the time that everybody is following all through Canada, and which does not exactly correspond to the 15 degree divisions marked from the Greenwich Meridian.

This time is followed willingly be everybody. But what if the divine at the head of his congregation—I am speaking of the province of Quebec where the Legislature does not appear to have enacted as to a standard time to be observed—was to advance the time in his parish by one hour? Would anybody under his jurisdiction have the right to apply for a mandamus or any other writ to force him to follow the accepted Standard Time? I do not think so. And if the head of a simple parish is vested with such power, why should not towns and cities have the right to do the same? Why should not railway companies have the right to fix the time of their trains under the provisions of the Railway Act?

As far as railway companies are concerned, they have their own interests in mind in fixing their time, and they desire to operate their system in a practical manner. They really opened up this country, and after opening it up they adopted whatever time best suited their purposes. Their dictum was accepted by everybody, as everybody depended upon them in almost every instance of their daily life. They have seen fit to adopt an early hour because of their frequent connections with the American roads, and if I am not mistaken the great majority of the Canadian people, especially those located in the larger centres, are anxious to do likewise.

Certain portions of the country, where international correspondence is not so active, seem to have prevented the re-enactment of the law forcing everybody to follow, during the summertime, an earlier clock.

I do not think we have power to intervene in the matter. The railway companies are at liberty to adopt whatever time they choose, in accordance with the Railway Act.

In view of the evidence given at the hearing in the matter. I, for one, would be willing to report favorably, as I think in advancing their time they have acted for the benefit of the public in general.

W.B.N.

Ottawa, April 11th, 1919.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) been consulted in the matter?

Mr. BUREAU: I understand the Commission to say it was a question of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Commission decided in these words at page 8:

> Standard or local time is determined in Canada by provincial law.

I will give you my synopsis of the judgment. They set out, first of all, that although the actual legal effect of the legislation of 1918 is such as to continue that Act in effect, clearly the intention of the sponsors of the Bill in both Houses was that it should not be in effect past the year 1918, and that as a consequence any power vested in the Railway Commission under that Act should not be now exercisable by them. Then, they take the ground that the general question as to the determination of standard or legal time is provincial but that the Board have jurisdiction if they are convinced that the change of time in railway operation is necessitated by the considerations of the protection and safety of the public or of public convenience. That is to say, they take the ground that they could only interfere with the determination of the railways in this matter if that interference is necessitated by public protection and safety and public convenience. In reference to that question they come to the conclusion that public safety and convenience are both conserved by this decision of the Railway War Board and that therefore they cannot interfere as they have no jurisdiction to interfere on any other basis or principle and therefore they decline to interfere at all.

Mr. GLASS: Are we to understand that the provinces have power to fix the standard time within their own jurisdiction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That seems to be the opinion of the Board and, to make it clear I will just state what the Ontario enactment is as outlined in this judgment:

> This Act provides that whenever an expression of time occurs in any Act or in any rule of court, by-law, deed or other instrument, heretofore or hereafter enacted or executed, or where any hour or other period of time is stated either orally or in writing, or any question as to a period of time arises, the time referred to or intended shall, unless it is otherwise specifically stated, be held to be "standard time." The Act declares that as regards that part of Ontario which lies east of the meridian of 90 degrees, west longitude, standard time should be reckoned as five hours behind Greenwich time,, and as regards that part of Ontario which lies west of that Meridian, standard time should be reckoned as six hours behind Greenwich time.

That is the present Ontario statute. That is fixing the standard or local time as a general question. The Board says that this is provincial time but it goes on to say that Parliament would have the power, in so far as railway operation is concerned, to determine what the time shall be. The Board has only power now under the authority of the Railway Act in cases where it is deemed that its interferance is necessitated by public safety, protection or convenience in railway operation.

Mr. GLASS: Will the minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the House that an adjournment motion is, according to Rule 17, not debatable. The debate has taken on proportions which are certainly not within the bounds of an undebatable motion. I would ask hon. members to reserve until some future occasion, the discussion of this question, especially until after the complete judgment, which has been placed on Hansard has been read by hon. members.

Mr. GLASS: Am I out of order in asking a question ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order unless he has the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. GLASS: I want to ask the minister if it was competent for this Parliament last year to pass this Act in view of that judgment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is the practice of Parliament to cross-examine ministers on questions of law, unless at all events some notice is given. It would appear as if the wide intent and scope of the Act, as enacted by this House, was possibly in some respects beyond the power of Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is hard on Sir George Foster.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to ask the minister a question—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to suggest that before the clocks are moved forward there should be an Order in Council passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion ?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour say "aye".

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those opposed say " no."

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In my opinion the "ayes" have it. This House stands adjourned until Monday at 3 o'clock, Ottawa time.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Monday, April 14, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DAYLIGHT SAVING—SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

POINT OF ORDER RAISED BY MR. J. J. DENIS.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is proceeded with, I wish to rise to a point of order, which I may formulate as follows:

> This House is not in order when it does now sit at this hour of the day, but can only be in order when it sits this afternoon at 3 p.m., such hour being based upon the standard time which was in effect when the House adjourned last Friday night.

If I am in order, I shall now proceed to demonstrate that it is now, not three o'clock, but two o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would be at liberty to discuss the point of order, if it is a point of order, but he would not be at liberty to raise a discussion or to present arguments as to whether it is now two o'clock or three o'clock. In the first place, I am not altogether clear in my own mind that the hon. gentleman has risen at the right stage. Although it is competent for a point of order to be raised at any stage of the proceedings, it has been the practice that no point of order may be raised until the proceedings of the House have begun. However, that question can be left open.

It would have been somewhat easier for the Chair if notice of this proposed point of order had been given. As I view it, the hon. member has not a point of order. A point of order, as I understand it, has reference to a violation of the rules of the House. It raises the question whether an hon. member may or may not be in contravention of those rules.

[The Deputy Speaker.]

The rules of the House say that the House shall meet at three o'clock. The time now may or may not be three o'clock within the meaning of the rule, but it does not seem to me that that is arguable as a point of order. It is a question of fact for the decision of the House. I have not the advantage of having been in the Chamber when the House rose on Friday night, but from a perusal of Hansard report of the proceedings, while it is not altogether clear, there certainly is at least prima facie evidence of the circumstance that the House by its decision upon that occasion determined that it would adjourn until three o'clock to-day, local time. It is true that the motion as entered in the Votes and Proceedings appears simply as an adjournment motion. The motion as put by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) was:

> That this House do stand adjourned until Monday at three o'clock, local time.

That of itself is to my mind sufficient evidence that the House is properly convened at this hour, and for this reason also: upon all other occasions the motion would simply have been "That the House do now adjourn," and ipso facto, under our rules, the House would stand adjourned until the next day at three o'clock.

I therefore rule that the point of order is not well taken, at the same time observing that the House is the sole arbiter as to the day and the hour it shall sit. It is open for the House, at the proper time, and within the rules, to make any alteration it may choose as to the hour. But for the time being I rule that the point of order is not well taken, and that the House is properly convened at this hour.

Mr. DENIS: If I correctly understand your decision, Sir, it bars any comment upon my part, and my only recourse is to appeal from your ruling to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is quite right.

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette) appealed from the ruling of Mr. Speaker, and the same was confirmed without division.

COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—ITS SCOPE DEFINED.

COPY OF ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) laid on the Table copy of an

Order in Council dated April 4, 1919, defining the scope of the Commission recently appointed to deal with the relations of capital and labour throughout Canada.

4th April, 1919.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 22nd March, 1919, from the Chairman, Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee, stating that a resolution was adopted at the meeting of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee on the 19th instant, in the terms following:—

The Labour Committee has been impressed by the necessity of some policy being formulated which will bring about the adoption of co-operative relations between employers and employees in the various lines of industry, as the best means of establishing a satisfactory relationship in industry throughout Canada. The Labour Committee realizes the different conditions existing in various industries, but nevertheless feels that there are certain basic principles which apply to all. The Labour Committee has itself given earnest consideration to the efforts which are being made in this and other countries for the solution of the problem of industrial relationships, and recognizing the complexity and importance of this problem, recommends that a Royal Commission be appointed immediately to report to the Government on the following matters, namely:—

1. To consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees.

2. To recommend means for ensuring that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and employees shall be reviewed from time to time by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.

For the above purposes the commission shall:

1. Make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries.

2. Obtain information as to the character and extent of organization already existing among bodies of employers and employees respectively.

3. Investigate available data as to the progress made by established joint industrial councils in Canada, Great Britain and the United States.

It is further recommended that the commission shall submit a final report on the foregoing reference not later than June 1, 1919.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

THE WAR MEASURES ACT, 1914.

EXTENSION OF OPERATION OF ORDERS AND REGULATIONS PASSED THEREUNDER.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 71, to extend the operation of the orders and regulations passed by the Governor in Council under The War Measures Act, 1914.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The purpose of the Bill is to extend the operation of Orders in Council passed under the War Measures Act, until the prorogation of this Parliament. The War Measures Act itself provides that it shall remain in effect until the cessation of hostilities, and that the cessation of hostilities may be determined by one of two methods—by the proclamation of His Majesty, or by the proclamation of the Governor in Council. In view of the possibility of an early declaration of peace, and of a proclamation thereof by His Majesty within a reasonable time and before the expiration of this session, we are asking that the Orders in Council passed under the War Measures Act which, upon the ceasing of the Act itself to have effect, may possibly themselves cease to have effect, be extended until the prorogation of Parliament. In the meantime, the Government will consider what may be necessary to be done with relation to some of those Orders in Council, having in view the general public interest. The Bill also provides that though the Orders in Council be extended in effect until the prorogation of Parliament, subject, of course, to any legislation in the meantime, the Governor in Council shall have power to repeal or rescind any of them in whole or in part.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it the intention of the minister, before the measure goes through Committee, to give a list of Orders in Council that are not to be continued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no such list. This simply extends the effect of the Orders in Council until the prorogation of Parliament even though His Majesty or the Governor in Council may declare that peace now reigns. After that, Orders in Council may be rescinded. Some have already been rescinded, many of them in part, and that process may continue until the end of Parliament. There are none at the present time, as far as I know, which it is the intention specifically to rescind.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DAYLIGHT SAVING—RAILROAD TIME.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to ensure that the railways of Canada shall run in accordance with the time of Canada and not of the United States.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I have given the matter some consideration, and it is not clear,—apart from the condition of war and for a war purpose,—that the Dominion Government has general jurisdiction upon the subject of time in the Dominion. On the contrary, it would appear to me that for many, if not all, purposes, this jurisdiction is provincial. However, I do not pas finally upon that; it is a legal question. My hon. friend, I think, suggests by his question, the advisability of the Dominion Government enforcing certain time or certain time-tables upon the railway companies of Canada. In connection with the recent decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, certain points have been cleared up. In the first place it does not appear that the railway companies of Canada, in the time they have adopted, are violating any law which has been enacted by the Parliament of Canada. It seems to be made clear by the decision of the chairman and the vice-chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, that the railways are within their right in what they have done. The Chief Commissioner, Sir Henry Drayton, points out in his decision that local time has never been observed by railways operating in Canada nor has it been observed by railways operating in the United States. He says:

> The different points in the United States where time now changes under American law were fixed by the exigencies of railway operation.
>
> I find that in England the practice of the railways, before the English Act of 1880 was passed, which standardized the mean time of the Greenwich standard meridian for England and Scotland, was to run on Greenwich time and pay no attention to local time, and that in some cases clocks, as a result, had two sets of hands, the one showing Greenwich time and the other the time of the locality.

Then the vice-chairman of the Board observes as follows:

> I do not think we have power to intervene in the matter. The railway companies are at liberty to adopt whatever time they choose, in accordance with the Railway Act.

In connection with the advisability of such action as is suggested on the part of the Dominion Parliament, I would call attention to the following observation of Sir Henry Drayton:

> Having regard to the convenience of the travelling public at large no order cancelling the new time schedules can well be justified.
>
> It is but fair to point out that it takes some time to rearrange time-tables. The lines, in some instances, are particularly busy. Changes in the running time of a large number of trains that would be affected have to be carefully worked out. The mere printing and rearrangement of the time-tables of itself takes time, and if the time is set back and new time-tables printed, a period of at least three weeks should be allowed for the purpose.
>
> The companies also insisted that in the interests of public safety it is practically impossible to do anything else.

Then the vice-chairman of the Railway Commission makes the following statement:

> In view of the evidence given at the hearing in the matter. I, for one, would be willing to report favourably, as I think in advancing their time they have acted for the benefit of the public in general.

Having regard to all the considerations which I have mentioned, namely, the doubt which exists as to the constitutional powers of the Dominion to legislate respecting the matter of time now that the war is over, and also the views put forward by the chairman and vice-chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners as to the inconvenience and danger of the travelling public, it does not appear to me, speaking for myself, that the introduction of legislation would be expedient.

CANADIANS IN THE NAVY—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: As I do not see the Acting Minister of Naval Affairs, may I call the attention of the Acting Prime Minister to the fact that at present there are young Canadian officers and men who have been in the Imperial Navy since the beginning of the war and who have not, as far as I know, been given leave to visit their families in Canada. I suggest the advisability of approaching the Admiralty with a view to having leave granted these officers and men in order that they may visit those whom they have not seen from the beginning of the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall have pleasure in bringing the matter to the attention of the Minister of Naval Affairs in order that information may be secured.

IMPRISONMENT OF SOLDIER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should like to call the attention of the Government to the case of a young man named Charles Macdonell, who has been sentenced to five years' imprisonment after Mons. This young man—a son of Oscar Macdonell, who was an officer of the House of Commons—had two brothers overseas with him, one of whom

was killed. He was one day suffering from sore feet and took a rest, and he ran foul of an officer, and the sentence I have mentioned was imposed upon him. I should be glad if the Government would take the matter up. This young man belongs to the Canadian forces and is on the other side of the water.

Hon. Mr. MEWBURN: Is he with the Imperials?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, the Canadians.

Mr. PECK: Would I be in order to speak now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may only rise now to ask a question; the subject cannot be discussed on the Orders of the Day.

CANADIAN SOLDIERS SENTENCED IN ENGLAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) asked me a question recently with respect to certain legislation before the Imperial Parliament. In deference to my hon. friend, who seemed to be greatly interested in the subject, I cabled Sir Edward Kemp for information, and have received the following reply:

London, April 9, 1919.

The Army (Annual) Act, 1919, which has at present passed the Commons but has not yet passed the Lords, proposes subsection (2) of section 131 of the Army Act be amended by adding "Notwithstanding anything in this Act the Secretary of State may arrange with the Governor of a Colony that any person or class of persons enlisted in the Colony shall, if sentenced under this Act to penal servitude, be transferred to or kept in the Colony and there undergo his sentence in any prison or place in which persons sentenced to penal servitude by a Civil Court in the Colony can for the time being be confined, or, if there be no such prison or place, in an authorized prison as defined by section 65 of this Act." Am informed this provision was introduced to meet a situation arising in regard to Africa.

REPORT OF EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): I would ask the Secretary of State when we may expect the report of the Editorial Committee in connection with Government printing, which has been a long time delayed, and for which report some people are pressing?

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): I think the report is practically ready and that it will be down in a day or two.

MAIL MATTER AT THOROLD.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I call the attention of the President of the Council, who I understand represents the Postmaster General in this House, to a telegram which I have received to-day, and a copy of which I furnished to the hon. minister:

St. Catharines, Ont., April 14, 1919.

D. D. McKenzie, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Postmaster Thorold refused to give me mail Saturday. Inspector refuses to act. Understand there are copies of application filed at Mexico and foreign countries. Take action at once on floor of House. Please answer.

(Signed) John G. Gunning.

I may inform the minister that I know nothing about this matter, and if there is any information he can give with respect to it I shall be much obliged.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President Privy Council): I confess I cannot understand what this matter refers to, but I was in hopes that my hon. friend might be able to give me some information. I received a copy of this telegram as I was entering the House, but I have not yet had an opportunity of inquiring about it from the Post Office Department. I cannot understand the basis of the complaint, or what grievance the complainant is desirous of drawing attention to, but I shall make inquiry and see if the Post Office Department can throw any light upon the subject.

SALARY AND ALLOWANCE OF POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: A few days ago the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) made inquiry as to questions outstanding between the employees of the post office and the department. Later on I think on Friday last, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) also drew attention to a protest of the letter carriers. Perhaps the House will permit me to make a statement with respect to the position of matters as between the post office employees and the Government. Doubtless the House will recall that last year—I think in the month of July—representatives of the employees of the post office made certain representations to the Government in reference to an increase of salary, the equalization of salaries between the East and the West, and some changes in the war bonus. As a result of these representations a report was made to Council by a committee of the Cabinet, and the

Cabinet acted upon that report. May I draw attention to three of its provisions, because it is upon these that the Government's action has now been taken. In the report it is set out that:

> The establishment of salary schedules, or the amendment of existing salary schedules, has always been regarded as a function of Parliament. Any action of this character by Order in Council would be without precedent, and in the opinion of your committee unwarranted. Further it is to be observed that the request for an immediate increase of salaries or remuneration is based upon present economic conditions due to the war.

The report then points out that the Civil Service Act of last session provided for a re-classification of the Service which would include the fixing of salaries, and that the Civil Service Commission was to proceed with that re-classification. Then in reference to the equalization of the bonus it states:

> With reference to the special allowance of $180 payable in recent years to employees at and west of Sault Ste. Marie owing to the higher cost of living in the West as compared with the East, your committee beg to report that they concur in the opinion which was strongly expressed at the hearings that the conditions upon which this preferential allowance was based have, in considerable measure at least, disappeared, and your committee recommend that this be taken into consideration in the granting of any additional allowance.

Then this conclusion was reached:

> In consideration of the abnormal cost of the necessities of life largely due to war conditions which impose serious burdens upon those in receipt of the smaller incomes, and the higher remuneration generally pay to-day for service and labour, your Committee beg to recommend that under authority of the War Measures Act and pending action of Parliament on the report of the Civil Service Commission, there be paid as a further provisional allowance to the employees of the Outside Postal Service for the current fiscal year as and from April 1, 1918, and in addition to all salaries and allowances voted by Parliament and now payable, the sum of $100 to employees east of Sault Ste. Marie, and $50 to those at and west of Sault Ste. Marie; provided, however, that this additional provisional allowance shall not be paid in excess of the proportion which together with any salary or provisional allowance now payable to any of such employees shall constitute an income of $1,880.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that this report contemplated the presentation to the House of the report of the Civil Service Commission providing for a re-classification of the Service, when the salaries would be fixed in accordance with the scale recommended by the Civil Service Commission, and that pending that these bonuses should continue. That has been the position of the Government. Certain requests have been made by the employees, both West and East, for changes in salaries, in the bonuses, and in a number of departmental matters. A series of conferences were held during the past week in Ottawa, and certain other conferences to-day, between the representatives of the Amalgamated Postal Workers—that is the organization in Western Canada—the Dominion Postal Clerks Association, and the representatives of the letter carriers. I am pleased to say that those conferences have been carried on in the very best of temper and spirit, and on the whole I believe reasonably satisfactory conclusions have been reached. The post office employees would like these changes which the re-classification may bring into force to go into effect at once, but the position of the Government is that until the re-classification is made it cannot put them into effect, and in the meantime it should not undertake to change the existing schedules. I may say that the matter is summed up, in so far as the eastern men are concerned, in three letters which have passed between the President of the Dominion Postal Clerks Association, and myself, as representing the Committee of the Cabinet with whom the conferences have been held. On the 9th of April the Dominion President of the Dominion Postal Clerks Association wrote me as follows:

> I have the honour to submit herewith, in duplicate, memorandum of requests presented and discussed with yourself and the Honourable P. E. Blondin, by a delegation representing the Dominion Postal Clerks' Association on Tuesday, April 8th.
>
> We are desirous that there shall be no misunderstanding as to the conclusions arrived at in regard to the several matters under discussion, and would therefore appreciate it as a favour if you will be kind enough to indicate on the margin of the enclosed memoranda the replies which you gave to our delegation.
>
> With regard to requests numbers one and two, I would respectfully remind you that you promised our delegation to advise us of the final decision arrived at by the Government, in respect to these two matters, in the course of two or three days.
>
> The visiting delegates are remaining in Ottawa for those decisions.
>
> I would appreciate a reply, with the return of one copy of the memoranda, at the earliest possible moment.

To that I replied on April 10th, giving the answer of the Government in regard to those matters as follows:

> Dear Mr. Cantwell,
>
> I am in receipt of your letter of April 9th, together with the memorandum of requests presented and discussed at the conference with the Government on Tuesday last. I have passed this on to the Postmaster General in order that

the various requests presented may be duly considered and an answer given to you.

In accordance with the intimation I made at the conference, I now beg to advise you:—

1. That the re-classification of the service which is now being made by the Civil Service Commission involves not only a change in classification but of the salaries which should be paid, having regard to the character of the service rendered. The new classification when put into effect will apply to the current fiscal year commencing the 1st of April, 1919.

2. We understand that this re-classification will wipe out the differential as between East and West. The basis of the re-classification is to be the character of service rendered by the men in the service, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is rendered.

3. The Civil Service Commission in recommending the re-classification may, as has been suggested, recommend salaries applicable to normal conditions. If they do so, the Government has requested them to report on the additional amount which should be paid to all classes of the Service to meet the abnormally high cost of living at the present time, so that the report from the Civil Service Commission will cover the total remuneration which the Government will pay to each member of the service during the current fiscal year.

The foregoing answers the two questions on which I promised to give you the Government's answer immediately, and deals with the matters mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 of your memorandum of April 7th.

Then, to that Mr. Cantwell replied on April 11th:

I beg to thank you for your letter of yesterday in reply to my communication of the 9th instant.

May I take the liberty of directing your attention to the paragraph of your letter which you state is a reply to question No. 2 in my memorandum of April 7th. The paragraph I have reference to reads as follows:—

"We understand that this re-classification will wipe out the differential as between East and West. The basis of the re-classification is to be the character of the service rendered by the men in the service, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is rendered."

I am, personally, satisfied that the wording of the paragraph is intended to convey to me the positive assurance of the Government that when re-classification becomes effective, as from April 1, 1919, the existing difference in remuneration amounting to $130 will be wiped out. The use of the words "We understand" however, leaves your answer liable to a different construction being put upon it from that which I feel sure you intended. For this reason I have deferred communicating the contents of your letter to the other members of my executive.

If you would be kind enough to authorize me to substitute the words: "I can assure you on behalf of the Government" for the words "We understand," I feel reasonably certain that your reply to the most important request submitted in our memorandum of the 7th instant, would be considered quite satisfactory.

Our branches in nearly all of the large centres have called special meetings for Monday night next, to receive the report of the delegation that waited on you and the Honourable P. E. Blondin, and I should like them to be able to make such a report as will allay—or at least reduce to a minimum—the existing discontent. I am sure you will appreciate my position in this matter.

With sincere appreciation of the courteous reception accorded our delegation,

To that I replied on the 11th of April in the following terms:

I am in receipt of your further letter of the 11th, in reference to the following clause in my letter of yesterday:

"We understand that this re-classification will wipe out the differential as between East and West. The basis of the re-classification is to be the character of the service rendered by the men in the service, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is rendered."

I used the expression "We understand" as being based on the information received from the Civil Service Commission as their report has not yet been presented to the Government.

You may rest assured, however, that the existing difference between East and West will be wiped out and that remuneration will be based on the character of the service rendered, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is rendered. I believe the above fully answers your inquiry.

That covers the correspondence, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one further letter, which again relates to that $130. This letter was received to-day, and I have not yet had an opportunity to reply to it. To sum up, the situation is this. The re-classification will wipe out all existing schedules and will provide a new scale of payment on the basis of the work done, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is done. It will therefore wipe out this differential between the East and the West. When it is ready to go into effect it will relate back to the first of April, so that all members of the service will get the benefit of the new classification from that date. My hon. friend, the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is in charge of this reclassification, hopes to be able to introduce it into the House by the first week of May. Under those conditions the House and the Service will soon have the information desired on the subject. What I have said with reference to the Dominion Postal Association will apply equally to the letter carriers and to the men in the West, but a specific answer will be made to them in reference to their request.

SOLDIERS' LAND SETTLEMENT ACT—ROYAL AIR FORCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (Winnipeg North): I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior whether it is his intention to make the necessary changes to bring members of the Royal Air Force under the provisions of the

Soldiers' Land Settlement Act. At present I understand they are not covered by the Act, and many of them are Canadian men.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): At first sight I am disposed to think that the hon. gentleman's information is not correct, because the term "settler" as defined in the Soldiers' Settlement Act of 1917 extends to members of the British service. However, I will look into the matter, and it will be taken care of in the Bill which will be shortly introduced into the House.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LEGALITY OF DIVORCES IN WESTERN PROVINCES.

On the motion of Mr. A. E. Fripp Bill No. 47 (Letter U of the Senate) for the relief of Annie Proderick was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman, whilst we are considering this divorce Bill I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Acting Minister of Justice, if the Department of Justice is represented before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the test case of the province of Saskatchewan, if I mistake not concerning the legality of divorces granted by the courts of that province.

I believe that judgments have been rendered in Saskatchewan and Manitoba declaring that the courts of those provinces are entitled to grant degress of divorce. I understand that appeal has been taken to the Privy Council; is the Department of Justice to be represented? What is the attitude of the Government in this matter?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): If the Department of Justice is represented, the decision to be represented was taken before I assumed the duties of acting minister, consequently I am not prepared to answer the question. I will make inquiry and give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 48 for the relief of Samuel David McElroy—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 49 for the relief of Mary Jane McCulloch—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 50 for the relief of Mary Garland Lewis—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill No. 51 for the relief of William Canham—Mr. Fripp.

[Mr. Blake.]

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

RENTAL OF BUILDING—MR. P. D. ROSS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

What amount was paid by the Government as rent for use of buildings or parts of buildings owned or controlled by Mr. P. D. Ross, or the Ottawa Journal or Journal-Press Printing Company: (a) From 1896 to 1911, inclusive; (b) From 1912 to 1918, inclusive?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: (a) nil; (b) $62,828.51.

CHAMPLAIN MARKET WHARVES.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to repair the damage caused to the Champlain Market Wharves, at Quebec, by the flood of last fall?

2. If so, has an estimate of the damage been prepared, and an amount been provided for this purpose in the estimates?

3. When will the repair works be proceeded with?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No decision has been reached in this matter, but as soon as the Government is fully seized of all the facts due consideration will be given the subject.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

MONK STATION ROADWAY.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. How much money has been expended by the Government on the roadway from Monk Station to the highway leading to Ste. Perpetue, in the county of l'Islet?

2. What is the length of said roadway?

3. Who was the contractor?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Nothing by Canadian Government Railways.

2. 2,150 feet.

3. Answered by No. 1.

EXEMPTION TRIBUNALS — MILITIA DEPARTMENT SOLICITORS.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What sums have been paid to the solicitors representing the Militia Department before the respective judges and tribunals of appeal for exemption purposes at Montreal, Quebec, and Ottawa, during that period when the Military Service Act of 1917 was being enforced?

2. Who were the solicitors, and what amount did each receive as salary?

3. What sums have been paid, during this period, to the District Registrar of Montreal, Mr. E. H. Godin, and his assistant, Mr. Petitclerc, setting forth the respective amounts for (a) salary; (b) travelling expenses, and (c) office disbursements?

4. What persons were employed in the said Registrar's Office at Montreal, and what amount did each of such persons receive?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No solicitors, as such, were employed, prior to February 4, 1918.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Mr. Godin, salary (to January 31, 1919), $6,359.16; travelling expenses, $644.19. Mr. Petitclerc, salary (to March 31, 1919), $6,200; travelling expenses, $149.07.

Office disbursements, none.

4. A separate ledger account is not kept for each individual employee and to obtain the information desired would necessitate an analysis of and tabulation from all pay-sheets since the Act came into force. Most of these sheets contain over two hundred names and altogether cover salaries paid to between six and seven hundred employees and whereas it will be an easy matter to supply information relative to any named individual employees it will take some weeks with the staff at our disposal to tabulate every one. The total disbursements for salaries from September 15, 1917, to February 15, 1919, was $289,053.71 (of Hansard " Unrevised " page 1018).

CIVIL SERVANTS RECEIVING $2,500 AND OVER.

Mr. BEST:

1. How many civil servants in the Outside and Inside Service are receiving a salary of $2,500 or over?

2. What proportion of the above have had salary increases during the last two fiscal years?

Agriculture: 1. Thirty-six; 2. Twenty-eight. Public Archives: 1. Six; 2. Four. Auditor General: 1. Fifteen; 2. Fifteen. Civil Service Commission: 1. Four; 2. Four. Customs: 1. Seventy-six; 2. Fifty-four. External Affairs: 1. Eight; 2. Three. Finance: 1. Twenty-six; 2. Twelve. Governor General's Secretary: 1. Four; 2. Four. Indian Affairs: 1. Twenty; 2. Fourteen. Inland Revenue: 1 Twenty-five; 2. Seventeen. Insurance: 1. Six; 2. Six. Interior: 1. Ninety-four; 2. Forty-four. Justice: 1. Fifty-nine; 2. Twenty-five. Labour: 1. Four; 2. Two. Marine and Fisheries: 1. Forty-six; 2. Thirty-four. Militia and Defence: 1. Twenty; 2. Fifteen. Mines: 1. Forty-nine; 2. Forty-six. Mounted Police: 1. Four; 2. Three. Naval Service: 1. Twenty-one; 2. Fifteen. Post Office: 1. One hundred and fourteen; 2. Seventy-eight. Privy Council: 1. Seven; 2. Six. Public Works: 1. Seventy-nine; 2. Fifty-six. Printing Bureau: 1. Six; 2. One. Railways and Canals: 1. Sixty-eight; 2. Forty-eight. Secretary of State: 1. Thirteen; 2. Five. Trade and Commerce: 1. Fifty; 2. Forty-two. Immigration and Colonization: 1. Thirty-two; 2. Eleven. Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment: 1. One hundred and eighty six; 2. Fifty-seven.

MR. BENJAMIN BOUDREAULT.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Has Mr. Benjamin Boudreault, one of the judges of tribunals for exemption purposes of l'Anse-St.-Jean, county of Chicoutimi, been entirely paid for his services?

2. If so, what amount was he paid?

3. If not, for what reason was said Benjamin Boudreault not paid?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. Fifteen days as Judge of Tribunal, $75; Fifty days subsistence allowance, $50.

3. Answered above.

QUEBEC MARINE BUILDING.

Mr. POWER:

Is it the intention to reconstruct that portion of the Marine Department Buildings at Quebec which were destroyed by fire during the month of December, 1918?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: Yes, and Parliament will be asked for the necessary appropriation during the current session.

Mr. POWER:

1. Were any recommendations or reports made to the Government by the officials of the Marine or Public Works Departments with regard to the transferring of the Marine Department Buildings at Quebec to Indian Cove, during the years 1911 to 1918?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to consider these recommendations or reports?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

M.S.A., M.D. No. 4.

Mr. VERVILLE:

What was the cost to the Government of each conscript in Military District No. 4, Montreal, managed by Mr. J. A. A. Belanger: (a) for the months of February, March and April, 1918, and (b) for the months of May, June, July, August, September and October, 1918?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: During the period that the Dominion Police was under the control of the Military Service Branch of the Department of Justice—January 8, 1918, to June 5, 1918—$79,046.51 was expended in connection with the force in M. D. No. 4, an expenditure which was to some extent offset by fines paid in connection with offences committed against the Military Service Act. During this period the police made 29,715 investigations, 3,233 apprehensions and turned over 1,476 men to the military authorities.

DOMINION POLICE FORCE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Was Mr. Henri Bourdon in the service of the Dominion Police Force prior to the 15th January, 1919?
2. Was he suspended? If so, for what reasons?
3. Has he been reinstated? If not, why?
4. Were others suspended about the same time? If so what were their names?
5. Have they been reinstated? If so, why?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No.
4. No.
5. No. By reason of reduction of staff the services of fourteen were dispensed with on the 15th January, namely: A. Deschamps, F. Bowes, E. A. Charbonneau, F. Haynes, G. H. Renaud, N. Caviola, A. Gagnon, V. Lemieux, H. Roberts, H. Rigaud, S. Ray, S. Shears, W. Woods, H. Bourdon, and the following were taken back as vacancies occurred: V. Lemieux, March 3; H. Rigaud, March 25; F. Bowes, March 26; N. Caviola, April 7, these four having given the best satisfaction.

HON. MAJOR REV. C. W. GORDON.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish-Guysborough):

Is Hon. Major Rev. C. W. Gordon, of Winnipeg, still attached to the C.E.F.? If so, in what capacity?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, but he was notified by letter, on the 21st February last, that he would be struck off the strength on the 1st April, on demobilization. As there was some doubt as to whether this letter had been received by Major Gordon, a cable was sent to the Overseas Minister extending the time for this officer to be struck off the strength to the 15th instant. He has been employed on special work at the request of the Chairman of the British War Mission.

MONTREAL ADMIRALTY COURT.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who is the Judge of the Admiralty Court at Montreal?
2. Who is the Assistant Judge of this Court?
3. What are the salaries attached to these positions?
4. What amounts have been paid by the Government to the Judge of the Admiralty Court, and to the Assistant Judge of the said Court, in Montreal, since January, 1915?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The Local Judge in Admiralty for the Quebec Admiralty District is the Hon. Sir A. B. Routhier, whose official residence is in the city of Quebec.

[Mr. Meighen.]

2. The Deputy Judge of the District, residing at Montreal, is Hon. F. S. Maclennan, whose appointment was made by the local judge under section 10, Cap. 29, 54-55, Vic. There is no assistant judge in Montreal.

3. Salary of Judge of the District, $1,000 per annum; salary of Deputy Judge, nil.

4. The Judge of the Quebec District has been paid at the rate of $1,000 per annum. The Deputy Judge has not been paid any salary.

MILITARY VOTES OVERSEAS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Had Judge Gibson, of Quebec, anything to do with the taking of votes of the Military voters in England or France during the last elections?
2. If so, in what position did he act, and what moneys were paid to him on that account?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No information in Department of Justice.

EXPEDITIONARY FORCE TO SIBERIA.

Mr. CURRIE:

Has the Government any information in regard to the probable date of the return of the 16th Brigade, Canadian Field Artillery, from Northern Russia?

Major-General MEWBURN: This information is not yet available.

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION.

Mr. PREVOST:

What persons were employed by the Registrar for the county of Argenteuil in connection with National Service Registration, and how much was paid as salary to each of said persons?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Euclide Deschatelets, $8; John McLaughlin, $4; Brigitte McLaughlin, $2.50; Margaret McLaughlin, $2.50; Eugenie Brosseau, $2.50; Alice Brosseau, $2.50; Mary McLaughlin, $2.50; D. Forget, $4; E. Forget, $2.50; M. A. Forget, $4.37; W. Briere, $2.50; Alphonse Aluise, $4; Lovina J. Dalpe, $2.50; Lucienne Mayer, $2.50; John F. Owens, $4; Cecilia Villeneuve, $2.50; Ariele Villeneuve, $2.50; Mrs. A. Kall, $4; Mrs. A. Kall, $2; Paul Galipeau, $2.50; Lea Galipeau, $2.50; Margaret Quesnel, $2.50; Lily Quesnel, $2.50; Thileus Monette, $36; C. Charlebois, $2.50; Emelda Pilion, $2.50; R. A. St. Onge, $2.50; Lilly McPhee, $4; Leslie Bates, $4; J. C. Herbison, $2.50; Euphemia Bates, $2.50; Thos. Canning, $4; Ferdinand Tessier, $2.50; Miss M. Weir, $2.50; J. Stiles, $2.50; Clementine Baulne, $2.50; Miss Lalonde, $2.50; Thileus Monette, $15; Mrs. A. Kall, $4; H. Hebert, $2.50; C. Trudeau, $2.50; A. Coulterier, $2.50; G. Duquette, $2.50; A. Zenon Morin, $12;

Jeannie Reid, $2.50; Neil MacMillan, $4; Alex. Bethune, $2.50; Gladys E. Cooke, $2.50; D. W. Scott, $2.50; Mary C. James, $2.50; Sarah McGibbon, $2.50; Muriel A. Nichols, $2.50; John Mason, $4; Clara I. Mason, $2; Jean A. Mason, $2.50; Elizabeth M. McKimie, $2.50; Delina LeBlanc, $2.50; Mr. J. Heathe, $2.50; C. M. Davis, $4; J. D. Sobey, $2.50; J. Dubeau, $2.50; Rev. E. Geoffrey, $12; Arthur E. Tomalty, $12; Gladys J. Tomalty, $2.50; John J. Kelly, $8; Mary J. Kelly, $2.50; Dora Gagnon, $2.50; Clement E. Ployart, $10; Albert Delisle, $2.50; Aurore Labonte, $2.50; J. D. Latulippe, $18; Alfred Carriere, $2.50; Miss Clouthier, $1.25; Jos. Edward Constantin, $12; Lorette Lafleur, $2.50; Eugenie Lafleur, $2.50; Delisca Lafleur, $2.50.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PARKINSON.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Does Lieut.-Col. Parkinson, now in the employ of the Ottawa Journal, still rank as head of the Publicity Section of the Overseas Minister of Militia's Staff at Sir Edward Kemp's special office, 34 Grosvenor street, London?

2. At what date and with what rank did Lieut.-Col. Parkinson join Sir Edward Kemp's staff, and what were the dates of his promotions from captain to lieutenant-colonel?

3. Has he been discharged from the army?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No.

2. June 28, 1918, with rank of major. Promoted to Major 8th August, 1915. Promoted to Acting Lieut.-Colonel 26th November, 1918.

3. No; he is on leave of absence without pay.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all documents relating to the investigation made by His Honour, Judge F. S. McLennan in the matter of the soldiers' votes which were deposited at the St. John Barracks, in connection with the general elections held on the 17th December, 1917; also a copy of the report thereon by the investigating commissioner, comprising the evidence and exhibits relating thereto, and copy of the correspondence and telegrams between the said commissioner and members of the Government, together with statements of accounts in connection therewith.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all documents, correspondence and plans relating to the proposed construction of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners' bridge, extending from the city of Montreal to the South Shore.

CONFERRING OF TITLES ON CANADIANS.

MOTION BY MR. NICKLE FOR ADDRESS TO HIS MAJESTY TO REFRAIN FROM CONFERRING THEM.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, an address should be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty,

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, it being always understood that this humble prayer has no reference to professional or vocational appellations conferred in respect to commissions issued by Your Majesty to persons in Military or Naval Services of Canada or to persons engaged in the administration of Justice of the Dominion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, unless it be that the multitude of words that you are compelled to hear has made you indifferent as to listening, you will remember that last year when I introduced into this House a resolution in respect of hereditary titles, I drew the attention of hon. members present to the fact that my sympathies went further than my resolution, and that I was prepared to support a resolution doing away with all titular distinctions as applied to persons domiciled or resident in Canada. At that time I feared that public opinion in this country and in this House was not sufficiently advanced to warrant the assumption that a resolution couched in the former language would be sympathetically received. But if I had any doubts of the length to which public opinion was prepared to go at that time, what I have learned since and what I now know convinces me that public opinion from one end of this country to the other strongly supports the doing away with titular distinctions in respect of persons domiciled or resident in Canada.

For the past four years Canada, with the rest of the world, has been engaged in a great struggle to determine what class of citizenship should predominate throughout the world. Generally speaking, I suppose one might say, to use a hackneyed expression, that the contest has been one between autocracy and democracy. We have heard so much of those words and they have been elaborated in such diverse and different ways that it would be unwise of me this afternoon to follow them to their extreme and

logical conclusion. But there is one point of view to which I should like to draw the attention of the House, and that is the fundamental difference that lies between a democracy and an autocracy. An autocracy proceeds on the assumption that the chosen few have the right to govern and that to them is given, almost by way of divine right, the right to enjoy what is commonly called the good things of life; that the many submit, to the government of the few, because they must, not because they are willing. Democracy, on the other hand, proceeds on a totally different assumption, namely that those who govern do so by the consent of the many; that all are equal before the law, and that we choose our governments; that there shall be one man, one vote; that class distinction shall as far as possible be done away with, that there shall be equality of citizenship.

4 p.m.

In reference to autocracy as illustrated in Germany, I was a short time ago discussing with a German woman in my riding the use of the term "von" as used before many German names, and she told me, what I have not as yet had an opportunity of verifying as a fact, that while the term in Germany did carry certain distinctions with it, yet it was a purchasable term, so to speak; if one family had it and had not the necessary means incidental to maintaining the social position attendant on the term, that family had the right to sell it, and it was sold in Germany just the same as one would barter produce of any sort. Might one ask oneself why it is that in Germany autocracy had such an awful hold on the people of Germany? Why is it that class distinction so governed the people that a few men were in a position to plunge the world into war and to drive the people before them to slaughter and bloodshed for a period of four years? Along that line of inquiry I would like to draw your attention, Sir, and that of the House, to the former American Ambassador, Mr. Gerard's book entitled, "My Four Years in Germany," published in 1917, in which he gives some very illuminative information in reference to what he calls the "system" in Germany. He says:

> One of the most successful ways of disciplining the people is by the "Rat" system. "Rat" means councillor, and is a title of honour given to any one who has attained a certain measure of success, or standing in his chosen business or profession. For instance, a business man is made a commerce "rat," a lawyer a justice "rat," a doctor a sanitary "rat," an architect or builder a building "rat," a keeper of the archives an archive "rat" and so on, The rats are created in this way: First, a man becomes a plain "rat," then later on he becomes a secret "rat" or privy councillor, still later a "court secret rat" and later still a "wirklicher" or really and truly secret court rat, to which may be added the title of "excellency" which puts the man who has attained this absolutely at the head of the "rat" ladder.
>
> But see the insidious working of the system. By German custom the woman always carries the husband's title. The wife of a successful builder is known as Mrs. Really Truly Secret Court Building Rat, and her social precedence over the other women depends entirely upon her husband's position in the rat class. Titles of nobility alone do not count when they come in contact with a high Government position.
>
> Now, if a lawyer gets to be about forty years old and is not some sort of rat his wife begins to nag him and his friends and relations look at him with suspicion. There must be something in his life which prevents his obtaining the coveted distinction, and if there is anything in a man's past, if he has shown at any time any spirit of opposition to the Government, as disclosed by the police registers, which are kept written up to date about every German citizen, then he has no chance of obtaining any of these distinctions, which make up so much of the social life of Germany. It is a means by which the Government keeps a far tighter hold on the intellectual part of its population than if they were threatened with torture and the stake.

Further on he says:

> Besides the "Rat" system, there is, of course, the system of decorations. Countless Orders and decorations are given in Germany. At the head is the Order of the Black Eagle; there are the Order of the Red Eagle, the Prussian Order of the Crown, the Orders "Pour le Merite," the Order of the House of Hohenzollern, and many others. In each of the twenty-five States there are also Orders, distinctions, and decorations. These Orders, in turn, are divided into numerous classes. For instance, a man can have the Red Eagle Order of the first, second, third or fourth class, and these may be complicated with a laurel crown, with an oak crown, with swords, and with stars, and so on. Even domestic servants who have served a long time in one family receive Orders; faithful postmen and other officials who have never appeared on the police books for having made statements against the Government or the army are sure of receiving some sort of Order. Once a year in Berlin a great festival is held, called the "Ordenfest," when all who hold Orders or decorations of any kind are invited to a great banquet.

He ends up by saying:

> This system is the most complete that has ever existed in any country, because it has drawn so many of the inhabitants of the country into its meshes. Practically the industrial workers of the great towns and the stupid peasants in the country are the only people in Germany left out of its net.

Now, Sir, we are a democratic country. We have been fighting for democracy, sacrificing our best in the defence of an ideal. Now that the armistice has been signed and the war is virtually over, we are confronted with fresh problems, and one of the

problems that is confronting us to-day is how to deal with the labour and rural unrest that certainly exists. A short time ago there was held in Montreal a meeting of the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at which the late president was present, and this is what he says:

> I have just returned from England. There the situation of labour is a cause of anxiety. Nominally the problems between labour and employers is a question of hours and rates of pay. To my mind, and it will be so here, there is something beyond that now. It is not only a question of hours and rates of pay but of the actual status of men who are performing such a large portion of work building up industries, and making itself as strong an influence as the capitalists and employers. It is a question of what their social status is to be in the future. We may take it for granted beyond question that the working man of the future, the working man of to-day, must be permitted and enabled and assisted, he and his wife and children, to lead quite a different existence to that of the past. They must not be confined to the narrow, sordid lives that circumstances have made hitherto. They must have the opportunity to enjoy the good things of life that those in higher positions have enjoyed.

Now, Sir, that enunciates the doctrine that underneath the labour unrest there is in Canada to-day, and, I submit, underneath the rural unrest there lies a dissatisfaction with status—a dissatisfaction with the position that the labouring men and the agriculturalists occupy in this country. and one of the problems which I think we have to face and solve is this. How can we make for these citizens a broader and more important position in this Canada of ours? Are we going to give satisfaction if we permit class differences to be increased, if we permit those who may, perchance, occupy what may be considered a somewhat higher position to be still further aggrandized and made greater in a social and titular way?

As I said a moment ago, we have been fighting for democracy, and if we were sincere in what we spoke from the platforms and in what we said in this House, then I say, now that the war is over and the fight has been won, let us be consistent and legislate a little for democracy, and let the first legislation that this House undertakes be legislation that will do away as far as possible with class distinctions; not the class distinctions of intellectual attainment, nor the class distinctions of innate difference, because no two men are alike, and you cannot make them alike by Act of Parliament, but let us do away with the class distinction that pretends to give one man a better social position than another, not by virtue of abilities, but by virtue of influence.

I have said that this resolution goes somewhat further than my resolution of last year. Experience has taught me that if you want to understand anything that is part of the national life in any country that has a constitution such as England or Canada has the way to understand the position of the subject under review is to go back and study a bit the historical development of that which you are considering, and I want to ask the patience of the House, because I realize that it requires a certain amount of patience to hear a man elaborate an argument that takes him back into early historical times, while I endeavour to place before you, Sir, and before the House, the principles from which knighthood sprang.

We all know how in the early days after the battle of Hastings the feudal system was introduced into England. William the Norman gave to his followers the great areas that the dominant Saxons had enjoyed. As I explained to this House last year, he gave them tremendous holdings, and by a principle of subholdings secured for himself an army by virtue of the feudal system. The landed proprietors were necessarily the more wealthy class in the community. The knights were the lesser people who held smaller holdings of land. Being of some wealth, they naturally took to the cavalry rather than the infantry, because having the means to purchase horses they fought in the more comfortable way, if I might use that expression. But as time went on and the feudal system developed, men got away more or less from their mere feudal holdings, and men acquired lands by virtue of rentals, and it was then that the Kings of England widened their method of obtaining an army. They said: Those who are bound to us by way of feudal tenure must fight in our army, but those who are bound by way of allegiance must also contribute something to the fighting forces of the nation. Being a knight became an obligation. It was a privilege because it gave a man a social position, but it also carried with it obligations to the state, and whereas, for a time, men were willing to take the position of knights, for the standing it gave them in the community, the time came when to be rid of the obligation was considered advantageous. It therefore became necessary for the Kings of England to interfere, and in 1215 King John directed that every nine knights should provide a tenth, well equipped with horses and arms for the defence of the kingdom, and should contribute two shillings per day for his keep.

The penalty was forfeiture of their land and a fine. But in the time of Henry III, in 1224, the king, in order to obtain money for his wars, ordered all laymen, who were of military age and who held a knight fee, to get themselves knighted, and a similar order was issued in 1234. In 1254 all who held land of the annual value of £10 were ordered to receive the dignity, though exemption might be purchased by payment of a fine. In those days men were anxious to avoid knighthood on account of the responsibilities it entailed, and the fines appear to have been considerable. Edward I imposed the obligation afresh, and in 1292 ordered that all who held land in fee to the value of £40 a year were to be distrained.

Coming to later days, James I, in the early part of his reign, revived the practice, and called on all who received forty pounds a year to receive knighthood or to pay a composition, and he made many hundreds of knights in the first year of his reign. The Long Parliament abolished compulsory knighthood on the ground that they objected to the king raising money in that way without their consent. In other words the conferring of knighthood meant that the knight had to contribute something for his privilege.

Let me emphasize the fact that in the early days knighthood was a privilege but also carried an obligation or a duty to the State. Knights were created in another way: Knight Bachelor was a signal recognition conferred on the field of battle, to those who had conducted themselves with gallantry and courage, and also as recognition conferred on distinguished persons on entering the profession of arms. It was the ceremonial entrance to the warrior class. Kings exchanged knighthoods as freely in the early days as they exchange ribands and orders to-day. It was a condition that grew out of the times in which men lived, and as these knighthoods that arose from the feudal system and knighthoods that were conferred on the field were part of the social condition of the day, so were the orders of knighthood that grew out of the days of chivalry. It would be tiresome to the House—because in all probability hon. members are equally conversant with the historical condition of the Middle Ages—to dilate on the meaning of chivalry, what it did for England in the early days, how it was misused, and its advantages and disadvantages. But chivalry did this: It laid down a certain standard of living; it brought to the aid of religion the men of arms; it brought character where perhaps there had been licentiousness: it established order where possibly there had been disorder. But like most institutions of its class, in its development many ridiculous things occurred; and like many other early historical customs in England, it became decadent and finally obsolete. It is interesting to study the various orders because it is largely to these orders of chivalry that we have to go to-day to find what actual significance there is in a man being dubbed a knight. The first great order is the "most noble" Order of the Garter. It was instituted by Edward III about the middle of the fourteenth century. The occasion of its creation is a matter of dispute. The vulgar and generally accepted story is that Edward picked up a lady's garter, and being chaffed by some of those who stood around, he made the remark: "Honi soit qui mal y pense," meaning, not "evil to him who evil thinks," but, as conveying a reproach to those who, by their laughter, appeared to cast an imputation upon his virtue: "Be he dishonoured who thinks ill of me;" and it is said that this incident led to Edward's adopting the garter as a symbol of the Order of the Garter. Others think that the order did not originate in this way, but that Edward seized on the old legend of the time of Richard I who, when his followers were sore pressed made them tie about their legs leathern bands so that they might be stimulated to fresh courage, realizing that they had devoted their life to a great cause. But whatever may be the exact reason, out of a simple incident arose the Order of the Garter, an order that came into existence simply for the purpose of a tournament. The King, the Prince of Wales, and twenty-four knights, all gentlemen of blood and men without reproach, constituted the membership of that order. But, Sir, there was a standard that underlay membership, a standard that had to be recognized as entitling a man to be made a member of the order. What that standard was is well set out by Shakespeare in his Henry VI, Act V, Sc. 1, when he puts into the mouth of one of his characters these words:

> "When first this order was ordained, my lords;
> Knights of the Garter were of noble birth;
> Valiant and virtuous, full of haughty courage,
> Such as were grown to credit by the wars;
> Not fearing death, nor shrinking or distress,
> But always resolute in most extremes.
> He, then, that is not furnish'd in this sort
> Doth but usurp the sacred name of knight,
> Profaning this most honourable order."

I would like some of those in this country who are in favour of the continuance

of titular distinction to compare the standard of knights created in those days:

> He, then, that is not furnish'd in this sort
> Doth but usurp the sacred name of knight,
> Profaning this most honourable order.

With the standard of some of our knights created within the last few years, dubbed, as it has been said, "with unhacked rapier for carpet consideration."

The next order is the Most Ancient Order of the Thistle. As this is a Scottish order it is not necessary that I should dilate upon it, because it is not applicable to Canada. Then there is the Most Illustrious Order of St. Patrick, similarly applicable to Ireland, and next the honourable Order of the Bath, created by George I in 1725. It was a pretended revival of an order supposed to have been created by Henry IV at his coronation in 1399. As a matter of fact no such order was ever instituted. Knights of the Bath, although they were allowed precedence before Knights Bachelors, were merely Knights Bachelors who were knighted with more elaborate ceremonies than others, and on certain great occasions. The members of the order were the Sovereign, Grand Master, and 36 Knights Companions. The name was taken from the ceremonial investiture of the fourteenth century to distinguish it from "dubbing" or knighthood as a creation of the field. After the Napoleonic wars—in 1815—the order was instituted in three classes to commemorate the auspicious termination of the long and tedious contest in which the Empire had been engaged. The three classes consisted of Knights Grand Cross, G.C.B.; Knights Commanders, K.C.B., and Knights Companions, C.B., which does not carry the title "Sir." If you had a state procession and were to determine the priority which the members of the various orders were to enjoy, you would find that the Knight Grand Cross would be No. 110, the Sovereign being No. 1; the Knights Commanders No. 112, and the Knights Companions No. 115.

Next comes the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George—the order with which we are most familiar in Canada—founded by George IV in 1818. The first branch comprises the Knights Grand Cross, G.C.M.G., No. 111 in procession; the Knights Commanders, K.C.M.G., No. 113; and the Companions, C.M.G., No. 116, who have not the title "Sir." In 1868 a change took place. The British Government departed from the old military idea of chivalry, and it was decided by Letters Patent that:

> The natural born subjects of the Crown of the United Kingdom as may have held high and confidential offices within Her Majesty's colonial possessions and in reward for services rendered to the Crown in relation to the foreign affairs of the Empire, might be members of the order.

The next is the Royal Victorian Order. This was an Order instituted by Queen Victoria on April 25, 1896, and conferred for personal services rendered to Her Majesty and her successors on the Throne. The Sovereign, the Chancellor, the Secretary and five classes constitute the Order—Knights Grand Commanders; Knights Commanders; Commanders and members of the fourth and fifth classes.

The next is the Order of Merit founded by Edward VII. There are no titular appellations here of Knight. It includes those who have gained distinction in the Military and Naval Services of the Empire, and such as have made themselves a great name in the fields of science, art, and literature. The British members are fixed at twenty-four.

The next Order is the Distinguished Service Order, D.S.O., founded by Queen Victoria in 1886. There is no titular appellation of Knight in this Order, its object being to recognize the special services of offices in the army and navy. Its numbers are unlimited.

The next is the Imperial Service Order, I.S.O., instituted in June 1902, revised 1908, to commemorate King Edward's coronation. This Order is a recognition of faithful and meritorious services rendered to the British Crown by the members of the Civil Service in various parts of the Empire. Women as well as men are eligible.

I find there are two Orders confined to women: The Royal Order of Victoria and Albert, V.A., instituted in 1862. It is purely a Court distinction, divided into four classes designated by the letters V.A. The next Order confined directly to women is the Imperial Order of the Crown of India, C.I., conferred for like purposes as the Order of the Indian Empire, the primary object being to recognize the services of ladies connected with the Court of India.

Then I come to the most recently constituted Order, the "Most Excellent" Order of the British Empire instituted in 1917. In regard to Orders that grew out of history perhaps one should not be jocular because in their day they may have served their purposes; but if there ever was an Order which did not serve a purpose, which has broken down in practice, which has demonstrated that after a great war such as this the conferring of honours is an im-

possibility, it is the Order known as the Order of the British Empire. Fortunately, Canada for the present has been spared the flood of titles—the flood of recognitions rather that has come in relation to the Order of the British Empire. South Africa, however, was caught in the mesh, and a flood of titles went to South Africa to such an extent that in a despatch from Capetown on September 2, 1918, it is said the South African press criticises and ridicules the honours that have been conferred in connection with the German East African campaign. The Capetown Times in the course of its outspoken articles ridicules the length of the list, and asserts that when South Africa ceases laughing it will assuredly resent having been made such a laughing-stock before the rest of the Empire, for that is what it really amounts to. The membership of the Order of the British Empire consists of the Sovereign, the Prince of Wales, the Bishop of London, the King of Arms, and so on, and so on. The recognition is conferred for services rendered to the Empire, whether at home or abroad, and it is open to both men and women. There are five clauses:

Knights Grand Cross or Dames	G.B.E.
Knights Commanders	K.B.E.
Dames Commanders	D.B.E.
Commanders	C.B.E.
Officers	O.B.E.
Members	M.B.E.

Will you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this Order take ceremonial priority over those who won the Distinguished Service Order on the field of battle for bravery and for courage. Why the whole thing is a travesty on modern conditions, and it is well summed up in a short poem which was published in a New Zealand paper some time ago. That poem reads as follows:

Ode to the O.B.E.

I knew a man of industry
Who made big bombs for the R.F.C.
And pocketed lots of L.S.D.
And he (thank God!) is an O.B.E.

I knew a woman of pedigree
Who asked some soldiers out to tea;
And said "Dear me!" and "Yes, I see,"
And she (thank God!) is an O.B.E.

I knew a fellow of twenty-three
Who got a job with a fat M.P.,
Not caring much for the infantry,
And he (thank God!) is an O.B.E.

I had a friend, a friend—and he
Just held the line for you and me,
And kept the Germans from the sea,
And died without the O.B.E.

Thank God!
He died without the O.B.E.

I think that last phrase expresses the sentiment of the country. Pretence and ceremonial priority is what at times stirs my indignation, and at other times appeals to my sense of humour. The other night I was sitting looking into a grate fire picturing a ceremonial procession in which possibly the Minister of Trade and Commerce (now overseas) the ex-Minister of Militia, and the Acting Premier and the member for St. Antoine might have been present, and I saw the deferential manner with which the ex-Minister of Militia allowed the Minister of Trade and Commerce to take priority of him. I thought, Sir, I could see the Napoleonic mien and the grim expression of the ex-Minister of Militia as he took priority over the Minister of Finance, the Acting Premier, who with a gracious bow allowed him to do so, and then I saw the Acting Prime Minister fall into place, followed, I trust, with his usual humility by the member for St Antoine, Montreal. But, Sir, as I said, you cannot apply mediæval age conditions to a democratic country such as Canada is to-day. In the Middle Ages, the twelfth, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, half of the people of England were serfs. The ancient orders, as I said, came into existence for a purpose. Their purpose served they became decadent. But see what happened? These recognitions determined that those who had them were entitled to social position, social priority, social preferences, and in the long number of years of peace that England enjoyed, her merchant and commercial class became wealthy. They said, "If those who have been to the wars have done something for England, if those who have done work for the state have done something for England, and have priority, we also are entitled to recognition. We are entitled to priority because we made great wealth, and that is an advantage to the state." And then with the lowered franchise, as I propose to show in a few moments, contributions to party funds became essential, as was shown last year and as I shall endeavour to show this afternoon, these recognitions which gave social priority, which gave position, were bartered and sold and given to those who had assisted the party for the time being in power. As I said, in the early days knighthood was avoided by the poorer nobles and was sought by rich citizens, and history repeated itself when the same thing took place in the days of the industrial aggrandizement of England.

There is a gentleman in Ottawa, Mr. Andrew T. Thompson, who has more wit than I have, who has the happy

faculty of expressing himself in verse, and who recently published a little pamphlet called "The Canadian Knights' Entertainment" in which he deals with the creation of certain knights in Canada in a humourous way. I said a moment ago that recognitions were given for political contributions, and Mr. Thompson has so aptly hit it off that I hope it will not be improper that I shall read to the House some of his verses on the subject. I might say that there are various verses in regard to various classes of knights, but I shall just read one or two. This is entitled "The Contributor Knight":—

And now a quiet smooth-faced man
Appears to speak his part,
A pros'prous man, of middle age,
And not too big a heart.

"I won my title well," said he,
"I saved my country dear,
Subscribing to election funds,
When there was cause to fear.

"Unless the boodle pot were full,
The other side would win,
And so wipe out all vested rights,
Which surely were a sin.

"I spent my thousands lavishly,
And when we won the day?
They handed me my knight-hood, and—
That's all I've got to say."

Then there are verses in regard to "The Railway Knight," and I feel sure the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) will appreciate these:

A sterner man succeeds the last,
A man of threat'ning mien,
And masterful—a leader he,
It's easy to be seen.

"Ye prate of ancestry," quote he,
"And blood both red and blue,
But my descent can straight be traced—
I swear to you it's true—

"From brave Sir Henry Morgan,
Of buccaneers the King,
Who swaggered through the Spanish Main,
And robbed like anything.

"Of Spanish ships he took his toll,
He raided many a city,
His fame's kept fresh unto this day,
In roaring sailor ditty.

'The Freedom of the seas' was his,
For none dare say him nay,
He took his tithe from anywhere,
His motto, 'Make them pay.'

"From his hot veins my blood I draw,
His watch-word, too, is mine,
I love to ponder on his might,
In the days of Auld Lang Syne.

"'From near Atlantic's sounding wave,
To far Pacific's shore,'
I've looted ev'ry treasury,
I've gathered more and more.

"Until, my primacy confessed,
They made of me a Knight,
In ermine's white and spotless fur,
I'm safely now bedight."

In other words, it simply means that these recognitions are not given on account of worth or of greatness of service or sacrifice, but on account of the attainment of an influential position.

Now, Sir, I said that I proposed to show or to endeavour to show, that in England, the home of these distinctions, corruption is playing a not insignificant part in the awarding of titles. Lord Bryce, whom we all know and for whose opinion we have the highest respect, says in his American Commonwealth:

It may seem a paradox to observe that a millionaire has a better and easier social career open to him in England than in America. Nevertheless there is a sense in which this is true. In America, if his private character be bad, if he be mean, or openly immoral, or personally vulgar, or dishonest, the best society may keep its doors closed against him. In England great wealth skilfully employed, will more readily force these doors to open. For in England great wealth can, by using the appropriate methods, practically buy rank from those who bestow it; or by obliging persons whose position enables them to command fashionable society, can induce them to stand sponsors for the upstart, and force him into society, a thing which no person in America has the power of doing. To affect such a stroke in England the rich man must of course have stopped short of positive frauds, that is, of such frauds as could be proved in court. But he may be still distrusted and disliked by the elite of the commercial world, he may be vulgar and ill-educated, and indeed have nothing to recommend him except his wealth and his willingness to spend it in providing amusement for fashionable people. All this will not prevent him from becoming a baronet, or possibly a peer, and thereby acquiring a position of assured dignity which he can transmit to his offspring. The existence of a system of artificial rank enables a stamp to be given to base metal in Europe which cannot be given in a thoroughly republican country.

I am not going to read extracts, as I did last year, from the House of Lords Debates of 1914 and 1917. Hon. members who are interested in the subject can refer to Hansard of last year in reference to the debate on hereditary titles, or if they wish to imbibe more fully they may read the debates in the House of Lords to which I have referred. No man can read those debates and not be impressed with the fact that it is generally recognized that distinctions which should be the reward of merit are not always so awarded, but that they are bought and sold, and that money considerations, not national contributions, are the factor that to a very great extent determine their award. But, Sir, it may be said: I have

nothing to do with what takes place in England. I am not willing to go exactly that far, as I said last year, because so long as Great Britain has legislative authority over Canada, so long do I think that Canada and Canadian legislatures are interested in the personnel of the House of Lords and of those who are influential in the Imperial Councils. But if in England with its traditions, with its conservatism, with its worship of the old, corruption has become a dominant source of recognition in the awarding of titles, then, I say, how long is the Canadian executive going to be able to stand against the attacks that will be assuredly be made upon it in the days that are to come unless once for all we put an end to the practice, and the time to do so is before it gets well begun.

I have puzzled my mind trying to discover why it is that any one should contend for a continuance of these titular distinctions in Canada. I have considered the arguments advanced by this one and by that to determine the philosophy of the thing, the natural reason for the existence of the practice, and the best that I have been able to get from what I have read and heard is this: That there are three reasons why men should get titular distinctions. One is, that there is an innate desire in human nature to be recognized, that recognition is very dear to some people; that other people are instigated to efforts through the belief that they may get recognition; and that man will render service to the State if they think there is a possibility of recognition coming. Let us see what all this means. It means, if you are prepared to admit the correctness of such philosophy, that human nature is so weak that it will not do great things unless there is something in it for the doer. It brings human nature down to the standard of a cynic, who was described as being a man who knew the price of everything and the value of nothing. Now, I have more faith in human nature than that. I am not prepared to admit that Canadian life is so poor that our men are not willing to serve the State and do big things, unless they think there is recognition in respect of the services rendered. Why, Sir, the consciousness of duty well done should be reward enough for any man; virtue should be its own reward; and while, as I said a moment ago, some men may be carried away with vanity, I see no reason why the desire of a few should result in the stamping—if I might so express the idea—with baseness those who have done public service for the sake of public service. I said a moment ago that in a war such as this, when the whole nation has been organized for the purpose of its successful prosecution, it is ridiculous to think that it is possible to distinguish between those who should obtain reward and those to whom reward should not be given.

You cannot begin to do it. The complexity of the situation is too great; the ramification of the service is too far extended.

How are you going to determine what man shall be given an honour, or what woman, as the case may be; and what man and what woman shall be left out? It is beyond the ability of any Prime Minister, any Government or any group of men to determine where reward shall go and from whom it shall be withheld. How are you going to determine the relative qualities of service and sacrifice in one man as against service and sacrifice in another? Why, Sir, it came home to me with crushing force within the last few weeks. I was speaking to a man from overseas who has been connected with a battalion that has done magnificent work; what they did was well done and was of signal service in the war. He was critical of me, because, he said, my attitude in reference to titles last session had stayed the Government's hands and certain recognitions that would have come to him and his fellow officers and men had been withheld pending the presentation of this resolution to the House. I said to him: "Are you not satisfied with the consciousness that you have done good work and that the people of Canada know that your work has been efficient"? He said, in effect: "No, I am not, and the reason why I am not satisfied is this: if these recognitions do not come through for us, the world will say that our work has not been well done, because others have them and they are the only imprimatur or recognition that will make the people feel that service has been adequately rendered." That is a false standard, Mr. Speaker; it is a standard that you cannot apply in a war like this; because just as sure as you try to apply it you are bound to have jealousies, you are bound to have heart-burnings, you are bound to have bitterness—and that is what we do not want to come out of this war.

I said that you cannot measure sacrifice and you cannot measure service. As I stand here this afternoon speaking to this House I see a woman in dull black who came into my office some five or six months ago and told me that she was a widow; that her only son, who had gone to the front, had

been killed. She said: "All I ask is that you get me a picture of the cross that marks his grave in Flanders fields; I shall be content to have that as a memento that he did his duty in a time of national peril and in a time of world crisis." Could you measure that woman's sacrifice and service as against the sacrifice, if needs be, and probably the service, of hundreds of men who stayed at home and did their best, but whose best was incomparably less in sacrifice than the sacrifice that this widow made in giving her only son to a great cause? The Postmaster General in the late administration expressed the idea a few days ago that these titles went by favour, and that when the Government of which he was a member was in power certain people transferred their allegiance from his Government to another party because they did not obtain from his leader the recognition by way of titular distinction to which they thought they were entitled. Sir, the idea is absolutely exploded that the King is the source of honour. We exploded that idea last year when the Prime Minister announced to the House that his Order in Council, which had anticipated the debate that took place, provided for recognitions to Canadians being given on the responsibility of the ministry. That inevitably carries with it the conclusion that while the source of the bestowment may be his Majesty, or Her Majesty as the case may be, the recommendation comes from the Prime Minister of the day, and the ministry of the day really are responsible in that they make the selection.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), in a debate which took place in this House when the member for West Peterborough (Mr. J. H. Burnham) introduced a resolution on this subject some four or five years ago, said:—

> I have not very much to say upon this question except that I think the bestowment of honours comes from the source of all honours, that is, the King; and that we must allow the King to have unrestricted scope as to the selection of persons upon whom to bestow these titles of honour.

That may have been the old doctrine; the Minister of Trade and Commerce may have considered this view sound at that day, because it was made abundantly clear in the discussion that took place last year that there had been a conflict of authority between the Canadian authorities and the Colonial Office in England as to who was responsible for those recognitions. But the Order in Council of last year, as read in this House by the Prime Minister, if it has been accepted by the British Government, makes it clear and beyond discussion that hereafter while these bestowments come from His Majesty, they come on the recommendation of the ministry of the day.

I have been told that these recognitions coming from overseas stimulate loyalty to the Empire. Well, I do not believe it. I do not believe one bit of loyalty is stimulated by these overseas recognitions. People know that they come on the recommendation of the Canadian ministry, and I cannot bring myself to believe that they tend to produce any greater loyalty. Loyalty in Canada to the British Empire is not in respect of titular distinction, is not in respect of badges, bands or sashes, but is in respect of the sentimental tie that binds us to a country which, we realize, has done much for civilization and which we believe still has a great work to do. We are proud to be British citizens, yet, while we are British citizens, we are equally proud in knowing that we are Canadian citizens. I do not think there is an iota of truth in the assumption that we shall longer remain British simply because His Majesty may from time to time take it into his mind, on the recommendation of the Canadian Ministry, to confer certain honours and distinctions on people in Canada. The question we have to decide in this House of Commons is: What is best for Canada? We have not an aristocracy such as England has; we are a democracy—and I hope we are going to be a democracy in the broad and true sense of that word. And if I might say a word without being considered as preaching, I would say that to my mind the great sin of the day—although sin is not the proper word—is the love of extravagance and show in Canada, the false standard of living that prevails, the development in some quarters of what the military people would term "swank" and what in the vulgar parlance of the street I would term "snobbery." What I should like to do is to lay down some principle that would aid us in getting away from these false standards and realizing that newer and simpler standards are what should govern in this country; that the recognition of value, not price, is what should count.

The sentiment of the people is against the conferring of these titles. I said last year that I doubted it, but if I doubted it last year I am confident of it this year. The President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) in his public utterances has time and again stated where he stood. Why, Sir, the farmer's platform, a copy of which I have in my hand, states distinctly that

the discontinuance of the practice of conferring titles upon citizens of Canada is one of its foremost democratic planks. It was not many evenings ago that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar) stated that he believed that that was a good platform when it was enunciated and that it is a good platform to-day. So I have at least one member of the Government with me.

If my memory serves me correctly, in August, 1917, a great Liberal convention was held in Winnipeg, at which the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) was present, and at that convention a resolution was passed denouncing titles in language much stronger than I have used this afternoon. I think, therefore, that I have shown that the agricultural population are against them; that what was called in 1917 the Liberal Party of the West were against them.

And surely the press are against them. You can hardly turn to a newspaper to-day in which something is not said against titles. For instance, I refer to an article in the Winnipeg Free Press which reads as follows:

> So luxuriously has the flower of knighthood been blooming in Canada, however, that there is grave danger of it becoming "common". Honorary colonels have become so plentiful since the war commenced that even the bearer of the real article is sometimes lightly looked upon. There is the same danger in connection with the honours of the King. In fact, men are suspected of going after knighthoods to-day! Yes, laying their plans deliberately to secure them. So much is this the case that when a wealthy individual undertakes to give his services free on behalf of any worthy war cause the casual and matter-of-fact remark is often heard, "Oh, he is looking for knighthood."

Other papers have expressed themselves pretty strongly on this question. There have been some very strong articles in a paper published in Woodstock, and let me read just one or two extracts because I do not want to take up much of the time of the House this afternoon:

> The sooner we learn to honestly face the facts of our national existence; the sooner we learn to distinguish between what is real and what is mere fiction, between the recognition that is earned and the recognition that is bestowed for a consideration, the better it will be for Canada, both as a young nation and as a part of the British Empire. The more faithfully Canada clings to her own ideals the better service she will be able to render to the Empire. They are no friends of Canada who are seeking to re-establish in this young land the worn out institutions of other countries, and especially such institutions as are antagonistic to the spirit of our democracy. . . . . It is no answer to say that these titles and honours come from the King, and that the bestowal of them is part of his prerogative. In a sense they do come from the King; but nobody believes that the King himself is responsible in this matter in any other way than as a constitutional ruler who acts on the advice of his responsible ministers.

And then the Kingston Whig, a paper published in my Riding, says:

> Public men in England are not so eager for knighthood. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright did without it in their day, and Mr. Balfour, Mr. Asquith and Lloyd George have done without it so far. Canada is being overladen with titles, and they are not congenial to the soil.

I might continue reading similar extracts for half an hour, but it would be wearisome to the House without giving members very much further information.

I admit there are difficulties in working out the problem to a logical conclusion, but I do not believe the difficulties are insurmountable. I believe the whole tendency of modern legislation is to do away with social distinctions. I have endeavoured to show this in relation to knighthoods as developed in Great Britain. We are on the threshold of a nation, and the problem we have to consider is: Are we to start aright, or are we "to get off on the left foot"? Is Canada to be a true democracy where equality before the law is recognized, where there is no such thing as social or ceremonial priority; or are we to allow this great war to be used as a means of getting the thin edge of the wedge of aristocratic practices into the life of this country? The mass of the people are against this, and the question which this House, as representing the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has to decide this afternoon is: Shall we voice the sentiments of our constituents, which I know by conversation with many members are the sentiments of the members of this House; or shall we submit to those who assume the right of thinking for us?

Mr. ROBERT LORNE RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can do better than begin my remarks by reciting another extract from that valuable collection of poems some of which the hon. member for Kingston, (Mr. Nickle) has just embalmed in Hansard. This is the product of an ex-member of the House (Colonel Thompson), and inasmuch as it refers to political knights, it will be of special interest at this time:

> In ancient armour now we see,
> It surely is a sight,
> A politician high in place,
> Who also is a Knight.
>
> "From turret to foundation stone
> I am a Democrat,
> 'The rank is but the guinea's stamp'
> Rab Burns was right in that.

"But when knighthood was offered me,—
Now show a little reason,—
To flout the kingly offer then,
Were surely like to treason.

"And don't forget, there's Lady Z.,
A wife both good and true,
Who wanted to be Lady Z.,
So pray what could I do?

"Don't bother with the 'Sir' to me,
I know it's not in favour,
And for a red-blood Democrat,
It hath too high a savour.

"Just call me Harry, Tom or Dick,
Or Cliff, or Bill or Sam,
All titles are, I'm quite sincere,
Not worth a tinker's damn."

I do not rise to second the motion of the hon. member for Kingston. You will recall, Sir, the discussion that occurred last year when my hon. friend introduced a resolution for the purpose of putting an end to hereditary titles. On that occasion I moved an amendment striking out the word "hereditary" and asking that an effectual end be placed to all titles in Canada. I want to congratulate my hon. friend in making real progress during the intermission. I am not accusing my hon. friend of grand larcency, but this session he steals my thunder by introducing a motion along the same line as my amendment of last year. I congratulate him upon the very able presentation of the case he made last session and the extremely able presentation he made on the present occasion.

My hon. friend has found, as I have and as, I am sure, all members have found during the recess, that the country is practically unanimous in favour of the abolition of all titles. That being the case, it was to me a source of great regret last session that the same practice as the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) introduced this session in connection with the subject of daylight saving, was not followed by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the question thrown open as a non-party one to the House generally. I am satisfied, had that been done, this House would have pronounced overwhelmingly in favour of the abolition of all titles. One of the regrets that I have over the passing of the late distinguished leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is that he is not here on the present occasion to participate in this debate. Hon. members and you, Sir, will recall the position he took last year when he declared that, notwithstanding the fact that he had taken a title himself, he did not believe in titles, and he declared his willingness to toss his title on a bonfire and have it consumed. Such an expression of opinion from a man holding the position of leader of a party in this House is bound to have an effect in this House and throughout the country. I agree with the hon. member for Kingston that the country is almost, if not unanimously in favour of the total extinction of titles of practically any kind. I was struck with the history which my hon. friend gave of titles. He went away back for almost a thousand years and traced the development of titles.

5 p.m.

Now I have lived in Western Canada a great many years and in company with my hon. friend from South Winnipeg (Mr. Allan), whose effective tones we may expect to hear in this House one of these days, because he is a speaker of prominence and ability, has witnessed many an Indian pow-wow in the Northwest, where the big chiefs togged out in paint and feathers and the squaws wearing fantastically coloured blankets danced to the more or less seductive music of the tom-tom. To go back further into the animal kingdom, we all know how the peacock and the male turkey strut around the barnyard displaying their feathers and making a proud exihibition of themselves. The Indians follow their example, and I have always been astounded, Mr. Speaker—I do not know what you personally think about it—to see on the occasion of a coronation or some other great event, human beings, supposedly with God-given intelligence, wearing fantastic feathers in their hats, and bedecked with gold lace and ribbons and braid strutting along in grand procession, just like the Indians do. It does seem to me that, although these things cost a little more money, the human race has made very little real progress indeed.

We see this mad race for distinction even in the present day. Men do not seem to be satisfied with the real dignity of the honest name inherited from their parents with the simple dignity of citizenship, but must, forsooth, be Lord this or Duke that or Sir the other. I even understand that a new Order has been introduced for "dames" to appeal to the female portion of our community. That does not seem to me to comport with the idea of progress in this country; it does not comport well with the idea of real simple modest dignity. These things do not make the man. As Burns said:

A prince can make a belted knight,
A marquis, duke and all that;
But an honest man's above his might,
Good faith, he must not try that.

I have not rendered it in the Scotch, although I could do so. No potentate or

body or army of potentates can add dignity to manhood or womanhood, and still we find even in this country the same mad race for social distinctions.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, when I moved my amendment last year the right hon. the Prime Minister took the view that it should not pass the House as he was in communication with the Government of the old land, to whom he had made certain proposals. He staked the Government's and his own existence on the fate of the amendment which I made to the motion of my hon. friend. The House was therefore suddenly confronted with a crisis. Had the amendment carried, as I certainly believe it would have done but for the Prime Minister's statement—I am satisfied that you too, Sir, believe that the House was overwhelmingly in favour of the abolition of titles—the country would have been faced with a crisis. The Union Government, for which so many sacrifices had been made by men of all parties, and the continuance of which was so essential to the country, especially in view of the war situation at that time, would have gone out of existence. What was a humble member like myself, without special experience in a situation of that kind, to do? I felt it was desirable to subordinate the less important matter to the carrying on of the war. I should not have liked to have the efficiency of the Canadian troops in any way impaired and the winning of the war jeopardized by the downfall of the Government, so I asked leave of the House to withdraw my amendment. That leave was not granted, and I was then up against the difficulty of deciding whether I should vote for or against my own amendment. I know some hon. gentlemen criticised me because I took a middle course. I declared then and I reiterate now, that when you do not know what to do, it is often a very good thing to do nothing. So I sat still in my seat and did not vote either way. The maxim does not always hold good, but in that case I thought it was the proper thing to do. A great deal of water has passed under the bridge since the House was face to face with that temporary crisis, and I am satisfied that most hon. members have found, as I have done, that the country is very largely, if not almost unanimously, in favour of the abolition of all titles. I therefore trust we shall not have a repetition of what happened last year, but that hon. members will be enabled to vote according to their convictions on this question. Though not of paramount importance, the question is of deep interest and considerable importance to the people of this country.

[Mr. Richardson.]

My hon. friend has explained pretty fully the ancient idea in the creation of knighthoods. In the old days knighthoods were created purely for military reasons and people did not go seeking knighthoods, but had them thrust upon them. I dislike reading, because it often tires the House, but just here I should like to quote from an excellent article I read in the Chronicle when I was in London last summer, written by Arthur Pollen, one of the greatest authorities on this question in the British Empire. He says:

> The number of honours bestowed by the King, on the recommendation of his ministers, has of late been so great that people have wondered how so many fellow-citizens, of whom they had never heard before, have earned the titles, hereditary and otherwise, by which they have been distinguished.

How similar has been our experience in Canada!

> The official reasons given for each selection fail to satisfy the pardonable curiosity so created.
>
> It is not, however, into this controversy that I propose to enter, but into another one raised two generations ago by Matthew Higgins, the famous "Jacob Omnium" of the Fifties. War, after all, is primarily an affair of the soldiers and sailors, and when, after the Crimean War, the civilians seemed to Higgins to have helped themselves too liberally to the decorations, he scored them with a very caustic pen on the text: "Kings with their armies did flee and were discomfited; and they of the household divided the spoil." It may be instructive to see how honours in our own time have been allotted between those defending their country at the war and those defending the war in the country.

Mark that distinction: "between those defending their country at the war, and those defending the war in the country." To continue:

> Dealing with the higher honours, that is, those which carry titles, how have these been distributed since the outbreak of hostilities? In all, 61 peerages have been created—

This is important as showing how few honours have been awarded to the men who fought for the liberty of the Empire, and how many titles have been awarded to politicians and others who did not go to the front.

> In all, 61 peerages have been created, including steps upward by those already ennobled. Of these, Mr. Asquith created 28 and Mr. Lloyd George 33.
>
> Civilians have received 58 of these. Only two have been conferred upon soldiers and one upon a sailor. Six Garters, four Thistles, and four Patricks have been given. With the exception of one, civilians have received all the Garters, and the same rule applies to both the

Thistles and Patricks. Fifty-six favoured individuals have become "Right Honourable" as Privy Councillors, and they are all civilians; and 107 have been made baronets, of whom no fewer than 106 were civilians and only one a sailor. Of the honours, then, that confer hereditary rank 164 have been given to civilians and four to sailors and soldiers, the ratio being 41 to 1. The great Orders have been given in the ratio of 11 to 3, and Privy Councillorships in the ratio of 56 to nothing. Lump them all together, and it is 231 to 7.

The fighting men fare, of course, a good deal better when it comes to the humbler business of knighthoods. Omitting the Indian honours, 262 soldiers and sailors have either been admitted to the rank of an Order that carried a title with it, or have received the advancement from Knight Commander to Grand Cross. If I am not mistaken, no soldiers or sailors at all have been made Knights Bachelor—at least not for military or naval services—a matter which has created some comment; for knighthood, after all, suggests nothing if not service in arms.

I call particular attention to that phrase: "For knighthood, after all, suggests nothing if not service in arms."

Still they have received 262 knighthoods or advances. But a considerable number of these have not been given for services in the war at all. They have followed from seniority, administrative services at home, and so forth, just as they would have followed in peace. They are practically civilian honours conferred on soldiers. They include, for instance, officers employed in the War Office and at the Admiralty, who have presided over departments, the responsibility for which has always conferred a claim for a K.C.B.; and the same is true of advancements from K.C.B. to G.C.B. In ordinary times such knighthoods and advancements would amount to 15 or 20 a year, so that it would probably not be safe to reckon more than 180 or 200 at most as honours for special war services. In the meantime, civilians, men and women, have received 739 knighthooods or their equivalents! Both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George have bestowed these decorations in about the same proportions. Mr. Asquith made 210 civil and 84 military knights, Mr. Lloyd George 473 civil knights, 46 dames, and 178 military and naval. The score then stands, for the greater honours, at the ratio of 46 to 1, and in the lesser, in the ratio of rather over 3 to 1.

This gives some idea of the way in which honours have been distributed in the Old Country. Do we desire to emulate the example of Great Britain? Sometimes she is set up as a proper example to follow, but I am sure that in a matter such as is under consideration this afternoon this Dominion should act on its own judgment. When I was in England I was struck with an article written by Robert Blatchford, the great socialist writer in England and one of the most prominent socialists in the world. In this article the writer advanced what in my opinion is an unanswerable argument against the conferring of titles, and an indictment of all classes of snobbery. Mr. Blatchford had received a letter from an optician in England, who wrote as follows:

I am practical watch and clock maker and optician, and, besides possessing the oldest business in the town, I am old-fashioned enough to love my children, and to wish to do my best for them, *and pay for it.*

I approached the principal of one of those higher schools, somewhat snobbishly described as "for the sons of gentlemen," and was told that my boys could not be accepted beacuse I "kept a shop" in the town. In other words, because my children have been so foolish as to choose a vulgar tradesman for a father, they are to be socially and educationally ostracised.

I had hoped that four years of horrible war had washed out that kind of snobbery and class cleavage, but it appears I was wrong.

I may mention that the parents of at least two of the high school scholars owe me money which I shall never get.

Commenting on this letter, Mr. Blatchford, in the article referred to, states:—

This matter of the optician's letter may seem trivial. But it is not.

Nor does the matter end there, for the letter indicates something more than a class or caste division amongst the people; it shows us quite plainly that there is something radically and seriously wrong with a nation in which such blind snobbery is possible. It shows a national misreading of values, an appraisement of men not by their deservings, nor by their utility, nor by their character, but by their garments, or their occupations, or their manner of pronouncing certain words.

I do not think Mr. Blatchford overdraws the situation in that description. Does this new western nation desire to set up an aristocracy and to institute a reign of snobbery such as that here described? If it does not it must set its face unalterably and determinedly against all social distinction and titles, and this Parliament, in my judgment, is in duty bound to express its opinion on the matter. I discussed with Mr. Lloyd George, that great tribune of the people, the question of titles, and I presume I violate no secret—he did not ask me not to repeat his words, and I have no doubt he would be ready to pronounce them himself publicly if he were requested to do so—I do not think I violate any confidence when I say that he informed me that he was unalterably opposed especially to hereditary titles, and that it had been his intention, and he hoped still to be able to do so, to introduce a Bill that would abolish hereditary titles altogether. He did not so much object to temporary titles being conferred on men who had distinguished themselves on the field or in some other striking capacity, but he was absolutely opposed to hereditary titles. I drew a bow at a venture, in speaking with the right hon. gentleman, and suggested that possibly I might some day be obliged as a journalist to

record the fact that he had accepted a title himself. He laughed heartily and answered: "My dear friend, you can set your mind absolutely at rest on that point. Lloyd George will die, as he has lived, a plain man of the people." Would the acquiring of a title add anything to the majesty of character and the greatness of the career of Mr. Lloyd George? On the contrary, I think it would seriously detract from his greatness.

I do not purpose to speak at any great length on this subject, but I shall conclude with an amendment to my hon. friend's motion, as I did last year, but I shall present it at the conclusion of my remarks. I have always thought that if you are to have titles, (and I of course disapprove of them in any form), if the sense of the public were in favour of titles, they should have been fairly distributed among the people of the country. The valuable services of the educationists of the country should be recognized. The farmers —a class without whom it would be impossible to successfully develop this country—should also be recognized. Have we ever seen a farmer knighted in this country? Then I think that prominent physicians and surgeons, men who have done much for the alleviation of human suffering, should have been recognized.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Is the hon. gentleman now defending the bestowal of titles?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No. I am saying that if you are to have this excrescence on the body politic recognitions should have been bestowed fairly. I want to assure my hon. friend from Peterborough that I take second place to no man in this country in my opposition to the very idea of titles. I think it is utterly derogatory to the country and a very great mistake, but I was saying that if you were going to have such things, men of the type I have mentioned should have been remembered.

An hon. MEMBER: Cut out the last line of the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will deal with the resolution in a suitable manner before I have finished, if my good friend will give me the opportunity. In Canada titles have largely been distributed amongst partisan politicians, railway promoters and exploiters, big business financiers, and rich nabobs and plutocrats. Just look over the list of recipients throughout the Dominion. It embraces men of uncanny reputation, little capacity, no record of achievement except it be in the line of the bedevilment of public affairs, and certainly no accomplishment of an altruistic or patriotic character. I should think that a considerable number of them possess a sufficient sense of humour and idea of the fitness of things to imitate the promised example of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in this House last session, and to hurl their decorations into a bonfire if they could only do it stealthily and by night. Especially in this critical and menacing time of social unrest and reconstruction, those responsible for the administration of public affairs, responsible for the impressions that are being stamped upon the restless, uneasy, jealous, if you will, exacting, and in view of all the past, perhaps pardonably resentful minds of a portion of the populace with its varied factions, must exercise a determined and insistent care that the idea of social justice and equality and opportunities for all shall be the resounding and dominant key-note of every act of legislation. There must be no attempt to set up a cheap, tinsel aristocracy in this young western nation. The idea of conferring social distinctions must be effaced,—nay, the plant that has been inserted in our soil must be rooted out and destroyed. But if the mistake is to be persisted in, which God forbid, the authorities better have a care that the distribution shall embrace the dignity of toil, the genuine aristocracy of industrial and mechanical achievement, and the simple, modest dignity of living, exemplified in the life of Cincinnatus, the old Roman hero. The class of men who have received social distinction, compared with those worthy citizens who have been overlooked, has caused an offensive odour in the nostrils of decent-going reflecting Canadians.

I should not think that hereditary titles would have any defenders whatever, and especially not in this House. Surely we do not want to plant in this country an hereditary aristocracy. We see the evils of hereditary aristocracy in the Old Land, and I cannot conceive of anything that has done more for the enslavement or degradation of the people than an hereditary aristocracy —the "gentry" as they call them over there. When I visited the Old Land upon several occasions I used to sit with the drivers in the busses and used to take every opportunity to draw out the workingman, to get his viewpoint on the question of the aristocracy or the gentry, and I want to confess with most profound disappointment the experiences that I had. The men over there, the lower classes as they call

them—and it is a term that I dislike very much to use—the greater portion of them seemed to have an admiration and a love for the gentry, they seemed actually to wish to be patronized, to be spat upon as it were. The result of all these distinctions throughout the old world has been the degradation of the human race, and we should not think for an instant of following the old European nations in maintaining such class or caste distinctions. Let us teach the race, the dignity of manhood, and the equality of opportunity. All men, says the American Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson, are born equal. I think if you took that pronouncement literally it is probably not true. All men are not born with equal endowments; but I suppose what Jefferson intended to say was that all men are born with equal opportunity and should before the law be regarded as possessing equal advantages. If we in this country were to allow the introduction of an hereditary aristocracy we would be striking a blow at citizenship, and a blow at the progress of our own country. We cannot afford to allow such a plant to flourish in Canada. It is doubtful if even the very limited number of possessors in the Dominion of these hereditary titles, after they have, like children, amused themselves with the tinselled toy, would not rejoice to be in a position to gracefully toss it into the Laurier bonfire. It must not be perpetuated in the life of the nation.

I was going to ask, what dignity would be added to Gladstone if he had accepted a knighthood or a peerage? What better would the human race have thought of him to-day, or of John Bright and Cobden, those great industrial and economic liberators? Why the very acceptance of a title, in my judgment, would degrade such names as theirs. Would Edmund Burke, perhaps the greatest orator the world has ever produced, be as dear in name to us all if he had been translated to a dukedom or a peerage? Coming to our own country, take Edward Blake, the great commoner, who sat in this House, I believe for twenty or twenty-five years, devoting that magnificent ability of his to the service of the nation, and Alexander Mackenzie, as honest a man as ever trod the soil. Would they be ennobled, would they be greater men had they been knighted in the old days? I think, Mr. Speaker, that every thoughtful Canadian respects and loves the names of the Hon. Edward Blake and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. Yes, and you might add to theirs the name of that other great Canadian William Lyon Mackenzie, to whom this country owes far more than the average citizen dreams of to-day. Because the people have short memories and I find that we Canadians make a great mistake when we fail to study the lives of the men that served us. Think of William Lyon Mackenzie, who fought for representative and responsible government, who fought against the old Family Compact, a man with Scotch blood in his veins who refused to be domineered, who stood nobly for right and principle, and was willing even to place his life and liberty in jeopardy by entering upon rebellion against what he considered the wrongs of the day. Perhaps he was mistaken—I would certainly in the light of history and of developments not like to venture the idea that he was mistaken—but he took the consequences of his act, and it is to William Lyon Mackenzie that this Dominion owes so much at the present day. Driven from his own country he became an exile in a foreign land for years, often going for days if not weeks without food. He was without friends, without a man to say a kind word to him. Then an amnesty was declared, and he returned to Canada and died a broken old man. Would it endear the name of William Lyon Mackenzie to the people of Canada if a knighthood or any other honour that a human potentate might control had been conferred upon him? Not at all. The memory and name of William Lyon Mackenzie to those who have studied and appreciated his life and work will live as long as Canadian history lives. These are the men who are entitled to honour, the men who spurned anything that kings could do for them, the men who fought for principle and placed their lives in jeopardy. This nation little dreams how much it owes to men like William Lyon Mackenzie and as a Canadian I would deeply deplore the conference of any title that a human potentate could confer.

Let me add: How myriads of hearts the world over, whether descendants of Auld Scotia or not, would have burned with regret had their beloved bard who wrote:

> The man o' independent mind,
> He's king o' men for a' that.

Been de-dignified—if I may be allowed to coin a word for the occasion—by allowing any human potentate to transform him into "a belted knight"?

You cannot elevate men of the type of Burns or of Thomas Carlyle, the great Scottish philosopher and historian, by con-

ferring titular distinction on them. The other day I noticed in the newspaper an extract from one of Carlyle's essays, and I am going to take a minute or two to read this great literature that it may be embalmed in the pages of Hansard. It is entitled "Two men I honour":

> Two men I honour, and no third. First, the toil-worn craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the earth and makes her man's. Venerable to me is the hard hand—crooked, coarse; wherein notwithstanding lies a cunning virtue, indefeasibly royal, as of the sceptre of this planet. Venerable, too, is the rugged face, all weather-tanned, besoiled, with its rude intelligence; for it is the face of a man living manlike. Oh, but the more venerable for thy rudeness, and even because we must pity as well as love thee! Hardly-entreated brother! For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert our conscript, on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles wert so marred. For in there, too, lay a God-created form, but it was not to be unfolded; encrusted must it stand with the thick adhesions and defacements of labour, and thy body was not to know freedom. Yet toil on, toil on: thou art in thy duty, be out of it who may; thou toilest for the altogether, for daily bread.
>
> A second man I honour, and still more highly him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread, but the bread of life. Is not he, too, in his duty; endeavouring towards inward harmony; revealing this, by act or by word, through all his outward endeavours, be they high or low? Highest of all when his outward and his inward endeavour are one, when we can name him artist, not earthly craftsman only, but inspired thinker, who with heaven-made implement conquers heaven for us. If the poor and humble toil that we have food, must not the high and glorious toil for him in return, that he have light, have guidance, freedom, immortality? These two, in all their degrees, I honour; all else is chaff and dust, which let the wind blow whither it listeth.
>
> Unspeakably touching is it, however, when I find both dignities united; and he that must toil outwardly for the lowest of men's wants is also toiling inwardly for the highest. Sublimer in this world know I nothing than a peasant saint, could such now anywhere be met with. Such a one will take thee back to Nazareth itself; thou wilt see the splendour of heaven spring forth from the humblest depths of earth, like a light shining in great darkness.

I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, if you do not think it was really worth while to read to the hon. members such a classic?

I will continue my imperfect and perhaps somewhat rambling remarks with this amendment to my hon friend's motion. I move, seconded by Mr. Cruise:

> That the following words be inserted after the word "message" at the beginning of the third line:
>
> "May take measures to ensure the extinction of the hereditary titles at present in existence in the Dominion at the death of the present possessors thereof and"

[Mr. Richardson.]

Some people would probably be disposed to cut off these titles at once. I would not have any objections if it could be done easily and would not raise a constitutional issue in the old land, but it might be considered a more graceful act to allow the four or five Canadians who possess hereditary titles to die in peace. The hand of time will remove them and with their removal let us earnestly trust that we shall see the last of this miserable institution in the Dominion.

You cannot make a man greater than he is, and no higher keynote should be sounded than that of service, because the Master Himself said that "Whosoever would be chiefest among you shall be servant of all." If men get the idea that the greatest honour is to serve their country and their fellowmen they will not think so much of having temporary titles conferred upon them. And at this time, after the sacrifices our noble sons and the country generally have made, this Parliament should hold up the highest ideals to the men who have served their country so faithfully and so well, and if we maintain those ideals, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that our nation shall measure up to the standard that God intended it should reach.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what has got into the minds of the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that those learned and able gentlemen should have made any exception whatever in favour of titles.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON: I certainly have made none.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am absolutely opposed to the amendment by the hon. member for Springfield, who first of all says that one of the objections to titular honours is that they have been incorrectly handed out.

That is an apology which logically and argumentatively means that if they had been correctly handed out, they might be excused. That of course, is absolutely a violation of the principle underlying the abolition of honours. We do not want titular honours in this country; that is the point. The people do not want them and we, being representatives of the people, are here for the purpose of voting them out of existence.

The member for Kingston is labouring, I think, under a misapprehension. He has two exceptions in his resolution, one with respect to military and naval officers and

the other with respect to judges and administrative officers.

Mr. NICKLE: No. Just read the resolution.

Mr. BURNHAM: The resolution says:

It being always understood that this humble prayer has no reference to professional or vocational appellations.

"Colonel" is not called by the King a title. A man may be John Smith, Colonel commanding the Buffs of Kingston; he is not called "Colonel" at all; that is simply a way of designating him. You do not call a judge "Judge So-and-So;" that is only our Canadian vulgarity. He is Mr. Smith, Judge of the Supreme Court—or wherever he may be.

Mr. FRIPP: Mr. Justice Smith.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Justice Smith, of the Supreme Court—there is no titular honour in that case. So that this resolution might convey a misunderstanding and might lead to very serious results, if what I say is true. It may be presumed that the member for Kingston knows all about it, and that the words of his resolution must refer to something else—that the exception could only be a title such as a knighthood, or something of that kind. But it mixes the resolution all up; there is nothing definite or clear about it. Away with the whole thing. These gentlemen may bring in their resolutions or their amendments, but the people will be satisfied with neither. They do not want any compromise. If this House has not learned what the feeling of the country is, they will probably learn it at the next election—and they will learn that titular honours must be abolished in this country. It will come; we need not hurry ourselves; we need not fret ourselves unduly. We need not have any serious apprehension about it. We need not deal in an hour-long historical review of it, for God knows the whole thing is founded on democracy, not on the aristocratic pretensions on which the historical review is given. Nor is there any necessity for arguing from analogy. The simple fundamental principle of social distinctions is abominable and must be done away with. The people are desirous of destroying it, and, that being the case, let us have no more of it.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly and heartily agree with all that the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) said this afternoon, and likewise with what was said by the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). It is not necessary, as the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) said a moment ago, that this question should be laboured further. My own opinion is that titles are not good for the country, and I have very grave doubts whether they are good for the persons upon whom they are bestowed. I think we would be far better without them. Our country would be better; the people would be better. It is indisputable that the vast majority of the people are bitterly opposed to titles being handed out.

But I did not rise so much to discuss that question as to say a word or two with regard to the position I took last year when this matter came before the House. At that time much fault was found with me because I was the first to introduce this matter in the early part of a session a good number of years ago, and my position last year was regarded by my friends as very extraordinary. It was in May last—those days in May were dark and dreary days—that the question of titles came up in this House—and we had the very extraordinary spectacle of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), upon a private member's resolution, suddenly taking to himself the right to say that that resolution should be treated as a want of confidence motion, and that did the resolution carry he would feel it essential that his Government should resign and go to the country. To me that was most extraordinary. A general election in May of 1918 would have been an absolute calamity. I was returned on the question of conscription; I was given a mandate from my constituents to see that conscription was carried out. At the time that that resolution was brought up conscription had not been carried out, and had I, with others who felt just as strongly on the subject as I did, voted against the Government on this subject, and had the Government been defeated, it would have meant a general election; it would have meant the disruption of business; it would have meant that I was not carrying out the mandate of my constituents. Therefore, it was, Sir, that I absolutely sunk my own convictions, that I let them go where they might, and that I stood by the Government, with the result that you know of.

To-day I feel just as strongly on this question as I ever did. To-day I believe that the abolishing of titles is true Liberalism. May I say, if it is of any import to anybody, that I differed from my chief and from others of my party on one question, and on one question only? That question was conscription. I consider it to-day, how-

ever much others may differ from me, to have been good Liberalism on my part to support that policy. But my political faith and tenets are the same that I have always held. In these great days of reconstruction my Liberalism is, perhaps, better than it ever was, because I believe the country needs it. But as I say, when this matter was up last session, I sunk my convictions and voted as I did to support a Government in war time. I do not consider that such is necessary to-day, but I do consider that so far as this country is concerned we must come to one form of government, and one only, and that is the party system.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss upon its merits the subject of this resolution, because, having accepted the honour of knighthood, I should feel myself at a certain disadvantage in doing so. If I spoke in favour of titles, it might be considered that my view was biased or prejudiced. If on the other hand I spoke against titles, I might be regarded as ungenerous to those having greater merits than myself. My intention to-night is to indicate the present position of this matter so far as concerns action by the Dominion Government and by the Imperial Government, and to suggest a certain disposition of the resolution and of the amendment to the resolution, which disposition will, I trust, be of advantage to the Government in giving the matter further consideration and will meet with the views of the House.

While this is a question upon which there is room for difference of opinion, a question upon which members may not agree, it is not in any respect a party question. Both Liberal and Conservative Governments have in the past recommended to His Majesty the bestowal of knighthood and other titular distinctions, and adherents of both political parties have been the recipients of such distinctions. I think I am correct in stating that every Prime Minister of Canada, with the exception of one, has accepted knighthood. That exception was the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who, I feel certain, must have been offered the distinction, although I do not know that that is so. I think, therefore, that in all probability he declined the honour; but with that exception, as I have stated, all the Prime Ministers of Canada, Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, accepted the honour of knighthood at the hand of their Sovereign. In addition to these distinguished men in the public life of Canada, many other members of Government were similarly honoured. I recall amongst others Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Sir George Ross, Sir James Whitney, in Ontario, and Sir Lomer Gouin in Quebec. I mention only outstanding men, for the purpose of showing that the acceptance of titular distinctions in this country has not been confined to any one party and that therefore the question is not in any respect a party one. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, while Prime Minister of Canada in 1902 had an Order in Council passed and forwarded to the Imperial Government, in which were these observations:

> In Canada a Government similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom has been established, and the advisers of His Majesty in Canada are the proper advisers of His Majesty for every kind of reward bestowed upon His Majesty's subjects for services performed within the legal and constitutional sphere of Canadian jurisdiction. His Majesty's ministers in Canada are acquainted with the standing in the community of the persons upon whom it may be proposed to confer honours, and of the character of the services for which these honours are the reward, and to have those rewards bestowed by His Majesty on the advice of those who are but imperfectly informed as to the estimation in which the recipients are held, or of the character of the services for which the honours are bestowed, is practically an invasion of the right of local self-government.

This report was based upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister of that date, the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The Order in Council goes on as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council concurring in the report of the Prime Minister, recommend that the same be presented to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, and respectfully ask that the Royal Instructions be modified to the effect that the same rules which apply for the exercise of the Royal Prerogative in granting honours and titular distinctions to subjects of the King in the United Kingdom be made likewise to apply to all recommendations by the Governor General for the exercise of the Prerogative to the King's subjects in the Colonies, and that all such recommendations by the Governor General to the Sovereign in such matters be made upon the advice of his responsible ministers.

I am quoting this in order to show the progressive steps which have been made in this matter of the bestowal of titles down

to the present time. In a despatch dated 23rd April, 1902, and signed by Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, then Colonial Secretary, the following observation was made with reference to the Order in Council which I read and which was submitted to the Imperial Government as I stated:

> In dealing with this subject I have been desirous of meeting the views of your ministers so far as possible, but as the responsibility for making recommendations to the Sovereign in regard to appointments to an Imperial Order such as that of Saint Michael and Saint George rests with the Secretary of State and not with your ministers, it is his duty to obtain the best advice he can and he must be the sole judge of what is the best advice.

That was the position taken by the late Liberal Government and by the Colonial Secretary in 1902. The matter rested there until the present leader of the Government took it up shortly before the last session of Parliament. The present Prime Minister took the most advanced ground that had been taken up to that time with respect to this matter of titles; and in order that his views may be upon Hansard for the consideration of the committee to which I propose asking this House to have this matter referred, and for the information of the members of the House, I hope I may be pardoned if I quote from the Order in Council which was passed at the instance of the Prime Minister on the 25th March, 1918. After submitting that the subject demands consideration and attention and that the bestowal or honours is a matter of concern to the whole community and has a direct relation to the orderly government of the State, and after referring to the Order in Council from which I have read, passed on the 19th February, 1902, the present Prime Minister proceeds:

> The Prime Minister is firmly of opinion that the creation or continuance of hereditary titles in Canada is entirely incompatible with the ideals of democracy as they have developed in this country and that the time has arrived when their heritable quality or effect should be abolished in this Dominion.
>
> The hereditary peerage as an institution can find neither historic justification nor scope for usefulness in a state structure and social tradition such as that which now exists in Canada. Consequently the effect of such an institution in this country is merely, on the one hand, to confer and to perpetuate arbitrarily for some members of the community a titular distinction or status of honour, and on the other hand to imply a position of special though ill-defined privilege to which there is not and cannot be assigned any obligation or function in the activities of Canadian national life. Honours conferred directly upon deserving recipients under appropriate conditions and by proper authority will be respected by the community; but a decoration or titular distinction which is attached to the holder not in recognition of his own services, but merely from incidence of birth, and which is invested with no special or public duties or responsibilities, will inevitably arouse in this country a sense of utter incongruity and a feeling of keen impatience.

That was the advanced ground with respect to hereditary titles taken by the Prime Minister of this country in March, 1918. The following recommendations were made in the Order in Council:

> 1. No honour or titular distinction (saving those granted in recognition of military service during the present war or ordinarily bestowed by the Sovereign proprio motu) shall be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada.
>
> 2. The Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.
>
> 3. No hereditary title of honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.
>
> 4. Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

I am tracing the development of the principle of responsibility of government with respect to this matter of titles, and I think it will be clear from this Order in Council, which was passed before the last session of Parliament, that the present Prime Minister took at that time the most advanced ground which had been taken upon this subject.

The House will recall what I said a few minutes ago as to the reply which had been made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, in 1902. He stated in effect that the Colonial Secretary was responsible for the recommendation to His Majesty. Since the last session of the House, dispatches have been received from the Imperial Government with respect to this Order in Council, which was laid before the Imperial Government shortly after its adoption in March, 1918, and to which reply had not been received from the Imperial Government at the time of the debate in the House last session. The present position of the Imperial Government with respect to this Order in Council is as follows. They accept without question recommendations Nos. 1 and 2, reading as follows:

> 1. No honour or titular distinction (saving those granted in recognition of military service during the present war or ordinarily bestowed

by the Sovereign proprio motu) shall he conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.

That means that no honour or titular distinction, with the above exceptions, shall be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada except with the approval and upon the advice of the Prime Minister of Canada, and that the Government of the United Kingdom will exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time.

Now I come to the third recommendation of the Order in Council of March 25, 1918, which reads as follows:

3. No hereditary title of honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada.

The reply from the Imperial Government to that was as follows:

His Majesty will not hereafter be advised to confer any hereditary honour upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, save on the formal recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, the Prime Minister of Canada has recommended, and his recommendation is embodied in the report of the 25th March, 1918, that he is firmly of opinion that the creation or continuance of hereditary titles in Canada is entirely incompatible with the ideals of democracy as they have developed in this country, and that the time has arrived when their hereditary quality or effect should be abolished. That means that, as a result of the action taken by the Government of Canada upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister in March, 1918, hereditary titles, so far as the future is concerned, are abolished.

The fourth recommendation of the Order in Council is as follows:

4. Appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title of honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect.

The reply to that was:

This presents many difficulties that would require very careful consideration. Action for the present remains in abeyance.

There is one further step which has been taken since the last session of the House.

[Sir Thomas White.]

It will be recalled that the Order in Council expressly excepts honours or titular distinctions granted in recognition of military service during the present war. The word "military" there would include "naval." With regard to knighthoods to those who have rendered military or naval service during the present war, the Army Council, through the Rt. Hon. Secretary of State, has advised that no grant of the distinction of knighthood to any Canadian military officer shall be recommended without previous reference to the Prime Minister of Canada.

I have shown the attitude taken by the late Liberal Government in 1902 with respect to titles, and the reply to their representations by the Imperial authorities. I have also shown the action taken by the present Government of Canada, and the reply to the Imperial authorities of to-day. I do not in any way contrast the two positions. I think the differing attitudes are entirely due to the advance in public opinion with respect to the subject under consideration; but I desire to emphasize the fact that the matter is not a party question. It was advanced considerably in 1902, when the Liberal Government took the view that the principles of responsible Government should apply to the bestowal of honours in Canada. It was further advanced in 1918 when the present Government, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, took a position which has resulted in the abolition of hereditary titles so far as concerns the future and in the acquiescence of the Imperial authorities in the principle that titular honours and distinctions, with the exceptions which I have mentioned, should be granted only upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister or the Government of Canada. Reference was made this afternoon to the debate of last session, and owing to the absence of the Prime Minister I feel that I must say a few words with regard to the position which then existed when he moved an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). The Order in Council had been passed and forwarded to the Imperial authorities, and no answer had yet been received from them. In his speech on May 21, 1918, the Prime Minister used these words. I quote from page 2343 of Hansard:

There is another consideration which I submit to the House and it is this: His Majesty's Government have to take into consideration, of course, the relation of this proposal not only to Canada but to all the dominions of the Empire and they have asked us, in a respectful and courteous way, that the whole subject be brought under discussion during the coming summer when certain of the Canadian minis-

ters are to visit the United Kingdom. It seems to me that as the Order in Council has been passed and has been communicated to His Majesty's Government, the delay that would ensue between this session and the next session, when the matter might be taken up again, if desired, ought not to stand in the way of our acceding to that respectful request. I do not imagine that the public interest will suffer by any action taken before Parliament shall assemble again. The Government of this country will then be in a position to announce to Parliament the result, of their conference with the Imperial authorities in respect to this subject. So, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson)—and I hope he will accept this suggestion—that the sub-amendment which I have proposed be accepted.

The Government, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, had taken certain advanced action with regard to this subject. The report embodying its recommendations was before the Imperial authorities, and request had been made that the matter should be allowed to stand in abeyance until they should have an opportunity of considering it in the summer. I am confident in my own mind that it was on account of the situation which existed with respect to the Order in Council and the Imperial authorities that the Prime Minister felt as he did with regard to the importance of the amendment to the amendment which he proposed.

There is just one other matter to which I desire to refer. It has not been mentioned in this House but reference has been made to it outside. Owing to the fact that the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues were obliged to go overseas in May last at the urgent solicitation of the Imperial authorities, and at a time of great national danger—in fact, the most critical period of the entire war—the session of Parliament came to an end earlier than would have been the case in the ordinary course. Some three distinctions were granted after Parliament rose. I have taken the opportunity to inquire respecting these distinctions, and I find that they had all been recommended months before Parliament rose, and that in the case of one of them the person who was to receive the honour had requested that so far as he was concerned it should be deferred in order to allow some one else to obtain an honour of which it was thought he was worthy. The point I desire to make with regard to that transaction is that the recommendations had all been made and were before the Imperial authorities before this House rose. I have explained the situation as it exists and the action taken by the Imperial Government since last session. The Order in Council of March, 1918, makes exception in cases of honours and decorations granted in recognition of military service during the war, and I have already explained that honours and titular distinctions can be conferred, under the existing regulations, upon subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada only with the approval or upon the advice of the Prime Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the last session of the House and down to the present time, the Government has been confronted with a situation respecting honours which I should like to describe to the House. We have in the military forces overseas many who have distinguished themselves and who would be eligible for honours and recognition, subject to what I have said as to the honour of knighthood; and there are in Canada many officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces who have rendered distinguished service in Canada. These men were all desirous to go overseas and felt keenly disappointed at not being permitted to do so. Their duty lay in Canada, however, and many of them have rendered service of a most meritorious character. With regard to those who have served overseas in the military or naval forces there is a well-established channel of recommendation for honours, namely, the Army Council, upon the report and recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief. No difficulty arises in connection with those. But with regard to officers in Canada who have served in Canada and have not been able to go overseas, the initiative had to be taken here, if taken at all. In addition to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and those who have remained in Canada, and in addition to those who have served in the navy overseas and those who have served in Canada, there is a very large number of civilian workers in the Red Cross, the Patriotic Fund, Munitions and many other services; and if Canada followed the same course as is adopted in Great Britain and, I think, the Overseas Dominions, there would be a considerable number of civilian workers in England and in Canada to be recommended for honours or decorations.

Now the Government last autumn, in connection with the New Year's list, decided that the granting of titular honours and decorations in respect of civilian services, viz.: the Red Cross, the Patriotic Fund, munitions, etc., should be suspended, with the object of having the whole question given the fullest consideration. I have explained to the House that a very large list

indeed was involved in Canada and in London. On January 3, 1919, we received a cablegram from the Prime Minister to which I especially desire to draw the attention of the House, because the suggestion is contained in it that I propose to make here this evening for the disposition of this motion. That cable stated that the opinion of the Prime Minister and his colleagues was that for the present there should be no deviation from the decision of the Canadian Government to suspend the granting of titular honours and decorations in respect of civilian services, viz.: Red Cross, Patriotic Fund, munitions, matrons, nursing sisters, and others.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the cablegram that brought forth this answer?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This cablegram came from the Prime Minister. The point that I am making is that the Prime Minister, having taken the ground that he had taken in March, 1918, in the House of Commons during the debate on this subject, had suggested the action which I propose to the House should be taken with regard to this motion. The same cablegram suggested for the consideration of council whether the question of civil honours for war services, as well as the whole question of honours, might be referred to a committee of the House of Commons for consideration and report. It was not intended that the duty of personal selection should be referred to the committee, but merely the general question of the principle to be adopted. On January 18, the Government informed the Prime Minister by cable of the decision of council that no honours or decorations should be recommended for the present for those engaged in military and naval service in Canada, and that action in this respect should be deferred until after the whole question of honours is referred to a committee of the House of Commons for consideration and report. Just let me summarize the position. The Order in Council of March, 1918, excepted from its provisions honours or distinctions granted to those engaged in military and naval services in Canada. A well established channel of communications exists in the War Council, upon the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, as to those who have served Overseas, but with regard to those who have served in Canada in the naval or military service the initiative in recommendation is to be taken here. With respect to that latter class, and with respect to civilian workers both here and overseas, the Government view was that no recommendation should be made until the matter had been referred to a select committee of the House for consideration and report.

Now, with respect to civilian services I quote an extract from a letter of the Prime Minister:

> If it proposed to recognize the work of this character as justifying a recommendation for honours by reason of service, the list will be a very large one, but not by any means so large as to do full justice to all those who have unselfishly and devotedly given their best effort to such service. The selection will be not only arbitrary but invidious, as it will not be possible to obtain that full knowledge of relative service which will be essential. On the other hand if such service is not to be recognized by Canada, then Canadians will feel a sense of injustice and discrimination. For example, scores of Canadian men and women have worked unselfishly and devotedly in London during the past four years. Persons giving no greater or perhaps less worthy service in the British Red Cross, or in the Red Cross of any Dominion, are recognized by the bestowal of suitable honours with the consent of their governments, while the Canadians receive no recognitions whatever. There will undoubtedly be much bitterness among those who will feel themselves thus placed under an unjust discrimination. Possibly it may be considered desirable to include work in the Red Cross as work in the military service. If so we cannot very well shut out service in the Y.M.C.A. or similar organizations.

The Prime Minister there touches upon the essential difficulties of this situation, which, in my view, render it highly important that a committee of this House should consider the whole question deliberately and maturely with a view of making a report to this House before the end of the session in order that it may be fully discussed, and, if approved, adopted here.

During the war thousands of people have rendered services involving the utmost self-sacrifice and devotion. If, on the one hand recognition is to be given, the difficulty is to choose those—and there will necessarily have to be a limited number—who should be recognized. There would, of course, be grave room for dissatisfaction on the part of the others if they were not also recognized. That is one aspect of the matter. On the other hand, you have the undoubted fact, as pointed out by the Prime Minister, that there are in London, and it is within the knowledge of the House that there are in Canada, hundreds of men and women who have worked most devotedly in civilian services connected with the war, and it is put forward by many that if in other parts of the Empire and in Great

Britain there is recognition of such services, and no recognition of like services in Canada, there will be a feeling of injustice and discrimination. It seems to me therefore that the matter, as it relates to those who have served most devotedly the interests of the State, should receive the most deliberate consideration on the part of the House. I am going somewhat into detail, Mr. Speaker, because I desire to show the House how many questions are really involved in this matter. It is not only a question of abolishing hereditary titles, of abolishing titular distinctions such as knighthood, but it involves the question of what, if any, recognition shall be given to those who served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force Overseas and the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Canada only; in the Naval Service Overseas, and the Naval Service in Canada; and that multitude of civilan workers who gave so freely of their time, both here and in London, in connection with the various funds—Patriotic, Red Cross and others,—which I have mentioned.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the Government accept the advice of the committee to be formed and be governed by it?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When I come to move my amendment I shall ask that the committee give careful consideration to this question and report back, and it will be for the House to adopt, modify, or reject the recommendations of the committee. The attitude of this House will, without question, be of the utmost value for the guidance of the Government. I do not wish to anticipate what the judgment of the committee and the House will be, but it is the sincere desire of the Prime Minister and of the Government to get the deliberate, reasoned opinion of this House upon all the questions I have mentioned this evening.

Mr. BELAND: The House is ready to give it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It may not be ready to give it with regard to those who have served in the naval and military forces.

Mr. BUREAU: With regard to anything.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It may be, as my hon. friend says, that the House is willing to give that decision which will prevent any distinctions being conferred upon those who have served in the naval and military forces overseas and in Canada, but I did not understand that the resolution went so far last year. Possibly I am in error. As to the present resolution, it may have in contemplation the wiping out of all distinctions to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

A letter from Sir George Perley, dated 10th February, states that there is a strong feeling that civilians who have been doing war work for Canada overseas should be treated in the same way as those who have done it for Great Britain and other parts of the Empire. The following is quoted from his letter:—

> A great many men and women have worked devotedly here, some of them throughout the whole length of the war, on various kinds of useful service. They did not do this for the purpose of obtaining recognition but when they see civilians from everywhere else in the King's Dominions getting honours it certainly seems strange that Canada should be the only part of the Empire which declines to make any recommendation for awards.

Now, I have pointed out the difficulty of making selections without injustice, and I propose, Mr. Speaker, to ask the House to adopt the suggestion of the Prime Minister, namely, that the whole question of honours be referred to a Special Committee of this House for consideration and report. It is not the desire of the Government to shelve this resolution, but to have a representative committee—whose names I shall give the House—take this matter up at once, consider it carefully and maturely, and report to this House with respect to the bestowal of various titular distinctions upon civilians, upon members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have served overseas and upon those who have remained in Canada, and also upon civilian war workers. I do not know what the view of the House is. It may be, as my hon. friend has said, that it is opposed to any decorations, let alone titular distinctions, for members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but I should doubt if that is the opinion of all the hon. members.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be misrepresented. I said the House was ready to give its opinion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I misunderstood. It seems to me that the Committee would have to consider the question of hereditary titles. The Prime Minister in the Order in Council of March 25, 1918, recommended the abolition of all such titles for the future, and that recommendation has been concurred in by the Imperial authorities. Then there is the further question whether the title of knighthood should be conferred either for public service or for naval or military service. If the Committee is of

the opinion that titular distinctions may be conferred upon members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, there is the question whether such distinctions should be limited to those who have served overseas, or whether they should also be awarded to those who have served with distinction in Canada. There is the further question whether there shall be lesser titular distinctions to civilians in future, and whether decorations or other distinctions shall be given to civilian war workers of the several classes which I have mentioned.

Since Confederation, titles have been bestowed in Canada for public service, and since the war many distinctions and decorations have been bestowed for distinguished naval and military service. Shall those be continued? It seems to me that the whole subject is so important, having regard especially to those who have served in the war, that the House of Commons might very well delegate it to a select and representative committee to consider and report as promptly as possible to this House for its conclusion upon the subject. I therefore beg to move the following amendment to the amendment; seconded by Mr. J. D. Reid:

That all the words after "that" in the first line of the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "a Special Committee of this House be appointed for the purpose of considering and reporting upon the question of the conferring of honours, titular distinctions and decorations upon subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, including those who have performed overseas, in Canada or elsewhere, Naval, Military and civilian service in connection with the war. The said Committee to consist of the following members: Messrs. Nickle, Green, Peck, Buchanan, Clark (Red Deer), Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Cowan, Richardson, Whidden, Nesbitt, Middlebro, Pardee, Cockshutt, Murphy, McCoig, Ross, Ames, McMaster, Lemieux, Robb, Fielding, Elkin, Copp, McCurdy, Sinclair (Guysborough)."

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I am very glad that this is not a party question. I have had the honour to collaborate with the member from Kingston (Mr. W. F. Nickle) in this matter, and I am glad to know that we shall be able to express our views with regard to it irrespective of whether we sit upon your right, Mr. Speaker, or upon your left.

The present position has been gone into somewhat fully by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), but I do not altogether agree with some of the things that he has said. I am in thorough accord with him when he says that an advance has been made, but I am not satisfied with the present position. I am not satisfied, for instance, that the Government of the United Kingdom shall exercise the same authority as heretofore in determining the character and number of titles or honours to be allocated to Canada from time to time. The number of knighthoods or the number of titles—I trust there will be none—to be granted to Canada should be a matter on which the Canadian people alone shall have the right to speak. I am not satisfied that the Government in London should say to us in Canada: "We shall decide how many knights or lesser luminaries you are to have in Canada."

[Sir Thomas White.]

Then, the Acting Prime Minister has said that no hereditary title or honour shall hereafter be conferred upon a subject of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada. That was the advanced ground taken by this House and by the Government—I wish to be absolutely fair—last session. But the authorities in London have made this addition to it: "Save on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada." It is true that the Prime Minister of Canada has said that in his opinion it is unwise to have hereditary titles in Canada; all honour to him for taking that view. But always in the history of nations there is an ebb and flow of advance, and it is possible that sometimes in the ebb of public opinion from what I consider right and just—in a temporary time of reaction—we might have a Prime Minister who would suggest that there should be hereditary titles in Canada. I see no reason why the Government at London should not accept the general statement referred to—accept it holus bolus without any reservation whatsoever.

9 p.m.

The fourth recommendation in the Order in Council of last session was that appropriate action shall be taken, whether by legislation or otherwise, to provide that after a prescribed period no title or honour held by a subject of His Majesty now or hereafter ordinarily resident in Canada shall be recognized as having hereditary effect. Well, what was the answer of the Government in London? The King's advisers in London gave what I might call a Scotch verdict; they merely suspended the matter— said that it might remain in abeyance. If this House, by an almost unanimous, if not an unanimous, vote accepts the resolution proposed by the member for Kingston, that will be a very good answer to these gentlemen and will impress them with the fact that the Canadian people not only do not want hereditary titles, but do not want titles of any kind. In saying this I hope

that no one will think I am dealing in personalities, for I am not. There are those in this country and in this House whose amiability of character and whose democratic bearing shine out, perhaps, with greater brilliance on a background of knighthood. I am discussing this matter, therefore, merely as a question of principle.

Are we to have recognition of military service by way of title or distinction? I refer the House, as concerns this part of the discussion, to the following remarks of the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last year:

> It occurs to me that if there ever was a time when a subject such as this should be brought before the House, it is a time when the nation is at war, because if war teaches us anything it teaches us this: that when the country is at war and when the war is over, you are likely to have the greatest crop, if I might use that term, of decorations and recognitions that are from time to time seen.

That reason is even stronger to-night than it was when the member for Kingston uttered these words, because we have the word of the Acting Prime Minister that a very avalanche of titles and distinctions is hanging over the Canadian people and may descend upon us at any time.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Before an election.

Mr. McMASTER: The Acting Prime Minister read a letter from Sir George Perley stating that civilian war workers in Great Britain, English folk, have received honours in large numbers from their Government, and that keen disappointment prevails among Canadians in London because similar showers—shall I say of blessing?—have not descended upon them. I wonder how far that is a correct statement of the fact. Some Canadian civilian war workers in London may be dissatisfied because knighthood has not been conferred upon them, but I doubt whether that is the sentiment of the majority of them. Although waves of titles have practically inundated the people of the British Isles, the matter of the conferring of titles is a subject there of keen criticism, aye, even of ridicule. I remember reading in a British paper not long since that people in England expressed the fear that under the administration of Mr. Lloyd George Great Britain was becoming one of the most decorated of nations. Certainly a great body of public opinion in England wants none of that sort of thing. Honours have been suspended since last session. Instead of putting them in a suspense account, may I implore this House to wipe them off the books altogether?

What is the position in regard to titles of all those who fought in the war, either on the field or at home? The vast majority of soldiers and sailors at the front or on the sea and the vast majority of workers in Canada worked faithfully and well, and if you are going to distribute titles or honours among them you must count them not in tens or hundreds, but in tens of thousands. You cannot do that. Well, then, let it be the proud record of this country that their people fought in the war not for knighthoods, not for titular distinctions, but from sense of duty, love of country, and regard for the principles for which the Allies contended.

Why are the Canadian people against titles? First of all, I think it is because titles are not in keeping with the very air of British North America.

We in this country are a democratic folk, and the giving of titles is an attack on democracy. What is a title? A title means that a man, by the appellation which is used in regard to him from day to day, is set apart from the great body of the Canadian people, and that is a mistake. We must insist in this country upon the three great principles of democracy. A good many years ago when I was a student in Paris, I was struck by the three great words which are found on the front of every public building, " Liberté," égalité, fraternité," and I believe the giving of knighthoods and titular distinctions in this country is an attack against the great principles of equality and fraternity. In this connection let me just repeat what the Prime Minister said last year in regard to hereditary titles:

> Consequently the effect of such an institution in this country is merely, on the one hand, to confer and to perpetuate arbitrarily for some members of the community a titular distinction or status of honour, and on the other hand to imply a position of special though ill-defined privilege to which there is not and cannot be assigned any obligation or function in the activities of Canadian national life.

Exactly the same principle applies to knighthoods and titular distinctions of that sort. I had not the privilege of being present at the debate this afternoon, but I understand the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) raised the question that the resolution as introduced by the hon. member for Kingston did not do away with the right of the Government to confer knighthood on persons who happened to be judges or to enjoy rank in the army. That is not the intention of the resolution, nor do I think it is a proper interpretation to place upon it. The resolution says:

It being always understood that this humble prayer has no reference to professional or vocational appellations conferred in respect to commissions issued by Your Majesty to persons in Military or Naval Services of Canada or to persons engaged in the administration of Justce of the Dominion.

All that that means is that a judge will continue to be called a judge; that a colonel will continue to be called a colonel; that a captain will continue to be called captain; it does not in any way infer that a special privilege is to be given to judges or officers in the army to receive titles of knighthood. I ask this: In the present state of feeling in Canada and throughout the world, when those whom we have been prone to call the working classes, those who work with their hands as well as with their brains, feel that there is unfairness in society, when they feel that society as at present organized does not give them a fair deal, is it wise to perpetuate such things as knighthoods? I do not think so, I believe we shall in this country tend to carry on the nation's business more harmoniously, and therefore more efficiently, if we apply in fullest measure those principles of democracy—liberty, equality and fraternity, if we make it known to all the world that the Canadian people do not wish to have titular distinctions or knighthoods; that they are all prepared to adopt an almost Quaker like simplicity in the appellation by which one or another is called. As regards the form of this question, I think it would be well for this House to vote for the resolution. I do not say that there might not be room for a committee to consider the best way in which the expression of the House might be put into effect, but it would possibly be as well for this House to put itself clearly and emphatically on record as being opposed to titles of any sort in Canada.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I shall with great pleasure vote for the amendment to the amendment which has been moved by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), if for no other reason than this, that I think we should all want to be just a little careful in these times of world impulse before we do anything in haste to prevent this generation from doing honour to itself by possibly doing something to honour those who have borne themselves in the late war in Europe beyond their fellows in the matter of earning human praise.

I rise, however, not with the purpose of saying anything more than that upon the parliamentary position of this question, but to indicate that I am not quite at one with what I understood to be the attitude of my democratic, radical, iconoclastic and, I might almost say, Bolshevistic, friends from Springfield and Kingston. I am sure I shall have the whole-hearted approval of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) when, in attempting to secure a right ground of thought upon this question, I have recourse to any teaching that is to be found in Holy Writ. My hon. friend knows very well the writings of the Apostle Peter, and he will remember that Peter was very severe upon a certain class of individuals about whom he said: "Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities." St. Jude, as my hon. friend will also well remember, in speaking of a very bad class of people who were set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of hellfire, said: "They despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." I do not think that I need quote at greater length from that Book to show that my hon. friends to whom I have referred were, to say the least of it, treading on very dangerous ground this afternoon. That is especially true of the hon. member for Springfield who, I think, actually went to the barnyard for comparisons of the peacock and turkey to those people who are referred to in Scripture as "dignities." Still, on the whole, seeking distinction from any one is not a Scriptural virtue.

I am bound to think honestly on this question, and there is a higher authority than even St. Jude or St. Peter, who said: "How can ye believe if ye receive honour one from another?"

That is the acid test on this question, and it is a test to which I am sure my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) would not submit himself, because it would debar a man from seeking any honour from his fellows whatsoever; he would have to stand always in the naked dignity of his manhood,—I am not sure, after listening to my hon. friend this afternoon, whether he would even be allowed to dress himself as a modern man does. What the hon. gentleman objected to, indeed, was not that a man wore dress, but that he wore gold braid. Well, Sir, that is not a very democratic distinction after all. The acid test is whether we seek honours from one another at all. My hon. friend from Springfield does not mind a little honour occasionally. There was a band of journalists went to Europe last summer, and he was picked out with others from among his fellow journalists, and had the distinction conferred upon him of being sent over

to represent the journalism of Canada in the Old Country, where he conferred and confabulated with no less a person than Mr. Lloyd George. He had also the distinction of going over to the battlefields and parading with a few peacock feathers of his own.

The Quakers are the only people, I think, who have attempted to live literally up to the last Scripture which I have quoted; so they always refer to one another by their simple names. A Quaker is never anything more than William Simpson or John Richardson, but my hon. friend from Kingston and my hon. friend from Springfield pander with the rest of us to this inherent vice in human nature by which almost every human being seeks in some way or another—and I am not at all sure that he seeks it viciously—to raise himself above his fellows. I say that I am not at all sure that this is a vicious desire, because a fair amount of emulation in human life is a part of strong individualism, and I think there is a great deal of very frothy democracy going around in these days. But the Quaker is consistent; he neither calls his friend Mister nor Esquire. As there are no Quakers that I know of in this House, every member of this House has failed to submit himself successfully to the acid test, because we all get our typists to address our letters with either "Mr." in front or "Esq." behind.

The churches themselves have failed in regard to the teaching of the Founder, because they, too, have their dignitaries—their bishops, their moderators, and their presidents, showing that there is in human nature this tendency to be reaching out to higher positions. In society this same thing prevails. Mr. Speaker, it has not been without its uses in the case of hereditary aristocracies. I am the last man in the world to have any brief to speak for the British aristocracy, but I will say this: In the best hereditary families of Britain, there are traditions which have come down through generations—yes, through centuries—which have on the whole ennobled the public life of Britain. I say that as a Radical. Take the traditions of the house of Cavendish. The late distinguished head of that house, the late Duke of Devonshire, the uncle of his present Excellency, was a remarkable example of the best traditions of his family. Three times, without hesitation, in public life when the call of principle and of duty came to him, he left the party with which he had been associated, and on each occasion, such was his tremendous influence and such the clearness of his thinking, that he took the majority of his fellow-countrymen along with him. I hold that that ability to act independently, that ability to strike out for himself, was an adornment of British public life in his person, and an adornment which we should do well to reproduce some of, at least, in this country; because if there is anything that has been a curse to Canada, it has been straightlaced party politics, and I say that without any hesitation. The traditions of the English nobility—and the very word teaches us that we should not too lightly speak even of dignities, because it is not wrong to be noble—their traditions in this war have been of the very highest. The sons of British peers, and the brothers of British peers, and British peers themselves, have stood in the trenches and fought in the trenches with the humblest Tommies from London and from the agricultural fields of Britain. They have done that of their own free will; they were volunteers. As officers at the very beginning of the war they left all the appurtenances of their rank and titles, all their wealth, their stately homes, their lordly fields and parks, to go and face the foe, and to taste of death in no small numbers for the cause of freedom and democracy. I think it is only right, when our friends proclaim that this is a democratic country, that we should recognize these truly democratic qualities of character in those who were born in a very different sphere of society from that in which we had birth.

Then, I do not know that it is altogether an evil thing in society to have something to aspire to. I am not looking up now much myself; I am coming to the time of life when I would rather control my spirit and teach it by looking down. But I am not sure that my friends from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and Springfield (Mr. Richardson) are on safe ground when they say that the people of Canada are so very strongly with them on this question. We have titles in Canada that I have not heard any kick about in this House. There is the title of senator for example. Does anybody tell me that that is a title which is generally spurned in Canada? Sir, if one of the Senate's functions is to be looked up to, it certainly fulfils that function to the letter because members of the House of Commons in large number are often looking up there with longing eyes. So that when we examine this thing, we see that there is an inherent quality in human nature which

recognizes, after all, that in human society, as in human nature itself, equality is sought in vain.

One of my two friends, the leading exponents of democracy in this House to-day —I think it was the hon. member for Kingston—described German autocracy, against which we have been fighting, as a state in which the few have the right to govern. Well, I do not quarrel with that; I think it would be a good definition of autocracy. But I should like to point out to my hon. friend that the few are not necessarily the titled few, and if Canada is to be a true democracy we must see to it that under democratic forms we do not allow ourselves to be governed by the few here—I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, even on such a subject as daylight saving. We must see to it, I repeat, that we do not allow ourselves to be governed by the few here. Government by the few is not necessarily government by the titled few, and if my friends will be radicals I will tell them what a radical is. A radical is a man who goes to the roots of things; he looks beneath the surface title to the real principles that prevail. If we accept that title let us accept it in the fullest of its meaning. If this House of Commons is the representative of a democracy and does not believe in autocracy, then let us, in all our approaches to public questions, whatsoever their size, whatsoever their bearing, see to it that we "hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may." Let us see to it that on no occasion do we allow any influences of the few to control the many in this House, and through us to control the many in this country. Autocracy does not reside in titles, Mr. Speaker, but in power. Autocracy resided in power, and it is the power that men grasp for before they seek the title. The power is there in many cases before the title is conferred—the title is a mere external emblem of the power. Wealth is a form of power, and I say deliberately that the autocracy that is to be really feared in its operations upon the rank and file of the people, whether in this country or in the United States of America, is not an autocracy of titles but an autocracy of wealth. A man becomes a real lord, Sir, before he becomes a titular one, and for my part I cannot profess to get very excited about titles. We have heard a great deal about individual cases of titles in recent years and individual cases of lordship. What was the process by which the titles were attained? Some one makes a fortune overnight almost—a large fortune. He goes to Britain and gets knighted, possibly finds his way into the British House of Lords and becomes, I suppose, an autocrat. But he was an autocrat by way of his millions before he was an autocrat through the peerage, and a real democrat would look into the state of the laws of his country to find out how it is possible for a man to accumulate huge amounts of wealth in a very brief time, these huge amounts of wealth being the natural road to the mere surface decorations over which we have got so excited and spent the whole day talking about. My hon. friend from Kingston said that there was great unrest among the workmen of this country and he thought that that unrest was in some way traceable to the conferring of titles. Well, Sir, I scarcely think so. I do not think the workmen of this country are troubling themselves a very great deal about the inequalities of social distinction. I do not think the labouring men of this country, even where they have come from across the seas, have very much of that quality of the Englishman which is embodied in the well known proverb "The Englishman dearly loves a lord." As a democrat, I believe in the removal of inequalities, but as a radical I think we should go to the root causes of inequalities; and if you want to deal rationally and effectively with any unrest there may be amongst the workmen of Canada to-day you must deal with the real causes of the real inequalities of society. The inequality of society which goes home to the workman is that inequality by which our soldiers, to the number of 55,000 or 60,000,—most of them serving for $1.10 a day,—have laid down their lives for society, while most of us who have remained at home have benefited in the way of making filthy pelf by dint of their sacrifices, in many cases making that pelf to the amount of actual enrichment. That is the inequality of society that is troubling our workmen to-day, and I should recommend to my hon. friends that after we have finished with this question we should settle down to deal with the real, the serious, inequalities which are disturbing society and which will be a terrific trouble to us, as to all other countries, unless they are dealt with along the line of drastic reform. That is all the contribution I have to make, Mr. Speaker, to this enormous question of titles.

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion merely to correct a wrong impression which may

have been created to-night by the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). In the course of his address he made the statement that there was not in this House a member of the Society of Friends otherwise known as Quakers. I wish to inform the hon. member that the speaker who is addressing the House at this moment, the member for South Renfrew, has the honour of being a member of that society. I might apologize somewhat for the extent to which I practise the tenets of the society, and possibly this fact may have influenced the hon. member for Red Deer in the conclusion at which he arrived. He must be aware that the Quakers of the present day are not the Quakers of the seventeenth, or the eighteenth or the nineteenth century. Like all other religious bodies they have changed considerably in recent years. So that, although they have adopted the plain language and the plain dress, and dispensed with titles entirely, even the common titles of " Mister," " Esquire," and so on, the Quakers of the present day are not as strict in the observance of these rules and regulations as they were in the days gone by. Consequently there is a possibility that the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has been misled in his judgment as to the personnel of the members of this assembly. I can assure him, though, that I am proud to be considered worthy of membership in that society, and I would be unworthy of that position if I sat silent on this occasion and failed to correct the impression that was left, although I know unintentionally, on this House.

I might say in passing that in regard to the resolution now under discussion, I endorse to the limit some of the statements made by the last speaker, and I refer more particularly to his eulogy of the position taken by the scions of our aristocracy in the Old Land during the recent war. It has always been a delight and pleasure to me to look back on the history of the sons of the aristocracy of the Old Land who have been trained to live up to the privileges that they enjoy, which is so different from the condition that obtains in other lands in that respect. We find the sons of multi-millionaires, and of the so-called aristocracy, in this country, following a different course. They do not seem in many instances to rise equal to the occasion, or to their surroundings, whereas in the recent war there is no doubt that the aristocracy of the Old Land played an equal part with the sons of the poorer people. Coming down to the question of titles or otherwise, in this country I believe—and naturally it follows from my religious training—that titles do not improve the individual on whom they are conferred. Take some of the leading men of Canada; I do not grant for a moment that their position has been improved by the conferring of titles upon them. On the contrary, I know there have been individuals in this country and in the Old Land whose names were mentioned this afternoon—I refer to such men as Gladstone and John Bright in England, and Blake and Mackenzie in Canada—whose value would not be at all enhanced in the estimation of their fellow citizens by the conferring on them of titles. There are too, men in Canada who have had titles conferred on them and I know that these titles have not improved them in the estimation of their fellowmen—they were worthy men independent altogether of these honours. It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to vote in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and I shall have very great pleasure in doing so.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House more than a minute or two. but it appears to me that I might back up the very excellent remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer, whose opinion on these matters I value very highly, and also endorse the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Acting Prime Minister. This debate has been largely academic. I was considerably wearied with it this afternoon, and because I thought we had heard too much already about the subject of titles. I think the word "democracy" has been worked to death these days, and there are a great many panaceas put forward in connection with it, which are really doing it a great deal of damage. What we want is to get to work to make a democracy that is satisfactory to the people of Canada, and not talk so much about the matter and use the word so often, because simply shouting "Democracy!" is not going to make us any more democratic, and is not going to settle those questions that are agitating the people. I think this subject received quite sufficient airing last year, and I had hoped that the member for Kingston would have been of the same opinion and not have introduced his motion again this session.

In the first place, I have no objection to titles if they are properly earned and are lived up to after they are obtained. We have a few titled gentlemen sitting in this Chamber. Who would say for a mo-

ment, knowing the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) as we know him, that he has in any way lost his hold upon the people, or upon the members of this House, because he has accepted the title "Sir." I think that he is a great deal broader man than when he received the title. I think he is more in touch with the members of the House and more in touch with the people than ever he was before, and he is growing rapidly. And now, having paid a compliment to the leader upon our side, let me say of our good friend across the way, the newly elected leader of the Opposition, that "Sir D. D. McKenzie" would sound very well indeed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not believe that the leader of the Opposition would lose any dignity if he assumed that title, and I think that none of the members of this House would say that the "light in the window" would burn any less brightly because it was lighted by Sir Daniel McKenzie.

Mr. McKENZIE: Donald, it should be.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, Sir Donald be it; but I am saying this believing that the hon. gentleman is following in the steps of the great leader whom he has just succeeded, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The late lamented statesman bore the title with a great deal of distinction for a good many years, and although it is true that at times he spoke a little disparagingly of the title, he retained it, and lived up to it perhaps as well, or better, than a great many other men that have borne titles.

Now my good friend from Kingston is generally very consistent, indeed, but in respect to titles I do not think he has quite lived up to that reputation. I understand that he has a bosom friend, and if I were asked to mention that friend I would say he is a gentleman with a title. The hon. member will know to whom I refer. I do not believe the hon. member is any the worse for spending a good deal of his time in the society of that titled gentleman. I congratulate him upon having so brilliant a friend in a gentleman who is living up to the distinction that he has received, and, I think, has received deservedly.

The member for Red Deer has quoted a few passages from Scripture. He has quoted them remarkably well, and they are very apt and fitting to this question. It is true that some members of the House, if we were to believe them, would be quite prepared to call each other, Tom, Dick and Harry across the floor instead of using the expression "honourable gentlemen." I cannot see, however, that the dignity, or the decorum, that we have in the Chamber would be enhanced if we were to so style one another. Every assembly must guide itself and try to live up to the dignity that belongs to it. If any gentleman who is elected a member of this House, or appointed to the Senate, fails to live up to the title appended to his name, in my opinion, he should abandon that title. It is hard to live up to these things, it is a difficult matter to realize what the responsibility of titles means, but we use them everywhere, and there is no place where they are used more profusely than in the fraternal societies where "Worshipful Grand Master" is quite a common title. In some orders every one is a "Sir Knight." They have a lot of such appellations, there is no need to enumerate them all; and the very highest forms of titles are handed to these gentlemen as soon as they enter the cloisters of these secret societies. The world is full of titles, and the thing more necessary than anything else is to see that they are deserved and lived up to.

I am glad to see that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has just entered the Chamber, because I have a passage of Scripture to quote and I know that he is very fond of hearing such quotations. The passage that I was going to give is from the ancient sage, Job, and I fancy my hon. friend has heard it before. Job said:

> I know not to give flattering titles to men, for in so doing my Maker would soon take me away.

I want to draw the attention of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to the word "flattering." Job did not say "titles;" he said "flattering titles." Sir John Macdonald gave an interpretation of flattery which I think has never been bettered since his day, and no dictionary contains as good a definition. He said that flattery was an agreeable untruth. Now, if I were to tell the hon. member for Brome that he was the greatest statesman in this House or on earth I would be using a flattering title.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If I were to tell him that he has a long way to go before he becomes a great statesman, I would be telling him what I believe to be the truth. The word "flattering" is where the prophet stumbles; and as long as titles are not flattering there is no fault to be found with them. The whole trouble is in a man getting a

title that he has not fairly won or does not live up to. It appears to me that the Acting Prime Minister has taken a very fair way of settling this thing, and I trust that the Committee, though a large one, will not take very long to settle the question. As I said at the outset, I think the subject has received far more attention than it deserves. The main thing is that our boys have won titles that are worth carrying, titles that they are entitled to for their heroism, their self-denial and their devotion to a great cause; and I say it is a poor time to cut off such titles now when our boys are on the eve of receiving them. We should not belittle the D.S.O., the V.C., the M.C., or the other decorations conferred on those who have won them only after tremendous effort. If those men never do anything more to distinguish themselves in this world, they have achieved what many in former days never reached to. I have very much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in heartily endorsing the Acting Prime Minister's amendment to the amendment.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Last session when this question of titles was gone into very fully I was only able to be present and hear the concluding part of the discussion. For that reason I have been very much pleased to hear the present lengthy and interesting debate. I listened, as usual, with a great deal of pleasure and profit to the address of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He is happy in mostly any realm, but he was particularly happy to-night when he launched into the realm of theology, although he went rather far afield for evidence in support of the amendment. The days of Peter are quite remote, and Jude lived about the same time, at all events their letters are in close juxtaposition. However, I am sure that there is nothing stronger in the mind of the hon. member for Red Deer than a sense of proportion and application —he always brings us severely to task if we are we not absolutely logical in everything that we say;—and I must tell him that the reasonings in the sphere of theology do not always fit in properly in the sphere of legislation and statesmanship. When he quotes Peter and Jude as having said certain things, he must not forget that those men were evangelists, preaching the gospel of the Nazarene, which was entirely theological and moral and had nothing to do with the legislative or political sphere. Therefore, I think my hon. friend will see that those quotations are not as apt as everything he quotes usually is. He must not forget that in those days the real dignitaries were the Scribes and Pharisees. But perhaps his recent acquaintance with such people constrained him to make those quotations. Another quotation from a higher source than even Peter or Jude might have come to his mind. He will remember that the Master himself said of those very dignitaries whom the hon. member for Red Deer defends to-day: "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should think my hon. friend would rather be excused from defending such dignitaries. But as my good friend invited me into the field of Holy Writ, I will take him a little further, back to an authority that he will not despise. I am sure that no one in this House is more familiar with the writings and history of that great legislator, Moses, than my good friend from Red Deer. When we come to talk of Moses we are in the realm of lawmaking and politics, and anything that he said on questions of this kind is more to the point. Now, we find that Moses refused a title.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have it on the very highest of authority that Moses when he became of age refused to be called Pharoah's daughter's——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: He refused to be called the son of Pharoah's daughter. My hon. friends will understand that, will they?

Some hon. MEMBERS: We have it.

Mr. McKENZIE: He preferred to suffer privation with the people of God rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. That is authority to the point from one of the best men that ever lived, the man selected to take the people of God out of the darkness of Egypt. He refused a title, and that being the case, I have the very best reason for saying that no matter how excellent men may be, who have accepted titles, there are men equally as good who have refused them.

My good friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was bordering on the realm of theology, but he did no go very far. There is something in the Scripture about people beating their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; I would expect the member for Brantford to be

somewhat familiar with that quotation. The hon. gentleman said that the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), would find the way weary and long to the Emmaus of the political heaven. Let me express the hope that the member for Brome will not be alone on that weary road; that others will be trudging along with him towards the sunset, saying, "It is toward evening and the day is far spent." So much for the delectable course into which the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) assisted by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has led us.

I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), whose addresses are always logical and clear-cut and whose argument in support of any proposal that he makes is always satisfactory. We heard his argument last spring; we have heard him address the House several times on this question. About a year ago the House was quite ready to pass judgment on the question of titles, and but for the intervention of the Prime Minister on that occasion it would have done so. There was no dissenting voice at that time on the ground that there was not sufficient information. Now a year afterwards, the Acting Prime Minister says that we are not sufficiently enlightened on this question. For the last fifty years—all our lives, no matter how old or how young we are—we have heard about this thing. What information is to be gathered by this very excellent committee that is to be formed? What are they going to tell us? Where are they going to get their information? The member for Kingston, in dealing with this matter, did not go back quite as far as the member for Red Deer did, but he went quite a distance back. He was present at the battle of Hastings; he came into the country with William the Conqueror; divided up the lands with him, and did considerable surveying; so that he was able to come to us with a great deal of information, covering a period from the earliest times down to the present day. With the lucid and authoritative evidence that the member for Kingston presents to the House we ought to be satisfied. The House is as well prepared now to pass judgment on the question of titles as it will be a month hence or after we have heard the report of this committee.

10 p.m.

Talking about committees, we have in the Government itself the very best committee that we could get from this House. Parliament is elected, and out of that Parliament the Governor General, on the advice of the Prime Minister, selects a committee from the House of Commons known as the Government. There are eighteen or twenty of them; let me hope they are the select men of the party on that side of the House. They are responsible to the people; they should come down with a policy on this matter. Are they going to play daylight saving again? Have they not enough courage and strength of conviction to reach a decision upon this very simple matter of titles, come down to the House with it and ask the House to endorse it? Surely that is responsible government. Why throw the responsibility upon the whole House, and upon a very large committee who may find it difficult to reach a concrete conclusion? I submit, therefore that we are just as well prepared now to pass judgment on this motion as we shall be at any time in the future.

On the 25th of March, 1918, the Government reached a conclusion with regard to the question of titles. They put that conclusion into the form of an Order in Council and submitted it to the House. Hon. gentlemen on the other side voted for it by a very large majority. The Prime Minister said: We have put three weeks of our time on this matter; we have looked at it from all sides; and we submit this Order in Council as the wisdom that we could bring to bear on the question. That was not long ago. But the difficulty is that the Prime Minister and the Government cannot stay put; you cannot keep them anywhere. I am reminded of the time when I heard the member for Red Deer designate the Government that preceded this one—a Tory Government, nevertheless, and as close to this one as you could possibly get—as an "aggregation of funks." I think he was right when he said that. The words are on Hansard; of course, I would not use them myself, but, particularly when it comes from such an authority as the member for Red Deer, it is, perhaps, proper to use language which was not thought out of the way at that time. This Order in Council was submitted to the King, and by him considered in Council; upon it the King in Council made certain suggestions, and submitted them to the Government of this country. If the motion of the Acting Prime Minister to-night was to leave the matter as it was left by that Order in Council, and as it was left by the vote of this House, I should be disposed to agree. But, "How long, O Lord, how long," will the Government continue to hold to one thing? That was the order then; they want another thing to-day; to-morrow it will be something else. For

goodness sake, let us get clear of this title business and get down to something else that is of more importance to the people. Over a year ago the Government solemnly declared its position in this matter, and that position was affirmed by Parliament; now the whole thing, in the absence of the Prime Minister, is to be unravelled, and thrown back to a committee of twenty or twenty-five members from both sides of the House who, in all human probability will not agree. That is the condition in which we find ourselves now.

Here is an extract from a speech of the Prime Minister on May 21, 1918, reported on page 2364 of Hansard of last year. As the Prime Minister is not here, and as whatever else I may do, I want to be absolutely fair to him in his absence, I am going to read his speech which is short:

Sir Robert Borden: If by the leave of the House I may be permitted to say a few words, I shall make the matter perfectly clear so far as I am concerned. The subject was taken very fully into consideration by the Government at different times. We spent three or four weeks in reaching a conclusion as to our recommendations through the Governor General to His Majesty the King and to the Government of the United Kingdom. We dealt with it according to the light that we had. And when the motion of my hon. friend the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) came before the House, I took the House absolutely into my confidence, told them of the discussion that we had had and of the conclusion that we had reached. I said that the Government of the United Kingdom, regarding some of the matters in the Order in Council as of very grave import, had asked us for an opportunity to discuss the whole subject, because undoubtedly it has relation to its ultimate effect not only to this Dominion but to all the Dominions of the Empire and to the United Kingdom as well. We reached a certain conclusion, and it has been stated frankly and clearly, as far as I was able to state it frankly and clearly, to the House. I can only say, so far as I am concerned, that if the House does not propose to accept the course which I have asked them frankly and with much respect to take, I should consider that I am relieved from my duty of carrying on any longer the Government of this country, and I should ask His Excellency the Governor General to seek other advisers. It seems to me that a somewhat peculiar course has been pursued by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in inquiring of the Leader of the Opposition as to whether or not this motion was to be treated as a motion of want of confidence. My understanding of the course to be pursued on such occasions is that the Leader of the Government should be asked with regard to that question, and I cannot quite understand the reason why there should have been resort to my right hon. friend on the other side of the House to learn how I should regard a motion of this kind. However, the course has been taken, and it is entirely in the judgment of the House to determine what course they propose to pursue in the matter. So far as I am concerned my course is absolutely clear and open.

That is the whole of the speech, and it is perfectly clear what was before the House. It bears out exactly what I said. Now, if, when this motion was taken on the 21st May, 1918, the Prime Minister was going to resign if his friends on that side did not support his Order in Council, what guarantee have we that we are not going to bring the same catastrophe on the country to-day if hon. gentlemen opposite will do anything except just fall in line as the Prime Minister called upon them to do on that occasion? If, after three or four weeks of close consideration of the question, as the Prime Minister tells us, a conclusion was reached, surely as much learning was put into the matter then as can be brought to bear upon it by this committee. The war is not a new thing. Every phase and every condition of the war that exist to-day, except peace, for which we thank the Lord, was well to the fore on the 25th of March, 1918. Whether titles should be granted to men who fight, or to women who helped, or to anybody else who was engaged either here or in the Old Country in connection with the war—all that was certainly before the Government, and they decided with all that knowledge before them that the Order in Council which was read here to-night was the best and safest conclusion to reach. Surely there is no excuse now for reversing that decision and starting over again anew. For those reasons I think we should decide the question now, once and for all, and if this House will reach the conclusion that the Order in Council for which they voted last year was good enough, I do not understand how hon. gentlemen who voted for that Order in Council are going, in the absence of the Prime Minister, to tell him that he was wrong then, that they will not support that, but that they want another thing altogether. There is no finality to this matter at all. It is given a twist and a turn just to suit the exigencies of the occasion. That is about all I have to say on that particular phase of the subject; but in view of what I have read from the Prime Minister's speech, I think I should bring to the notice of wise, patriotic hon. gentlemen sitting on both sides of the House, particularly those supporting the Government and those who left their old friends, cut away from their old moorings on the high question of conscientious necessity and duty, as they thought, the weight which the Prime Minister attached to this situation. A few days before this motion he was returned from

the country by an overwhelming majority to fight the war to a finish; he was the selected champion of the Canadian people to fight this war. What weight does he attach to this question? There comes up in this House a trivial matter about titles—I say "trivial" advisedly, for it was trivial as compared with the great question of life and death of this war—and we find our friends who were honest and in earnest about this thing told by their leader: Away with your war, away with your catastrophe, away with your loyalty, if you do not come up to the scratch on this question of titles, I will throw you to the dogs and will have nothing further to do with you. That shows to me the hollow mockery of the business and that it was politics, first, last and all the time. And I want to hear the argument to the contrary in face of the declaration of the Prime Minister himself that if they did not come to the mark on this little business of titles, there was nothing further to it and he was relieved from all the vast and great responsibilities of the salvation of this country thrust into his hands by the Canadian people. And I should like to know from hon. gentlemen who are sitting behind him for no other purpose than to see that the mandate of the Canadian people in respect to the war was carried out, why they were ready to permit that mandate to be torn to shreds and thrown to the dogs for the mere purpose of carrying the Prime Minister's views in regard to titles into effect.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) spoke about unrest in this country, and the same matter was referred to by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). There is unrest in this country, but that unrest is not created by reason of titles. I am a poor man and a poor man's son. I am in touch with the poor people of this country, working men and all classes. I know their pulsations and heart-beats and the circumstances in their houses and families, and I know they are not concerned very much about titles. They do not lose any sleep over who is a knight or a baronet or a lord, but it does concern them that the flour is getting down to the bottom of the barrel; that the meat barrel is almost empty. It does concern them that their children's shoes are getting thin and worn, and that they cannot keep their children warm at night or in the day time; that they are not able to gather together enough of this world's goods to carry them along decently and comfortably.

There is another class of knights, another class of autocrats, they are after in this country, and that is the combines and the trusts who are taking the money and the very heart's blood of our people. Let me hope, Sir, that the eloquence and learning of my good friends from Kingston and Springfield will be directed along this channel. I hope that an opportunity will be given them to strike a blow at these autocrats who are bringing pain, penury and trouble to the homes of the people by reason of the title which they have to control this Government. Why, we had the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) the other day saying right before hon. gentlemen who sit on the Government benches that this Government is owned body and bones by the Baronet Sir Joseph Flavelle. Is that true or is it not? There are other chosen ones besides Sir Joseph Flavelle; he is not the only pebble on the beach. I repeat, it was said here openly by a supporter of the Government, that hon. gentlemen on the Government benches, with all their learning and all their ability, are nothing but a flock of sheep in a cart, with their legs tied, being driven to market by Sir Joseph Flavelle and other autocrats and plutocrats in this country. I invite my hon. friend from Kingston and my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to let their voices be heard along these lines. My hon. friend from Red Deer will find in Holy Writ severe condemnation of those who are starving the poor, and robbing the people, and putting heavy burdens on the workers, which they will not touch even with a finger. My hon. friend will find the sternest condemnation in Holy Writ of these practices, and nobody can apply it better than he. If this discussion does nothing more than to compel us to think of these things and to help us make this a truly democratic country, it will have done some good. Let us show our democracy by going to the homes of the poor, and seeing to it that there shall be an even distribution of the great wealth of this country. Let us help to relieve the suffering so that every man, woman and child in this country will know that this is a Parliament to which they can look with confidence for redress, and that there is a Government in this country which has their interests at heart. These are the things which come home to my mind and conscience much more than the question of titles.

Mr. G. W. ALLAN (South Winnipeg): I wish to add a very few words to the debate which has taken place to-night. First of all, I wish to say that I shall vote for the

amendment to the amendment. I put this proposition to the House, and I do not believe it can be honestly contraverted by any man inside or outside of the House. We in Canada owe to all those who have served in our military and naval forces a debt of gratitude which we shall never be able wholly to repay, and having those men in mind, it should be an honour and a distinction to be able to serve on the committee which has been suggested by the amendment to the amendment by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White)). I trust that the members of that committee will work most earnestly and faithfully in order to offer to this House their very best decision as to whether titles should be conferred on our naval and military forces. With regard to distinctions and decorations for those who have served in connection with the war in a civilian capacity, I will frankly say that I regard that service from an entirely different point of view. For the military and naval forces there is nothing too good that this country can accord in the way of distinctions or decorations, if this House believes they can be conferred with advantage. I believe, however, that no man who has not served in the military or naval forces in this war can feel for one moment that any act or accomplishment of his life is comparable for one solitary second to the accomplishment of the youngest youngster who has served in either of those forces. That is my feeling, and I feel it deep down. I doubt very much whether the bestowal of decorations in acknowledgement of civilian service will redound very much to the advantage of this country. With all the complex problems facing us as an aftermath of the war, and calling for solution, I think it would not tend to better the situation or to overcome our difficulties to confer distinctions or decorations on civilians. I believe there is a good deal in the widow's mite, and I think those who were well enough off to offer their services in a civilian capacity freely and without hope of reward are entitled to no more recognition than the thousands of working girls in this country who have given of their small wages to send parcels to our soldiers, and who, in order to do that, had to exercise the direst economy and practise the greatest self-sacrifice from the commencement of this war until victory was achieved.

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I regret very much that I find it necessary to say a few words in this debate. When the resolution on the Order Paper came before the House, I had no intention of taking part in the discussion, which I had assumed would resolve itself into the clear-cut question whether this House favoured or did not favour the granting of such titles as knighthoods in this country. I had hoped that there would be a vote on that simple question, and I had intended to vote with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). I by no means agree with either of these hon. gentlemen that this country is at all agitated over the question of titles. I have never heard in my own constituency, or in different parts of the country in which I have been, anything of the great agitation over the question which they and other hon. members would lead us to believe exists. I believe there are a great many bigger questions which the people are much more agitated about to-day. I do not think the people of this country care very much about that question at all, although if it came to a vote I believe they would overwhelmingly support the hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Springfield. I do not believe there is any real open agitation in connection with the question, but I must take issue with some of the statements contained in the letter from the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in which it was implied that a good many decorations should be bestowed in this country on civilians who have worked in Canada or in London in supporting the men at the front. I think that the most humble Tommy who has served in the line deserves far more in the way of decorations than any of those who have worked on the Patriotic Society or the Red Cross Society either in London or in Canada. Another opinion I wish to emphasize is that the mothers of the boys who died at the front —even women who did nothing else than supply those boys—deserve ten thousand times more the gratitude of the country, whether in titles or anything else, than the people who worked in Red Cross or patriotic societies. I do not for a moment belittle those who have rendered service in these societies, because I have every respect for them; but in my opinion the giving of titles to such people is responsible for whatever agitation there may be in the country and whatever adverse opinion that may exist in regard to the conferring of titles. Speaking for myself as a returned soldier, and not for any group of returned soldiers, I wish to raise another point, and it is this: I do not believe any titles should be

conferred—and when I say "titles," I mean for example, knighthoods, with the title "Sir"—any more to the naval or military forces than to civilians, because I do not believe we have any right to establish in Canada a military autocracy or aristocracy. I shall quote some of my words of last year on this question. Last year when the question came before the House I intended to vote as I intend to vote to-night, but the Prime Minister made a statement that if a vote were given against the conferring of titles he would resign. I then expressed the opinion that in the condition of world affairs that existed at the time the question was of too small importance to turn out any Government, and accordingly I voted with the Prime Minister. To-day I understand the Acting Prime Minister to say that the subject is not a party question. At any rate I shall vote against the appointment of a committee for the reason that I do not require any committee to instruct me on this question. I regret that I should have to take this position. I regret that the Government has found it necessary to make me take this position, and it is unfortunate that a question like this should be brought before the House, in my opinion, more or less unnecessarily at the present time. I think that a number of questions are unnecessarily introduced, and it is a matter for much regret that the House should be forced to divide on an issue which is not of paramount importance to the country. I feel it my duty, in view of the statement which I made last year and my sentiments in this matter, to vote against the Acting Prime Minister, but there are times when perforce we must take a stand, and, as my hon. friend from Red Deer said, "let the chips fall where they may." My position last year was stated in these words:—

> I wish to say that, generally speaking, I agree absolutely with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that not only hereditary titles but all knighthoods should be abolished in this country.
>
> x x x x
>
> I repeat that I believe that this Government was elected for the purpose of carrying out the Military Service Act and sending soldiers to the front. I do not believe that it is the duty of this Parliament, of men who are elected as I was with that specific purpose in view, to turn out this Government on such a question as this without due consideration. If after due consideration this question comes up again, if it comes up in the next Parliament, I am willing to say here to-night. that if the hon. member for Springfield moves this motion I shall be willing to support it at that time.
>
> x x x x
>
> There is one point I wish to make before I sit down, a point in regard to naval and military titles.
>
> I do not agree that there should be titles given only to naval and military men in this country. I agree absolutely with the Prime Minister in that. We should not make a military caste to stand over and above the other people of this country. While we are fighting to put down autocracy in Germany, we do not want to create a military aristocracy or autocracy in our own country. I do not believe that the military should be given titles any more than any other class. But I do believe that for deeds of valour the military should be given decorations.

That is where the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was somewhat confused in thought when he spoke of the Military Cross and the Victoria Cross. There is no resemblance between these distinctions and titles. I believe that Military Crosses and Victoria Crosses should be granted for deeds of bravery, and I may point out that while the Republic of France does not confer titles it gives such decorations as the Legion of Honour, which the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) wears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after quoting what I said last year, I do not see how I could consistently or honestly take any other position than to vote against the appointment of a committee. If the hon. member for Springfield and the hon. member for Kingston can take any other course, after introducing this motion on two different occasions and forcing men like myself to take the stand I am taking on the question, then I say they have more elasticity of mentality than I have.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, when this question was before the House last year I took the liberty to discuss it and I shall endeavour to avoid repeating the arguments which I then advanced. I rise merely to support the position taken by my hon. friend from Rainy River and Fort William (Mr. Manion). The resolution involves a declaration of principle, and certainly does not necessitate the consideration or report of a committee. As far as I can learn, a question is usually referred to a committee after the principle which is involved has been decided upon by the House, but when the whole question resolves itself into a declaration of principle I do not see why it should be referred to a committee at all. Are we or are we not in favour of the continuance of bestowing titles upon citizens of Canada? That is the whole question. I do not wish to employ harsh terms, but I think that this Parliament would stultify itself if it accepted the

amendment to the amendment proposed by the Acting Prime Minister to-night. Such an action would simply mean the postponing again of the settlement of a question which was before the House last year and upon which the opinion of the House was perfectly clear. Every one remembers, as has been stated to-night, that all the hon. members who spoke upon the question last year were emphatically opposed to titles, apart from the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and, I believe, the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell), so much so that the right hon. the Prime Minister was compelled to resort to what I think was a most arbitrary position to save an unpopular institution. The Prime Minister virtually said to Parliament: We are passing through the most critical period of the war; this Government has been elected to conduct the war; it has been elected on a policy which has as its object the winning of the war; but if this Parliament decides that the Government shall no longer have the right to bestow titles on its friends and on such citizens as it may deem fit, the war can take care of itself and I shall quit and go home.

That was the position taken by the Prime Minister last year, and it was on account of that position, an hon. gentleman stated, that his amendment was voted on and accepted by the House. Sir, since that took place public opinion has asserted itself in this country and in no mistakable manner. The people are utterly tired and sick of this title question. The Prime Minister last session, when moving his amendment to the amendment, as reported at page 2343 of Hansard, said:

> There is another consideration which I submit to the House and it is this: His Majesty's Government have to take into consideration, of course, the relation of this proposal not only to Canada but to all the Dominions of the Empire, and they have asked us, in a respectful and courteous way, that the whole subject be brought under discussion during the coming summer when certain of the Canadian ministers are to visit the United Kingdom. It seems to me that as the Order in Council has been passed and has been communicated to His Majesty's Government, the delay that would ensue between this session and the next session, when the matter might be taken up again, if desired, ought not to stand in the way of our acceding to that respectful request. I do not imagine that the public interest will suffer by any action taken before Parliament shall assemble again. The Government of this country will then be in a position to announce to Parliament the result of their conference with the Imperial authorities in respect to this subject. So, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson)—and I hope he will accept this suggestion—that the sub-amendment which I have proposed be accepted.

So the Prime Minister moved his amendment last year for the purpose of having another year to confer with the Imperial authorities at the then coming conference, and stated to this House that at this session the Government would come down with a definite policy upon the question. Instead of that being done, when the hon. member for Kingston again introduces his resolution on the very same subject, the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) moves another dilatory motion, and asks again to postpone the settlement and the decision of this question. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote now on the question. I have the greatest confidence in the hon. gentlemen whose names have been proposed as members of the committee, but I do not wish any of those gentlemen to make a finding or to form an opinion for me on a question of principle such as that which forms the subject of the present resolution.

Nobody has tried to defend the institution, although perhaps my hon. friends from Brantford and Red Deer went close to it. My hon. friend from Red Deer pointed to the fact that there are men in this country who got rich overnight, went to Britain, and then found their way to knighthood. Well, Sir, I think that no stronger indictment can be preferred against the whole institution than those very words. Honours which are bought are no honours at all, and we do not want them in this country of ours. The hon. gentleman also said that the nobility of England conducted itself splendidly during the great war. That is true, but so did the plain citizens of England, so did the workingmen of England, so did the democracy of England. I know something else: I read only recently in an important British review that it was a misfortune that when war broke out commissions in the army had been confined exclusively to the sons of the aristocracy, and that it took some time for the brains of the country to be called and trained to serve as officers in the army. My hon. friend from Brantford said that the word "democracy" was worked to death in this country. There are words which my hon. friend does not like. I remember that a few years ago—I think it was during the naval debate—my hon. friend said he was tired of the word "autonomy." Let me tell him that the words "autonomy" and "democracy" will be used quite a few times in this country again, and if he does not like them he had better change his mind and tolerate them at all events. Mr. Speaker I am going to vote against the amendment of the Acting Prime Minister.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I think it was the hon. member for Red Deer who said that if you were going to be radical you should start at the root of things. I do not know whether the people that I have the honour to represent in this House would come within that category or not, but one thing I do know, that they have been very consistent upon this matter. They have not let an opportunity slip, for the last few years, of passing resolutions upon this subject, and voting against not only hereditary titles, but titles in all forms. And as their representative, I feel that I would be very derelict in my duty if I did not express that opinion in this House. I am heartily in favour of the resolution as introduced by the hon. member for Kingston, and whilst I do not feel like going as far as the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) I feel that the Government has not treated me properly by putting me in the position that it has done in this matter. I believe that the members of this House should be left to decide this matter for themselves. As has been very well pointed out, it is really a matter of principle upon which every man should be able to make up his own mind.

The hon. member for Brantford made some comparisons which I think were altogether unfair in his application to members of this House of the term "honourable gentlemen." We all know, at any rate I think I know, that is a term which is merely used for convenience in the transaction of the business of the House, and as soon as we go outside the portals of this Chamber the term is used no longer. Reference has been made also to the titles conferred upon the officers of fraternal organizations, but I think the comparison was ill-advised. The people of my constituency are absolutely opposed to titles in any shape or form, and, as a member of this House, I intend to back them up as far as I can.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): I regret that I was prevented from being present at the earlier stages of this debate, and have only had the pleasure of hearing the last two or three speakers. It is quite conceivable that if I had had the pleasure of hearing the whole of the debate I should have reached a different conclusion. However, I am disposed to fall back upon the view which I ventured to express when this matter was before the House a year ago. The motion of the hon. member for Kingston has been repeatedly referred to to-night as if it were the same motion he made a year ago. That is not the case. When my hon. friend brought forward his motion last session, I had great pleasure in giving it my very cordial support. It dealt with hereditary titles, and upon that question I had no hesitation whatever in expressing an opinion. On the wider question of titles generally I frankly confessed that I had some hesitation in agreeing with the amendment moved at that time by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). I did feel that these titles had been rather freely distributed, and in that way there was an abuse of the system which had tended to make it very unpopular. But when you look back to the days when Macdonald, Cartier, Galt, and a few others, received titles, there was no condemnation of them in the community, as these titles were then granted but rarely and to men of undoubted distinction. If that had been the case in later years, I presume the conferring of titles would not have been as unpopular as it is to-day. I am hesitating a little in this matter. It will not break my heart if the ultimate decision is that all titles of the kind are to be abolished, and probably that will be the outcome; but if in the meantime the Government thinks that it can get any help from Parliament, that this is a matter for a committee, I have no objection to letting it make the trial, although I have not much faith in it. I would have some hesitation in voting for the resolution of my hon. friend from Kingston, but I am quite content to let the Government make a trial of its committee, although I do not expect it to make much out of that course.

Mr. D. SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): The question of titles is one that appears to engage the attention of this House to the exclusion of a great many other matters of very urgent importance. I thought a year ago when the question was under discussion that we were possibly devoting too much attention to what was a question of very minor importance compared with the urgent questions then before the House; and although the war has ended I believe that the reconstruction period with which we are confronted demands not only our closest, but almost our exclusive attention, and that we could well afford to leave matters such as this to some time in the future without any great injustice to the country. I do not mean that I approve of the conferring of titles upon people in this country. There have been times when titles were consider-

ed a great honour and the recipients were deserving of them, but I agree with the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) that titles have been conferred in a manner which has taken away from them any prestige which they might at one time have had, and that we do not regard them to-day in the light in which they were intended to be regarded, or would be regarded if they were properly conferred. I think that the amendment of the Acting Prime Minister to refer this to a committee to report upon will be much more satisfactory than attempting to dispose of it here. I must again repeat that I believe we are devoting altogether too much attention to matters of minor importance when other matters of urgent public importance are demanding our attention.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With the consent of the House I should like to substitute for my amendment, in order to improve the phraseology, the following:

That the subject matters of the said motion and amendment together with the questions of conferring honours, titular distinctions and decorations upon the subjects of His Majesty ordinarily resident in Canada, including those who have performed overseas, in Canada or elsewhere, naval, military or civilian services in connection with the war be referred for consideration and report to a Special Committee consisting of the following members: Messrs. Nickle, Green, Peck, Buchanan, Clark (Red Deer), Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Cowan, Richardson, Whidden, Nesbitt, Middlebro, Pardee, Cockshutt, Murphy, McCoig, Ross, Ames, McMaster, Lemieux, Robb, Fielding, Elkin, Copp, McCurdy, Sinclair (Guysborough).

Mr. SPEAKER: This can only be put with the unanimous consent of the House. I would direct attention also to the fact that under Rule 11 a committee consisting of more than fifteen members can only be appointed with the unanimous consent of the House. The question is on the amendment to——

Mr. NICKLE: Before the debate is closed I would like to exercise my privilege——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen at a very peculiar stage of the proceedings.

Mr. NICKLE: I endeavoured to rise but I did not catch your eye, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not see the hon. member. I will accept his statement that he purposed to rise.

Mr. NICKLE: What I want to say before this debate is closed will be very brief. As has been said by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), the resolution I introduced this afternoon differs from the resolution I introduced last year in this respect, that last year's resolution was aimed at hereditary titles, while the resolution of this afternoon is aimed at titular distinctions. I do not intend at this late hour to go fully into the various arguments that have been advanced both for and against the resolution and the amendments, but I do not think I should allow the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to pass entirely unnoticed. One is always charmed to hear him, he has a wealth of comparisons, a vigour of diction, and a charm of style peculiarly his own. But sometimes in the swing of his argument, it seems to me, that he is not entirely consistent. To-night, if I judged his argument correctly—and I endeavoured to give due weight to everything he said—it seemed to me he failed to make the distinction that exists between officiary appellations—if I may use two very large words—and titular distinctions of an honorary character. He elaborated and laboured the point that one was inconsistent in contending for the abolition of titular distinctions provided one were prepared to admit that such terms as "senator," "minister" and "president" should be used.

I am utterly at a loss, Sir, to understand how we can express ourselves in the ordinary parlance of every day life unless we use some words to describe the objects about which we intend to talk. I do not see how you can describe the presiding officer of an assembly unless you call him "president". I cannot see very well how you can make a distinction between male and female, man and woman, unless at times you use the words "Mr." or "Mrs.". I am also at a loss to understand how you are to make the distinction between the commoner and the senator unless you use the ordinary parlance of every day life to describe those who happen to sit in this assembly or those who sit in the assembly across the way.

The member for Red Deer waxed eloquent—and probably rightly so—when he described the magnificent service which those who occupied positions of importance in England had rendered in this great war. He described in glowing terms the service rendered by the sons of those who belonged to a long hereditary line, and for a moment I wondered whether he was forgetting the men in the trenches, because I know with what favour he views the services these men have rendered. But in a moment his natural impulses overcame his argument,

and he paid just as glowing a tribute to the simple men in the trenches as he paid to those who came from the aristocratic homes of Britain. All of which only demonstrates that valour is not confined to any particular group of men. When the call of country is heard, brave men, no matter what their birth, come from cottage or from castle and render efficient service to the State in a great time of need.

The member for Red Deer said that I said labour unrest and labour trouble were traceable to titles. I do not think I used any such expression this afternoon. I said—and I quoted from the speech of Lord Shaughnessy—that there was labour unrest in this country, but I did not say that the question of titles was that

11 p.m. which was disturbing labour. I said that labour was dissatisfied in respect of the status that it occupied in this country and that it was a pity that at a time like this we should accentuate that unrest by the establishment or the recognition, or the granting, of fresh titular distinction.

I am not going to follow the member for Brantford (Mr. W. F. Cockshutt). He spoke of the men at the front winning titles in the trenches. The men at the front do not win titles in the trenches; they win distinction in the trenches for which sometimes titles are given. The member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), in referring to my motion as it appears on the Order Paper, stated that he was against it because I had made two exceptions; that is, that a title might be granted to persons in the military or naval services of Canada or to persons engaged in the administration of justice of the Dominion. With all due respect for the ability and academic knowledge of the member for West Peterborough, may I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that the hon. gentleman has not correctly read my resolution. What my resolution said, in effect, was that no more titular distinction should be granted, it being always understood "that this humble prayer has no reference to professional or vocational appellations conferred in respect to commissions issued by Your Majesty to persons in military or naval service of Canada or to persons engaged in the administration of justice in the Dominion." That is, when a commission was issued by His Majesty that carried with it a professional or vocational appellation, that professional or vocational appellation should be enjoyed by the person to whom the commission was issued, but not that a titular honorary distinction should be so enjoyed.

I now come to a question that has caused me some consideration to-night. The question with which I am confronted is this: Am I to vote for the amendment to the amendment as moved by the Acting Prime Minister, or am I to stand firm, if I may use the expression, and vote for my resolution? Now, I want to be perfectly frank with this House. Last year, when this question came to a crisis, late in the evening, after a bitter yet brilliant debate in which many members took part, I voted against the amendment of the Prime Minister because I did not think that this question should be made at that time a want of confidence motion. I thought it was a question on which the House should reach its own conclusion, each man thinking for himself; I therefore stood to my guns and voted for the amendment proposed by the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). What I want is results, not notoriety. I am absolutely sincere in what I am urging this House to do and in advocating the reform which I want this country to adopt. I am not playing politics; I am not looking for recognition by way of notoriety in this quarter or in that. I realize that difficulties have to be met, obstacles have to be overcome. I realize, as I said this afternoon, that this is an involved and confusing subject. The Acting Prime Minister made to me this afternoon what I consider an eminently fair, a just and a judicial offer; and I am going to accept his proposal in exactly the same spirit as he offered it to me, to this House and to the country. He said that the Government had no desire to shelve this question. He said: We have held up honours that might have been granted; honours have been granted in all parts of the British Empire except Canada; we realize the difficulty of the situation and we want the deliberate judgment of the House on the question. Had the Acting Prime Minister submitted to this House a blanket resolution without naming a committee, I doubt very much whether I would have voted for it. But he has been honest with me, and I am going to be quite as frank with him. On the committee named by the Acting Prime Minister are representatives of all shades of thought, all shades of opinion, from the radical to the Conservative in this House. He says that the Committee is to meet promptly and is to prepare a report, and that that report is to be considered in this House this session.

If I and those who see eye to eye with me on this subject cannot convince as fair a committee as the Acting Prime Minister has suggested of the merits of the subject that we have been debating to-day and that we debated last session, then I say that we are not entitled to win, because if any contention in a matter of public interest cannot win on its merits, cannot win on the arguments that are advanced in favour of it, it should not win at all. I believe that there is a preponderance of opinion from one end of this country to the other in favour of the resolution that I have propounded this afternoon. Such confidence have I in public opinion; such confidence have I in the merits of the matter which I have introduced to this House for consideration, that I am going to vote for the committee proposed by the Acting Prime Minister. I believe that that committee will give honest and thorough consideration to the broad questions that have been relegated to it for consideration—broader questions by far than have been embraced in my resolution—and that we shall get out of the way, once and, I hope, for all time, questions that have caused, are causing, and will cause unless finally settled, unrest and disquietude in Canada.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment of Sir Thomas White, which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Allan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Andrews,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Calder,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Davis,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Rich.),
Elkin,
Fielding,
Fraser,
Fulton,
Glass,
Guthrie,
Harrison,
Hay,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Johnston,
Keefer,
Loggie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McIsaac,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Morphy,
Munson,
Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Nicholson (Algoma),
Nickle,
Reid (Grenville),
Richardson,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sexsmith,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Yukon),
Tweedie,
Wallace,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon).—71.

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,
Béland,
Boivin,
Boyer,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
Copp,
Crowe,
Cruise,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis,
Deslauriers,
Devlin,
Duff,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Foster (York),
Fournier,
Fripp,
Gauthier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Harold,
Hunt,
Kennedy,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (St. James),
Leduc,
Leger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
McGibbon (Argenteuil),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Manion,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Reid (Mackenzie),
Ross,
Savard,
Seguin,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Vien.—64.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Sifton,
Doherty,
Kemp, Sir Edward,
Foster, Sir George,
Borden, Sir Robert,
Blair,
Stevens,
MacNutt,
Argue,
Burnham,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Griesbach,
Marshall,
Blake,
Cowan,
Knox,
Lang,
Maharg,
Myers,
Wright,
McGregor,
Spinney,
Middlebro,
Green,
Verville,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
McCrea,
Ethier,
Sinclair (Guysborough),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Murphy,
Chisholm,
Euler,
DuTremblay,
Lavigueur,
McCoig,
Cardin,
Brouillard,
Desaulniers,
Jacobs,
Baldwin,
Bourassa,
Gladu,
Pacaud,
Demers,
Robb.
White, Alta.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I was paired with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert

Borden). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. Sixty-four members have just voted against the appointment of a special committee of 15. I raise a point of order whether this Committee can sit or not, because Rule 11 of the House says:

> No special committee may, without leave of the House, consist of more than fifteen members—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in a position to rule now, if the hon. member will only permit me. I drew the attention of the House to that rule and pointed out that the motion of the Acting Prime Minister could only be put by unanimous consent, and that consent was given when the motion was first put.

Mr. POWER: It was certainly not given by unanimous consent, when 64 members voted against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must direct the attention of the hon. member to the fact that I especially drew the attention of the House to Rule 11 and stated that a special committee of more than 15 members could not be appointed except by unanimous consent. That was done before the motion was put in the first instance. The hon. member, to be in order, should have raised the point of order prior to the time the motion was put in the House. He is not in order now.

Mr. POWER: I wish to raise another point of order. Rule 11 says further:

> No member who declares or decides against the principle or substance of a Bill, resolution, or matter to be committed, can be nominated of such committee.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson), and two or three others who have already decided, are nominated of this committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to the second point of order raised by the hon. member, I am in the judgment of the House; but in my opinion the rule does not apply here, because the subject of the resolution and also that of the amendment have not been determined upon. They are both referred to a special committee of the House for consideration, and that is an entirely different matter from a committee being appointed to consider a resolution as to the principle of which a vote has been given by any hon. member. Therefore, in my judgment, the rule does not apply in this respect at all, and I so rule.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, April 15, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

DAYLIGHT SAVING—MR. ETHIER'S VOTE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval—Two Mountains): Mr. Speaker, on March 27, the House divided on an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Mackie) on the question of daylight saving. The vote was taken as appears on page 968 of Hansard, but my vote is not recorded. I voted "nay" on the amendment to the amendment and would ask that the omission be rectified.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall inquire into the matter and have the necessary correction made.

CARDINAL MERCIER'S VISIT TO AMERICA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I noticed in the press this morning that a very distinguished personage, His Eminence Cardinal Mercier of Belgium who played a noble part in the war is coming to America soon. The other day the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of Justice paid their respects to His Eminence in his episcopal city. I am informed that on his visit to America Cardinal Mercier will be invited to visit Canada, and perhaps the Acting Prime Minister will inform the House if an official invitation has been extended to His Eminence.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not to my knowledge. My hon. friend's statement is the first intimation I have had of the proposed visit.

LABOUR STRIKE IN MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. DESLAURIERS (St. Mary): Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Labour (Hon. A. K. Maclean) to a very serious situation which exists in the city of

Montreal. The employees of the Montreal Light, Heat & Power Company, some thousands of men, are on strike, and the situation of the five hundred thousand people who compose the population of Montreal will be extremely critical if this strike continues, and if they are unable to obtain light, heat and power.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will be quite in order in asking a question but not in reading a statement.

Mr. DESLAURIERS: Well, will the minister be kind enough to inform me whether an arbitration tribunal has been appointed to deal with the matter and, if so, with what result? Is it a fact that the company have refused to recognize the employees' union, and can any steps be taken by the Government to remedy this deplorable state of affairs?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not been able to catch the remarks of the hon. member and cannot therefore undertake to answer him immediately. The question will appear in Hansard to-morrow and at the first opportunity I shall answer him fully.

CANADIANS IN THE IMPERIAL NAVY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Yesterday the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) inquired of the Acting Prime Minister if any arrangements were being made with the British Admiralty for leave for men serving in the navy. In reply I may say that the British Admiralty have issued instructions that officers and men in the Imperial Navy from the Dominions may, as their services can be spared, be granted leave to visit their homes after two years of service.

DELIVERY OF MAILS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: The leader of the Opposition yesterday made inquiry in reference to an alleged failure to deliver mail to a man named John G. Gunning, and read a telegram in connection with the matter. I have inquired into the matter and it would appear that my hon. friend's correspondent has a somewhat vivid imagination. He is in correspondence with public men all over the country and if he does not get letters from those from whom he expects to receive them he files complaints in the Post Office. A great many of such complaints have been filed and investigated, and the Post Office authorities think that if the correspondent would turn his attention to some other branch of the Service—

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): The only explanation I can give is that the man's name is "Gunning."

DR. BRUCE'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): May I ask when the second report of Dr. Bruce may be expected by the House?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I personally have no knowledge of any second report of Dr. Bruce. It has never come before me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think the hon. member refers to the reply of Dr. Bruce to the Baptie report.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My recollection is that the Prime Minister, in answer to a question in the session of 1917, stated that as the report in question was not an official one it would not be brought down. I am merely speaking from recollection.

SUPPLY.

MILITARY MANAGEMENT OVERSEAS—THE ALLEGATIONS BY BRIGADIER-GENERAL SMART, COLONEL PRATT, COLONEL PRICE.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister), that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply I wish to refer to some matters which have engrossed the attention of the public of late. In rising I must say I am not casting any reflections on the administration of the Militia Department.

I cannot forget that my hon. friend took office when the conditions to which I intend to allude briefly this afternoon were in existence. I would certainly impugn his administration if, after the disclosures that have been made of late and which I intend to re-echo this afternoon on the floor of this House, he did not think it proper to take the necessary action in order to probe the whole matter to the bottom. My object this afternoon is to elicit information, first, and then having shown the conditions that exist, and have existed of late in connection with the administration of the Department of Militia and Defence overseas, to ask for an investigation to be held at the earliest moment. The country is entitled

to know whether or not the charges which have been made of late are true. It is not a good answer to say that the war is over and that bygones should be bygones. It is true that the war is over, but if conditions continue to exist until complete demobilization has taken place, we have a right to ask the Government to put an end to the state of things which has been denounced. It is not a good answer to say: The war is over; therefore we must not investigate. At the time the war was being carried on the only answer the Government had to our criticism was that it was not fair to bring charges whilst the war was being carried on. From whichever angle you look at this question, certainly, the Government must see to it that these charges are probed to the bottom.

The effort of Canada during the war has been simply marvellous. The total enlistments have been, according to the official report which I hold in my hand, 595,441 men, and the total casualties, died of wounds, died of disease, wounded, prisoners of war, 218,433. The loans made by the Canadian people to the Government amount to the fabulous sum of $1,436,000,000; or in other words, $192 per capita of the population of the Dominion. The net debt of Canada, chiefly as a result of the war, amounted, on the 30th November, 1918, to $1,307,449,661. The proceeds of taxation during the last fiscal year amounted, in round figures, to $76,000,000. So, from this cursory reference, you have an idea of the magnitude of the effort on the part of Canada in connection with the war. This has been accomplished with a population of less than 8,000,000.

By all means, our country is entitled to the fullest information as regards the conduct of the war. Although the war has been happily ended, there have been fatal errors in connection with the demobilization plan adopted by the Government, which errors, I submit, must be avoided in the future. Our returned soldiers constitute a national asset of the first importance, and therefore their grievances cannot be disregarded with a wave of the hand. Besides, the honour of Canada is at stake. The other day my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) drew the attention of my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) to the charges which have been made by a returned officer of very high rank—I refer to Brigadier General Smart—and when he drew the attention of the Acting Prime Minister to the very serious charges made by that gallant officer, my hon. friend, I regret to say, did not give the matter the attention that he should have given to it. He simply gave a denial in toto of all the charges which had been made by a responsible and gallant officer who had served the Empire and the King since the beginning of the war overseas. Now, Sir, the matter cannot be hushed up; the bald, naked truth must be told. There is, I am sorry to say, dissatisfaction in every province of this Dominion, not excepting the good province of Ontario, against the administration of the Department of Militia and Defence, bar always what I said a moment ago that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence came late into the present Administration and found conditions existing for the creation of which he was not responsible. But there is general dissatisfaction. We can hardly meet a soldier, or an officer back from the trenches, or from the camps in England, who has not his tale of woe to repeat.

The gentlemen who have become very prominent of late in their denunciation of the administration of the Department of Militia and Defence overseas are very well known. I am glad to be able to refer to the evidence of General Smart, of Colonel Pratt and of Colonel Price not as constituting biased, ex parte evidence but as the evidence of men holding high and responsible positions in the Canadian army besides being prominent members of the Conservative party and supporters of the Union Government. Of course, you cannot expect that petty officers will dare speak on this question. They are afraid to think even, but General Smart and Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price are not afraid to speak and speak boldly.

Since this cloudburst, the press which supports the present Administration has been very vociferous in asking for a thorough investigation. I shall not quote extensively from that press, but I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, if I take what I consider the most influential newspaper in the great province of Ontario—I refer to the Toronto Globe, which has given the present Government very faithful support—and quote from an editorial which appeared in its issue of April 3rd. This editorial, which is entitled "Investigate General Smart's Charges," was published a few days after the denial made by the Acting Prime Minister, when his attention was called to the Smart charges by my hon. friend the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy). I will quote a couple of paragraphs:—

Thousands of people in Canada—

Not a few members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition.

—Thousands of people in Canada are dissatisfied with Sir Thomas White's rather offhand manner of dealing with the charges made by Brigadier-General Smart, a member of the Quebec Legislature, in which he alleged inefficiency and neglect on the part of the administration of Canadian Medical Services in England, and inefficiency and favoritism on the part of the overseas administration generally. There has long been a good deal of anxiety and uneasiness among Canadians over these questions, particularly in view of the unsatisfactory method of dealing with the report of Colonel Bruce. It is not surprising to find General Smart returning to the attack and using emphatic language in the repetition of some of his allegations, nor is there much room for doubting that the public generally feels that an inquiry is in order; but the partial excuse that his charges deal with the condition existing in England in 1916—

Now, mark this: General Smart mentions reports and occurrences of a later date, and I shall draw the attention of the Acting Prime Minister to them. Among those is the report of Lieut.-Colonel J. S. Jenkins, submitted to the Overseas Minister of Militia in November, 1918. The Globe concludes its article in the following words:—

The country is entitled to the truth, good or bad, and the Government ought not to be afraid to probe for it, no matter who may be hurt in the operation. If the charges are shown to be without foundation, all Canadians will be happy; meanwhile they are suspicious and uneasy.

The Globe is an influential organ friendly to the present Union Government, and it states positively that thousands of people are suspicious, uneasy and dissatisfied with the offhand answer given by my hon. friend the Acting Premier. I remember that during the early part of the present session the member for Russell called the attention of the Minister of Militia to the existence of the report of Lieut.-Colonel Jenkins, and the hon. minister disclaimed any knowledge of that report. I have not seen that report, but I will convey to him the information which I have in regard to it, so that he may take the necessary steps to make sure that that report will be tabled during the present session, in order that the Canadian Parliament,—which constitutes after all, as in England, the voice of the nation,—may know how the Department of Militia overseas has been administered. I am informed that Colonel Jenkins was asked by the Minister of Militia overseas—just as Colonel Bruce was asked—to investigate the financial administration of the Canadian Medical Service in England, and that he reported, after a very close investigation, a leakage of Government funds to the amount of $10,000,000. I have that information, Mr. Speaker, on thoroughly reliable authority. My hon. friend says that he has no knowledge of the existence of that report. That report does exist, if I am well informed, and is in the hands of the present Minister of Militia overseas, Sir Edward Kemp. I do not know when he intends to sail for Canada, but now that all the German submarines have been surrendered to England I hope it will not be stated as a reason for withholding that report that it cannot be sent to Canada lest it should become lost through submarine activity. It is the duty of the overseas Minister of Militia, to table that report during the present session so that we may have full knowledge of the conditions of things overseas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming to the charges made by General Smart. General Smart. I need not say, is a well known citizen of Westmount, and represents that constituency in the Legislature of Quebec. He enlisted during the early days of the great war; he rallied to the colours the yeomanry of Westmount and Montreal, and crossed the ocean in the early fall of 1914, remaining overseas until quite recently. He served his King and country faithfully and gallantly.

Brigadier-General Smart said the other day that, now that the war was over, he felt it his duty to tell the people of Canada that the moving factors in the whole administration of the medical service branch of the Canadian army in England were patronage. influence and pull. He gave facts and data concerning the evil treatment and abuse of our sick and wounded soldiers, and he traced all these troubles, all this scandalous state of affairs, to the evil influence of what is called Argyll House, and especially to the interference of Sir George Perley, the High Commissioner.

Let me quote briefly what General Smart says about the medical service in England.

Mr. PECK: Did Brigadier-General Smart specify the medical service in England? It was not so reported in the papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The medical service in connection with the Canadian army, mostly in England.

Mr. PECK: I did not see that report in the papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will read what General Smart said, and my hon. friend may draw his own conclusions. He said:

I feel it is up to me to tell the people of Canada how the Canadian Medical Service blundered overseas; how patronage, influence, pull, went to paralyse the good work of the medical services.

I perfectly know who is responsible for this state of things; official Ottawa knows it too; Sir Robert Borden does not ignore it, but no one dares tell. And that is why I feel it is up to me to show all the evil that has been done, to show the abuse, the ill-treatment our wounded and sick received overseas at the hands of the improperly managed medical service. The whole trouble is to be traced to Argyll House.

And I may add that personally, after seeing all that I have seen, I have not the slightest confidence in those who administer the affairs in England.

I pass over the uncomplimentary references he makes to Sir George Perley; also —because this should come up later—what he says about the death of General Steele. He goes on to say:

Gentlemen, I tell you, without fear of impartial contradiction, that the medical service overseas was directed in an insensible and neglected way. Our Canadian wounded were afforded a medical service that was absolutely inadequate, and I have seen instances where medical officers, ridiculously inapt to care for the sick and wounded, were put in charge of important hospital units. I have pitied the poor soldiers that were made to travel through the British Isles to far-off hospitals when they passed close to the unit that should have received them for their particular treatment.

So it would appear that this happened in England. I quote further:

He stated instances where men medically found unfit in Canada, were, however, sent to England. These men cause hard work and worry to the officers overseas,. went through hardships, and are now coming back a charge to the country, for they will be getting pay pension all at the expense of the country.

Then General Smart told of what he saw in his own military district of Shorncliffe, which again justifies my saying that his words have special reference to what happened in England. (Reading):

He said he could not criticise the medical officers and nurses. They were up to what he had expected from them, but, he says, I feel I must and do criticize the headquarters of management of this service.

General Smart said that each Canadian hospital had its full staff of competent doctors and nurses, but outside of these hospitals, there had been organized Voluntary Aid Detachments, made up of people of good-will, but who knew little or nothing of medical care, and he stated instances where soldiers were left for definite treatment in these Voluntary Aid Detachments while cots were empty in the regular hospitals.

He stated that, in cases he knew of, men—

This is a very serious accusation. (Reading):

He stated that in cases he knew of, men had lost the use of their eyes because of this practice. When such cases reached the proper hospitals, said Generol Smart, it was too late for treatment to have any effect.

General Smart then mentioned cases where patronage placed in responsible posts men who had not even diplomas of medical studies, while competent men without the "pull" were kept in England or in posts where their science and experience could not be used to succour our wounded and sick.

Talking of the riot, General Smart said that the Rhyl outbreak was not the first of this kind; there had been outbreaks previously at Shorncliffe, Witley, Bramshott, and even at Rhyl before.

This is the gist of the charges made by Brigadier-General Smart. They are not new, Mr. Speaker, in this House. During the sessions of 1916 rumours came to us that the medical service overseas had been impaired through the intrusion of outside influence. The member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) denounced that intrusion and the fussiness of certain people in the Old Country. The Government appointed Colonel Bruce to investigate. I have not the honour of knowing Colonel Bruce personally, but I know from some medical friends that he enjoys the highest reputation in the part of the country in which he lives; indeed, he is known as one of the best surgeons in Canada. The Government, then, appointed Colonel Bruce to investigate the conditions said to exist in connection with the medical service in England. His report created quite a sensation. I have here the conclusions of that report, divided into twenty-three parts, each of which is a charge against the administration of the medical service in England. Let me **refer briefly to those** conclusions. It was in September, 1916, that Dr. Bruce was deputed by the then Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) to conduct this investigation. His report says:

1. Many soldiers are arriving in England from Canada medically unfit, who should never have been enlisted.

2. The system of disposing of casualties from the front to Imperial hospitals in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, is extremely unsatisfactory.

3. The present method of having Canadian hospitals scattered over a large area is very objectionable.

4. There is unnecessary detention in hospitals. There has been no medical inspection by the Canadian Medical Service of Canadian soldiers in Imperial hospitals, and there has been no efficient medical inspection of Canadian hospitals, in consequence of which Canadian soldiers are retained in hospitals in Great Britain, many of whom would have been returned to duty and others should have been returned to Canada, where they could have been more economically and efficiently treated. The lack of system permits of the aimless moving of patients from hospital to hospital.

5. The use by the Canadian service of Voluntary Aid Hospitals is very undesirable as they are inefficient, expensive and unsatisfactory.

6. The administration of the group of 57 Voluntary Aid Hospitals under Shorncliffe Military Hospital by the Canadian Medical Service is unsatisfactory and expensive.

7. The present method of operating, jointly with the Red Cross, certain hospitals built and equipped by them is unsatisfactory. Such dual control is undesirable.

8. Impropriety of detailing Canadian Army Medical Corps personnel to Imperial hospitals and still retaining them on Canadian pay-roll.

9. Unsatisfactory situation at Shorncliffe owing to our Canadian A.D.M.S. acting in a similar capacity over a large area for the Imperial authorities.

10. No attempt has been made to restrict surgical operations which produce no increased military efficiency.

11. The installation of an expensive plant at Ramsgate was inadvisable, as a large number of cases treated there should be sent to Canada for treatment.

12. The establishment at Buxton of a special hospital for the treatment of rheumatics which is ill-advised as the majority of rheumatics will not be fit again for active service and could be better and more cheaply treated in Canada.

13. The present system of handling Canadian venereal patients is very strongly condemned.

14. The method of handling infectious diseases is most unsatisfactory.

15. Medical Boards which regulate the classification of casualties when convalescent have not been adequately provided for.

16. Satisfactory records regarding individual casualties are not available.

17. The exceedingly important question of pensions, which will involve the expenditure of large sums of money by Canada annually has been neglected by the Canadian Medical Service.

18. Lack of co-ordination in the Canadian Medical Service between Canada, England and the front.

19. The medical personnel is not being used to the best advantage.

20. The policy of the department has been opposed to the use of experienced medical and surgical consulting specialists.

21. Discontent concerning promotions, especially in regard to regimental medical officers serving at the front.

22. The Canadian Army Medical Corps training school in England has never been properly organized, although of the greatest importance to the Canadian Medical Service.

23. In the operation of the Medical Service sufficient regard has not been paid to economy in management.

Such are very briefly the conclusions of the report made by Colonel Bruce at the request of the Government. That information was handed to the Government, and Sir George Perley, who was then Acting Minister of Militia overseas, found the report so severe against the Government of which he was a member that he thought, by appointing another commission, the Government might, perhaps evade the responsibility which they bore. As if Dr. Bruce had not been an authority on such matters—and besides he was surrounded by some of the ablest men—another commissioner, Sir William Babtie, an Imperial officer who had seen service in Mesopotamia, was appointed with other commissioners, the object of the new commission being to investigate Dr. Bruce's commission—a most ridiculous state of affairs. Sir William Babtie, however, reported on the whole matter, and, strange to say, he, biased as he was, had to admit that 18 out of the 23 charges made by Dr. Bruce were found to be true; but practically nothing was done. What do we find? We find that the Government, or, rather, Sir George Perley, instead of standing by a Canadian officer appointed by the Government who had fearlessly done his duty by the Canadian army, practically dismisses Dr. Bruce and gets him another appointment in France through the Imperial Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. member pardon me. He did not "practically" dismiss Dr. Bruce; he actually dismissed him. And he did not get Dr. Bruce a position in France; Dr. Bruce got it independently of him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I accept the correction. Sir George Perley, according to a gentleman who is in a position to know, because he was our Minister of Militia and Defence long enough and because he did enough for the 1st Contingent, actually dismissed Dr. Bruce, and Dr. Bruce was sent to France to take charge of two hospitals, but I think in France he was an officer under Imperial control.

This question came before the House on a previous occasion, and I regret the answer given by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). When reference is made to the Bruce and Babtie reports my hon. friend conveys to the House and the public the impression that the report has been tabled and distributed. What are the facts? I was a member of the House in 1917, and I followed the question pretty closely, as did the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), and also my desk-mate, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

The question of Dr. Bruce's report came before the House, not on one or two or three but on at least ten different occasions, I think, and I remember that the Government, after parrying for quite a while, finally said that forty copies of Dr. Bruce's report had been received from the other side. I remember seeing a copy of that report, as well as a copy of Sir William Babtie's report and the interim report of General Jones. But strange to say, you cannot find a copy of the Bruce report in the House to-day. It is impossible to obtain a copy of it at the Distribution office. The report was tabled in the House, but the Clerk of the House, the late Dr. Flint, by whose orders I know not, recalled the copies

which had been printed, and we never saw the report again. Mr. Speaker, that report was not complete and almost every day in the House the then member for Pictou, Mr. Macdonald, the then leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and my desk mate at that time, Hon. Mr. Pugsley, insisted that the reply of Colonel Bruce be tabled with the Babtie report, but the Government evaded giving an answer for a few months until the Prime Minister was about to leave for England, and then he gave us to understand that the reply would not be tabled or made public. The reply has not been made public since, and for good cause. I am afraid that if that reply was made public, it would be found to contain the most severe indictment of the Government's administration of the medical services overseas. I appeal to the Acting Prime Minister to let the truth be known. The war is over, and let the guilty parties, if there are guilty parties, be punished. Let the Acting Prime Minister come boldly before the House, and in justice to both the living and the dead make public the reply which was made by Colonel Bruce. But I am afraid that my hon. friend, as he de-defended in 1916 Sir William Babtie, who is far from having in England the reputation Colonel Bruce enjoys in Canada, against the charges of Colonel Bruce, whom my hon. friend knows well, and as he sprang to the defence the other day, when reference was made to the charges made by Brigadier-General Smart—I am afraid he will continue to deny the slashing allegations made by that gallant officer. Well Sir, the challenge of the Acting Prime Minister the other day, for it was nothing less than a challenge, has been taken up by General Smart in a public letter addressed to the Ottawa Citizen on the 1st of April last—a fitting day. Let me read part of that letter:

> With reference to my statements in the Quebec legislature on the 14th inst., charging inefficiency and neglect on the part of the administration of Canadian Medical Services in England and also inefficiency and favouritism on the part of the Overseas Administration generally, be good enough to allow me space to reply to the shifty and evasive denial given to my charges by Sir Thomas White in the House of Commons.

Then he quotes the answer given in the House by the Acting Prime Minister, and rejoins:

> What in the name of fairness and honour does Sir Thomas White mean by telling the House of Commons that my charges "refer to a condition which existed in England in 1916 when Colonel Bruce was there"? He knows, as others who are helping Sir George Perley and Sir Edward Kemp to protect those responsible for the shocking administration of the Canadian Medical Services know, that the "conditions which existed in England in 1916 when Colonel Bruce was there" were conditions produced by the notorious inefficiency of those at the head of the Canadian Medical Services previous to that year.
>
> Despite the evidence of their utter unfittedness, fearlessly exposed by Colonel Bruce in his capacity as an investigating officer of the Canadian Government, at that time, they have continued to enjoy the favour of certain members of the Government and the coterie in London, and the power until an aroused press and public opinion ended their activities, to produce irreparable damage at home. "The condition that existed in England in 1916" continued to exist in 1917, because the Government shut off the searchlight which Colonel Bruce had directed toward its medical administration of the war, and which condition it is still endeavouring to obscure.
>
> As was the obvious conclusion of any honest interpretation of my speech, the conditions of which I complained existed previous to 1916, and Colonel Bruce had unfavourably reported upon them. Colonel Bruce recommended amongst other things that the system of scattering our wounded throughout the various hospitals in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales be abolished, but instead of accepting Colonel Bruce's recommendations, a commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir Wm. Babtie, which, as was known it would do, reported against all, or practically all, of Colonel Bruce's recommendations. As a part of the programme Colonel Bruce was relieved of his appointment in a manner which reflects little credit on Sir George Perley, and it is the general impression that the Babtie commission was appointed to counteract the effects produced by Colonel Bruce's disclosure.
>
> I further stated that since that time practically all of Colonel Bruce's recommendations have been put into effect (notwithstanding their condemnation by the Babtie commission) with the exception of the recommendation against scattering Canadian wounded men all over the British Isles, which was the pet scheme of Sir George Perley, and which is still in effect. I cited two specific cases, one occurring in a London hospital while I was in London, in the month of February of this year. How then can Sir Thomas White justify his statement, that that existed in 1916 "when Colonel Bruce was there," a statement that could only be construed into meaning that Colonel Bruce was the responsible party? That answer is wholly unworthy of a man in the position that Sir Thomas White occupies.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must point out to the hon. member that it is not competent for him to read any statement emanating from a man outside of this House controverting or having reference to a statement made by any hon. member. Much less is it competent for him to read anything from such a source in the way of criticism or censure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I shall quote only such parts as I can without violating the rule. To continue:

> Perhaps the most iniquitous phase of the C.A.M.C. scandal is the fact that though the

overseas ministry was compelled, in deference to public sentiment, to adopt many of the reforms advocated by Col. Bruce, it was resolved to punish the investigators who had revealed the abuses of the service.

Then he claims that Wilson was persecuted:

I stated that Lt.-Col. F. W. E. Wilson, of Niagara Falls, who collaborated with Col. Bruce, one of the best officers in the C.A.M.C., was also punished by being relieved of his appointment as deputy director of medical services, headquarters, London, and sent off as a medical officer to a Forestry unit in the Jura Mountains. An attempt was made to "square" Lt.-Col. Wilson, but like the sterling man he is, he refused to be "squared" and when I left England in February, was still "carrying on" with his unit.

I wish here to impress upon the Government the gravity of these charges. General Smart demands that an impartial commission be immediately appointed to investigate the whole subject to the overseas administration, especially in connection with the medical administration in England.

Such commission should have wide powers and be authorized to investigate fully:

(1) The Col. Bruce report and recommendations.

(2) The report of the Babtie commission.

(3) Col. Bruce's reply to the Babtie report.

(4) The Taplow hospital scandal.

(5) The Perley scheme for scattering Canadian wounded throughout the British Isles.

(6) The report of Lt.-Col. J. S. Jenkins, submitted to the overseas minister of militia in November, 1918.

What does he say about Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkins? Well, I find that if I referred to that I might perhaps wound the feelings of my good friend, the Acting Prime Minister, and I would not do that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No danger.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would not be guilty of such a crime. At all events I have stated what I am informed the Jenkins report contains, and I think that it is the duty of the Government to table that report so that the country may know the facts. General Smart says:

I have received many letters from far distant places, approving my stand in exposing this matter and offering to furnish me with ample evidence, if required, to substantiate my statements.

We have won the war against the Huns but we still have a heavy task on our hands to clean up the rottenness that exists in high places and which those in power seem disposed to cover up.

I have acted as I have done solely from a sense of duty and have refrained from going into many details that would only wound afresh the hearts of those who have already suffered much, but if the government persist in their present unwise policy of attempting to protect those who should be dismissed from office, no matter how high a position they hold, then it may be necessary to publish further details. I am a firm believer in a continuance of the Union Government for some years to come—

I must say his faith is greater than mine.

—but the present administration will have to show greater capacity and more backbone if it is to hold the confidence of the public.

Further on he says:

But whether that administration was a bit of statesmanship or a crafty and discreditable political plot will be more apparent when the people of Canada realize the magnitude of the pension burden which has been thrown upon the country by the conditions of which I have complained, the injustices which will re-act upon the veterans of the war and the needless suffering and waste which this administration produced.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that after such an arraignment, coming from a responsible officer of the rank of Brigadier-General Smart, the Government cannot do otherwise than appoint investigators to probe this whole matter. These are very specific charges. It is no answer to say that he refers to conditions existing in 1916, for he declares positively that the same condition of things has continued since that year. Can these specific and serious charges be ignored? These things are not very complimentary to the administration of Sir George Perley, but he is not the only one who has complained of the activities of Sir George Perley in connection with the Overseas administration. Although Sir George Perley is a knight and is High Commissioner of Canada in England, he must not forget neither must any one else forget, that he is a paid servant of Canada. We vote his salary at every session of Parliament, and therefore he is amenable to this Parliament. I must repeat again, that it is no answer to say that the war is over. I can well understand that when the war was on there might have been state reasons why certain matters—for instance, the reply of Dr. Bruce to Sir William Babtie—should not be tabled. But now that the war is over the Government should have sufficient confidence in Parliament, which was, to say the least, very liberal and generous to them, and in the taxpayers of Canada to tell the whole truth, not only as regards the contents of Dr. Bruce's report, but also as regards that mysterious Jenkins report, which, as I am informed, contains revelations of a most unsavoury nature. As I said a moment ago I am informed that in that report Colonel Jenkins declares that there has been a leakage of at least ten million dollars in connection

with the Overseas Administration of the Medical Service. Publicity in such cases is the great cure, and I again entreat the Acting Prime Minister to see that these two reports are tabled during the present session. So far, Mr. Speaker, I have alluded to the charges made by Brigadier-General Smart. Let me now refer to those of Colonel Pratt, another gallant officer and a member of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, and also, as I am told, a very active member of the Conservative party, therefore a friend of the Union Government. I have already quoted in this House the letter which he addressed to the Toronto Telegram on his return to Canada. His charges then were of a general nature. His new charges made on the 27th March last are more specific and more serious even. Let me give just a synopsis of these charges. Colonel Pratt charges that thousands of our Canadian airmen, after facing death at the front, are actually stranded in London, moneyless, penniless, unable to find accommodation on ships or to get any satisfaction from the air ministry, the High Commissioner or Argyll House. He charges further that some of these young Canadian airmen, who performed such noble service during the last four years, out of their own savings, managed to secure berths, at what price do you imagine? Young Canadian airmen who fought so valiantly for the Empire, for the King and for humanity, can, at the present time, out of their own modest savings, secure berths by bribing for £5 ticket sellers and thus they are able to pay their own passages from England to Canada.

Colonel Pratt charges that the riots at Kinmel camp took place because our men had no pay, no fuel, poor food, no comforts, no pleasures of any kind. Moreover they were being fleeced by grafters, shylocks and profiteers. He charges that whole Canadian detachments were entrained from the camp to Liverpool and then returned to camp without any explanation and that not once but several times. He charges that homesick veterans who served at the front from the beginning of the war were detained while the draftees or the conscripts, whether American or Canadian, were sailing home by boatloads. Colonel Pratt charges that they made frequent representations to the officers commanding, that their representations were at first ignored and that it was because these representations were ignored that the riot took place; so much so, that twenty-four hours after the riot had taken place they received their pay and within a week 20,000 of them were put on ships for home.

Now, I am going to address myself to my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister. I am informed—I may be wrong—that our men were detained at the camp at his solicitation, that he cabled overseas to stop the sending of men to Canada, for what reason he knows better than I do. That is my information.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I may say that my hon. friend is entirely incorrect in that statement. I sent no cable of that kind at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad to accept my hon. friend's denial. Some others, who claim to know better, will probably take up his challenge. I accept his denial. The arraignment of Colonel Pratt is circumstantial; he gives names and dates. I have here the speech which he delivered as reported in the Toronto Globe, and I might perhaps give just a few extracts. He said, speaking of the reports:

> The first reports allowed to get into the papers were greatly distorted, and he read from The London Times to bear him out in this, contradicting, as he did, so many of the statements contained therein. All told there had been only about 600 rioters in the Rhyl Camp. He attributed the causes for the rioting to the fact that when the men were sent to Rhyl they were told they would be going home soon, and they had to wait around; because they were cold and uncomfortable, feeding arrangements had not been properly organized, and after having been told there were no ships to take them home, they found that the Olympic and the Aquitania had been transferred to transport American soldiers. The men could get no relief, they were uncomfortable, and they could have no pleasures. The men, he said, were unable to get their pay for weeks at a time. There were army canteens in the camp and civilian stores nearby making great sums of money out of the soldiers. Cigarettes could be got only by indenting a week in advance, and then only for cash, and the soldiers could not get their money. On top of this was the fact that many military service men were being brought home before those who had had long service. Some of these conscripts had been taken to France to march into Germany with the Canadians, and they were then sent back to England. They had never fired a shot and yet had got home first.

He tells about the deputation sent to the commanding officer and the poor reception which the men received. Then he continues:

> No communication was had with the men after that, and 10.30 o'clock Tuesday night came around without any promise. It was then the rioting started. The purpose of it was to attract public attention. It was a difficult matter, he said, to understand the condition of private soldiers who "happened to be under a bulldozing, domineering officer. There are some such officers in the Canadian army I am sorry to say," said the speaker.

"I didn't excuse the rioting, but subsequent events have justified the actions of those men," declared Col. Pratt. "They were told they could not get ships. Twenty-four hours after that rioting the men in Rhyl Camp were all paid, although they could not get it before. Subsequent events proved that the men were right. Within a week 20,000 were put on ships and sent home, and they are now coming home as never before."

Up to the beginning of this month and since the armistice was signed,—

The figures are very eloquent, I should say:

—52,000 Canadians had been sent home. He compared this with the record of England, where 2,340,470 men had been disembarked in the homeland in a similar period. During the same time 92,000 Australians had been sent home.

Col. Pratt then told of a senior officer who is now in Toronto who was coming home a couple of years ago and got on a train at Euston Station, London, to go to Greenock to sail for Canada. After boarding the train the coaches were locked, and an officer and two n.c.o.'s claiming to be from Argyll House, passed through and demanded two pounds from each passenger. The Toronto officer paid £4 for himself and wife, and loaned money to other passengers. There were about 1,200 passengers on the train, and this money was collected from each of them. This matter had been brought to the attention of the Ottawa authorities, he declared.

"There should be some accounting, for in the neighbourhood of £3,000 which was collected in that way," said Col. Pratt.

Then he speaks of the experiences of officers in the Royal Air Force.

About 60 per cent of the best flying men in the world were Canadians. There were about 6,000 of them in Great Britain at the present time, many of them waiting to get home for four months. This it was impossible to do but the word had been passed around among them that by "salving" the hand of some ticket seller they could get a berth and trip home. It was a fact that if they went to the Air Ministry and proved they had a passage booked for home they were immediately discharged. He instanced a case of Lieut. Mitchell and another lieutenant who was with that officer. They had been trying for four months to get away. Finally they gave £5 to a ticket seller for a "D" deck berth, and they got home at a cost of £23. The ticket seller confided in them that he was making £75 a week in that manner. "That is a positive scandal," declared Colonel Pratt.

I will not quote what he says about the Earl of Reading, but he speaks of a more serious condition of affairs.

He says that five or six men were killed in the Rhyl riots, and he regretted they had not been given a military burial. He believed that public opinion would yet force them to be given a proper burial. At an inquest the other day it had been stated 80 Canadians were in jails and dungeons of England. There was no Habeas Corpus in the army—

Not only in the army, I am sorry to say, in the civilian life of Canada the Habeas Corpus Act was dispensed with throughout the whole of last year.

He cited a case to show that it was common for men to languish in prisons for two or three months without being brought before a court-martial. A Toronto officer, a criminal lawyer, a couple of years ago had approached the Adjutant-General overseas and said there were many men in Canadian camps waiting to be dealt with by courts-martial. He offered, at his own expense, to visit the camps and make a report within a week. The Adjutant-General promised consideration, and the next morning the Toronto officer was ordered by wire to go home "because it looked as though he might in some way bring discredit on somebody." There was no reason for men languishing in prison for five or six months. When he left England it was said ten Canadian boys were in the Tower of London.

I visited the Tower of London in 1889, Mr. Speaker, and I know by history what took place within its walls in ancient times. When I read these charges by Colonel Pratt I could not believe that Canadian boys were lying in those dungeons. It is a scandal, Sir, that our boys should be languishing there. I can hardly believe that the authorities in London are aware of the fact, for it is inconceiveable, if the fact were known, that the people of England would stand for such treatment to our boys. It is a crime against this country and against our boys that they should languish in those dungeons.

These charges are specific and serious, and they are all corroborated by another officer of high standing, Lieut.-Colonel W. H. Price, another member of the Ontario Legislature and another supporter of the Government. He charges that the riots at Rhyl were caused by the lack of method in the repatriation arrangements. He speaks as follows:

Referring to the riots at Rhyl recently the speaker said that they should occasion no surprise. Newspaper reports had given the impression to those at home that a handful of Russians in the Canadian forces had been preaching Bolshevism and that they started the trouble.

Argyll House, said Col. Price, had not shown itself capable of meeting the situation and it had completely lost sight of the fact that Canadian soldiers would not submit to conditions that the English Tommy would.

He referred to the fact that no official statement had been promptly issued by Argyll House dealing with the riots, although reports about Bolshevists were permitted to be cabled to the newspapers in Canada. Whether the intention had been to let the opinion prevail that Bolshevists had been to blame so as to shift the responsibility from Argyll House, he did not know.

The speaker pleaded the cause of the returned soldier, urging that more adequate pensions be paid and that greater opportunities be offered veterans for employment. He believed that if the provincial government would

place itself on record in connection with the latter, the Federal Government would act.

While discussing the returned soldier, Col. Price spoke of the high cost of living which had prevailed in Canada for some time. "I had to pay 68 cents a pound for bacon when I came back," he said, "and I don't know whether to blame the United Farmers of Ontario or Sir Joseph Flavelle, but I know that it was between them. I think they had better get together and clear up where these 68 cents come in. We are not all farmers nor capitalists," he declared.

Continuing, Col. Price said that the returned man would certainly desire an explanation as to who had been making immense profits out of the millions Canada had spent on munitions. He quoted figures extensively to show that during the war production had increased more rapidly than wages, and that production increasing the percentage of material, and labour costs had decreased. That was one of the causes of industrial unrest.

"No man in this country had the right" he said "to put millions of money into his pockets from munition contracts at a time when patriotic men were sacrificing everything they had in the common cause."

Col. Price declared that it was his intention to move a resolution in the House asking the Dominion Government to find out just where the money made by those engaged in war contracts had gone.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, what is the turn of mind of the returning officers and soldiers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. member permit me to put a question? Am I to understand that any reflection is cast on the doctors attached to units all over the country, or is it to the administration service?

Mr. LEMIEUX: To the administration service. As regards the doctors, General Smart seems to say that they were good men, but their services were not utilized. Sir George Perley scattered the wounded and sick all over England, Scotland and Wales,—even Ireland,—in order to promote, as he said, "the cause of Imperialism. The blending of Australians, New Zealanders, Canadians, Englishmen and Welshmen would make for a greater and better Empire." That was the definition of Sir George Perley. I remember at the time when this question was discussed in the Press, a lady, well known in Montreal, who has taken a very active part in the V. A. D. organization in England, stated that the reason given for the scattering of our boys all over the country instead of centralizing them at our Canadian hospitals, organized by Canada and placed under the care and control of our own doctors, was for "the sacred cause of Imperialism." General Smart, who is a good Imperialist himself, says in his speech, "If that is Imperialism you talk of, then I am not an Imperialist."

Coming back to the Rhyl riots, an inquiry took place and a verdict was rendered on the 27th of March last. Here is the verdict:

> That the soldiers came to their deaths by the wounds described by the doctors, but that there is no evidence to show how the wounds were inflicted. Evidence was taken which showed that both the rioters and the defenders of the camp fired ball ammunition, but no one was identified as having actually killed one of the soldiers.

Not a word as to the cause of the riots or the responsibility for them. This is an extraordinary verdict. The surprise of the public in Canada with regard to it is expressed in the following article from such a responsible paper as the Montreal Gazette, of March 31:

> A meaningless verdict was returned by the coroner's jury which inquired into the cause of the deaths of the victims of the Kinmel Camp riots. If any one is to be punished, it will be as the result of military inquiry and court martial. A military inquiry has been held, the results of which will be learned in time.

And further on the Gazette says:

> This, as well as the fact that men were killed in the course of the demonstrations, is to be remembered in forming judgment on the unhappy incident and its causes, the whole truth in regard to which has yet to be made public.

So that the verdict is most unsatisfactory, and this inquiry held by the coroner should be implemented at the earliest moment by the Government in order that Canada may know what caused the riots and how it was that Canadian boys were killed and were buried so unceremoniously as they were on that occasion. This is one of the worst tragedies of the war. Our boys were sent overseas to fight, to die, if need be, for liberty. Their sacrifice was great, but because of the sacredness of the cause, they bore the burden with equanimity all through this long war. Now we hear of riots on the occasion of their return to England prior to their coming home. Some of them are murdered in a cold-blooded manner. Some of them are languishing in dungeons in the Tower of London. Others are left penniless on the streets of London. Others are exploited by Shylocks and grafters. Yet, when such facts as these are brought to light, the Acting Prime Minister, with a wave of the hand, simply denies the charges in toto and says that this one or that one may come back from England in the near future with similar charges, and that his denial in the case of Brigadier-General Smart will be his denial of all other similar charges. This is a very poor answer indeed.

The charges are made by responsible officers holding high rank, friends of the Government. It may be that during the war the Government had some excuse for not covering the charges that were made. But now, speaking on behalf of the boys, speaking on behalf of Canadians generally, I say that an investigation is urgent. The Government owe it to Canada, owe it to the returned soldiers, owe it to themselves as a Government. The widest powers were given to the Government by a benevolent Parliament and a benevolent public during the four years of the war. Is it against the public interest that the truth be known? I always go back to England, the mother of Parliaments, for my precedents. In England, whether during the bright days of victory or during the black and bleak days of defeat, public men are not afraid of the truth; they are not afraid to speak boldly. During the South African war, when there was a surrender of British troops in the veldt,—much against the grain of Britishers generally—the Government granted an investigation, and court-martials and inquiries were held. If you go back to the eighteenth century, at the time of the famous Marlborough charges, you will find that the British Government granted an investigation while a war was in progress. During the Seven Years' war, Admiral Byng, with all his glorious career behind him, was the subject of an inquiry, and at the time of the Napoleonic Wars, Lord Melville was impeached as the result of a naval inquiry. And at the time of the Crimean war, when it was discovered that the commissariat of the British troops had failed, the Duke of Newcastle was removed during the war and replaced by Lord Panmure. As to the matter under discussion, the war is over, and here are specific and serious charges, made not by civilians, but by returned officers who served faithfully their King and country during four successive years, who hold the highest rank in Canadian armies, and who are friends of the Government in office—yet the Government would disregard these accusations. I say that the sooner an investigation is granted the better for the Government and the better for the country. I repeat that the Government should hold such an investigation. They owe it to the country; they owe it to the soldiers, both the living and the dead.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, in opening his somewhat lengthy statement, during which he has covered almost the entire period from the beginning of the war in 1914 down to the present date, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux) was good enough to say that I as Minister of Militia was not responsible for what took place before my regime.

I feel in a somewhat delicate position, because, when I accepted office, I was aware that there was an Overseas Minister of Militia authorized by Parliament, and that the Minister of Militia in Canada was not in any way responsible for anything that took place in the administration, organization, or direction of the Canadian forces after they left Canada, that matter being in charge of the Overseas Minister of Militia, who was charged with the responsibility therefor. Nevertheless, in so far as in my power lies, I am prepared to take the responsibility of defending to the best of my ability any officers absent on duty overseas, whom I consider to be slandered, or as having mud thrown at them without cause. I do not know whether any hon. gentleman has ever experienced the sensation of being a legatee, but when I was burdened with the responsibility of the administration of the Militia Department I felt it was a pretty large legacy that was given to me. I looked upon it as the young man did whose father left him a very large estate, who thought it was a wonderful thing to have this big estate to manage, and who took upon himself the burden and responsibility of managing it. About a year afterwards, when a friend asked him how he was getting along, he said: "Well, I know the responsibilities are somewhat heavy, and I almost wish my father were alive again." Well, Sir, I sometimes wish that one of my predecessors were back again in harness.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is very much alive.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was not the immediate predecessor of the minister—an hon. gentleman named Kemp intervened.

Major-General MEWBURN: I said one of my predecessors; he might be my father or my step-father.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, that is it.

Major-General MEWBURN: As far as I can gather from the statements made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, he is not willing to make any charges, at least I should like to ask him if he is prepared, as a responsible member of this House, to make the charges he has quoted.

An hon. MEMBER: Let him answer that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not myself a witness of what took place in England. I am simply re-echoing the specific charges made by three of the highest officers in the Canadian army, namely, Brigadier-General Smart, Colonel Pratt, and Colonel Price, three members of the Conservative party and three members of two of the local legislatures.

Major-General MEWBURN: As regards Brigadier-General Smart's charges, which are very specific, great stress seems to be laid on the administration of the medical service. I have not the full text of his statement, as nothing has been laid before the House except allegations that have appeared in the press in which General Smart is reported to have made a number of broad statements regarding the general administration of the medical service. I shall try to deal with his statements seriatim. In one place General Smart says—and the hon. member did not quote it quite in full:

> I say, without fear of contradiction from any impartial source, that the medical administration overseas has been bad.

Further on he says:

> In the area that I commanded at Shorncliffe, in addition to other units, I had seven hospitals under my command—four of them special hospitals, two dealing with shell-shock cases, one hospital for eyes, ears, nose, and throat, and one for venereal diseases, all of which were under me for administration and discipline.

Therefore, General Smart in his own statement almost contradicts his own charges, as he admits that he was responsible for the administration and discipline of all those hospitals in his area, and, consequently, if the administration was faulty, General Smart himself would be responsible. He goes on in a general way to blame High Commissioner Sir George Perley for certain things and then he proceeds to blame Sir William Babtie. I have no brief for General Babtie; I know Colonel Bruce intimately and he is one of the finest medical officers the Dominion of Canada has ever produced. I have never had an opportunity of seeing or reading either the Babtie report or the Bruce report; but General Smart according to his statement, regards Sir William Babtie as though he had been discharged from the British army and was not a responsible man at all, although General Smart complains about his being responsible for the break-down. I notice from what I saw a few days ago that this same Sir William Babtie, as reported in the British Hansard of the 7th of June, 1918, was "not only under no personal aspersion from Mesopotamia investigation, but has since been advanced to Inspector of Medical Services. Babtie has also been promoted to Lieut-General." I imagine, therefore, that Sir William Babtie is pretty highly thought of in the British army today. General Smart goes on to say in his statement to complain that the recommendations regarding the hospitals made in the Bruce report were not adopted; he says that practically all of Col. Bruce's recommendations were turned down. But in another paragraph he says:

> Practically every recommendation made by Col. Bruce has since been adopted and put into effect by General Foster, showing that they were sound.

That shows that, no matter what the Bruce report was and the Babtie report was General Smart, in his statement in the Quebec Legislature, said that all the recommendations made by Col. Bruce were put into effect. The statement he makes is that he wants an investigation into certain things that happened in 1915 and 1916, particularly in 1916. That is some three years ago, and General Smart himself admits that those recommendations of Colonel Bruce have been put into effect. General Smart, as I said before, was an officer who was in charge of the Shorncliffe area. I have know him for many years, and I have always known him to be an officer who took an interest in the active Militia in Canada. Far be it from me to criticise General Smart who is, I believe, highly recognized as an officer and held in high esteem by his brother officers; but why is he making these statements at this late date on his return to Canada, I am not prepared to say. General Smart went overseas in 1915; he proceeded to France, I understand, in October, 1915, and he was returned to England on December 13, 1915. I understand that altogether General Smart's services in France covered 78 days. He was returned to England for service in England and I understand that subsequently he took over the Shorncliffe command.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know my hon. friend desires to be absolutely fair. He mentioned that General Smart was only in France 78 days. Did General Smart refuse to accept service in France, or did he only obey the orders that were given to him.

Major-General MEWBURN: I am not saying anything to belittle General Smart's good-will, but General Smart, I am informed, had actually 78 days' service in France, during part of which time he was in a convalescent hospital.

On the reorganization of the Mounted Rifles he was offered the command, but declined it, contending that he should have been made brigadier-general, which he had been continuously urging since 1915. Then when the policy was adopted that no officer should hold a position in England who had not had six months' service in France, the overseas forces in France were asked if they could use him, and they replied that there was no employment for him with the rank of colonel in France. I am not suggesting for one moment that Colonel Smart was not prepared to serve in France from the start; I am only giving the actual facts. I was going on to say that General Smart did command the Shorncliffe area. When I was in England in July of last year, he did me the kindness to call on me. I saw him on more than one occasion, and he knew that I was Minister of Militia in Canada, but never at any time did he intimate to me that there was anything wrong in any part of the services, medical or otherwise. If he had knowledge at that time that the administration of the Medical Services was faulty or wrong, or that there had been maladministration, why was he not frank enough to tell me, as Minister of Militia in Canada? Several of General Smart's friends came to see me while I was in England, and asked if I could get him a permanent military position in Canada. My reply was that I should be very glad to do what I could for him, but that I was not making—and I have not made, and I am not making—any permanent military appointments, because those positions are being reserved for men who have seen service in France.

Mr. VIEN: Was not the proper course for General Smart, if he had complaints to make, to make them to the Minister of Militia overseas, and not to the Minister of Militia in Canada?

Major General MEWBURN: Perfectly true. I am just pointing out that if he had all these worries over there, one would have thought he would have mentioned them to me. Subsequently, the Shorncliffe command was practically done away with as the troops were moved from there, and I went out of my way to see if any further employment could be found for General Smart in England. After that command, I do not know what employment he did have until he was returned to Canada and transferred to the C.E.F. Reserve. If General Smart, while he was in command at Shorncliffe or since then, had any knowledge of maladministration or had any reason to believe there had been wrong-doing, then it was his duty to bring the matter to the attention of the Overseas Minister of Militia. But I am not aware of his having done so, though he had ample opportunity.

The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) has refered to a report of Lt.-Colonel Jenkins. I was asked a question in the House early in the session regarding the Jenkins' report, and I replied that I had no knowledge of it; I never heard of it. I referred the matter to Sir Edward Kemp. I may not be correct, but I surmise that if Lt.-Colonel Jenkins did make a report—and this is only a surmise—it was for the information of the overseas minister, and not for the Government. It may have been for some personal use; I do not know. The fact remains that that report has never come to the Militia Department here, or to the Government so far as I am aware.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is no such thing as a report made for a minister personally. A report of that nature is made for the department, for the Government, and for Parliament.

Major-General MEWBURN: That is perfectly true. I say that the report may have been made at Sir Edward Kemp's personal request or for him, but that so far as I know it has never reached the Militia Department or the Government here.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Shall we get the report later on?

Major-General MEWBURN: I was going to refer later on, but I may as well do it now, to General Smart's reference in his letter to three water-tight compartments in France, England, and Canada, and his statement that there is no co-operation, and that intrigue is going on. I wish to say in the most emphatic manner possible that since I have been Minister of Militia in Canada the relationship between the Overseas Minister, Sir Edward Kemp, and myself, has been most harmonious. There has been the closest co-operation between us in our respective spheres of activity. I know that Sir Edward Kemp fully intended to return to Canada so that he could make a statement to the House this session regarding his administration overseas, but hon. members must be well aware how impossible it has been for him to leave his post during the terrible trial of demobilization that he has had on his hands since the armistice was signed, and up to the present time. I know

that it is his full intention to return to Canada at the earliest possible moment, and before this House prorogues, for the purpose of making a full statement of his administration. I wish to repeat most emphatically, that ever since he has been Minister of Militia overseas, and since I have held the position of Minister of Militia of Canada, there has been the very closest co-operation and harmony between us, although Sir Edward Kemp is in no way under my control, being a minister of the Crown and responsible to the Government, not to me.

Mr. VIEN: Does not General Smart's complaint refer, not to the lack of co-operation between the Minister of Militia overseas and the Minister of Militia in Canada, but to the lack of co-operation between the commands of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and between the various departments?

Major-General MEWBURN: No. He says distinctly that there is no co-operation between the Department of Militia and Defence in Canada and the Minister of Militia overseas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Referring to the Jenkins report, which I understood the minister to say had been made to Sir Edward Kemp personally, if it is true, as is rumoured and as far as my information goes, that a leakage of $10,000,000 has been discovered, does not the minister think that that report ought to be tabled?

Major-General MEWBURN: As a matter of fact, I do not know if there is such a thing as the Jenkins report, except for what has been said by my hon. friend this afternoon and by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) about three weeks ago. The hon. member read a statement this afternoon that a report had been submitted to the Overseas Minister of Militia. If there is such a report, the Overseas Minister of Militia when he returns to Canada will be prepared to answer fully any questions with regard to it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Can you not cable him in the meantime?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have already cabled to ascertain if he has such a report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was his answer?

Major-General MEWBURN: I have had no definite answer. Regarding the treatment of Canadian soldiers overseas, I had the privilege of being in England and France last July and August, when I visited very many hospitals in both countries and saw a majority of the medical officers, and I never heard of one single complaint regarding the treatment of Canadian soldiers either in France or in England. I may say further, that an officer from Canada proceeded overseas in July of 1918, a doctor of very high standing in his profession, Dr. Charles Martin, of Montreal. He has been over there since, and he has visited every single hospital in France and in England where Canadians are being treated. He has informed me that he has heard no complaints but, on the other hand, that there are no patients in any of the Allied Armies who receive such admirable treatment as do the Canadians in the Canadian hospitals. I think, Sir, that the statement that our Canadian invalid soldiers have not been properly treated or have been neglected is nothing short of a slander on the medical profession. If there is one service in the whole war more outstanding than any other it is the medical service, and I think that the citizens of Canada have reason to be deeply indebted to our magnificent doctors who, neglecting all that was profitable to them in civil life, went to the front to help our soldiers. The surgeons and doctors who went overseas in the early days of the war, and who continued to go steadily until the armistice was signed, abandoned lucrative practices, many of them giving up thousands of dollars a year in order that they might serve their country. I do not think that anything is too good for these splendid men.

A few days ago I received a couple of letters which indicate the opinion which some people have on the question of the treatment of Canadian soldiers, and one of these letters I shall read:

> I thought perhaps that you would like to see the enclosed extract from the last letter which has just come to hand from my son Austin, officially Major C. A. Bell, M.C. and Bar, 3rd Bn. Engineers, who you may remember was dreadfully wounded August 8th last at the opening day of the battle of Amiens, losing both legs below the knees and the right eye.
>
> In sending this I do so not so much for the item of news but as an evidence of his wonderful early recovery. As an original first campaigner, badly wounded twice before, one would have thought, so the politicians tell us, that these hardships would have undermined his constitution, but not so. Thanks to the skill of such surgeons as Col. Armour and eye specialists at the I.O.D.E. hospital as well as the constant personal attention of the nursing sisters, among them Miss Robertson, matron of the Christie St. Hospital, he has made a wonderful quick recovery.
>
> Unfortunately our soldier boys do not tell us of the names of their attending surgeons and it is left to chance for the folks at home to find

out to whom they are indebted for the wonderful work that has been done in this respect.

I am persuaded that one great reason of Austin's quick recovery has been his spirit of optimism and good cheer as well as his belief that he was not yet done for. One of his college chums just returned told me that Austin had counted upon returning to France, figuring the war would last a long time, and believing that he could still make good behind the lines.

I trust, Sir, that in due time the people of Canada will find out the names of the surgeons and nursing sisters who have been satisfied to work out of the "limelight," only looking for results.

I have received one or two other letters written in the same strain, and it fairly makes my blood boil to hear people criticising the work of the medical profession in this war, in view of the splendid, indeed the wonderful service our doctors have rendered.

General Smart has referred to the case of General Sir Sam Steele, and I feel it my duty to make a statement regarding that matter, because General Smart blames the Militia Department in Canada for certain alleged treatment as a result of which General Steele, it is said, died of a broken heart. I am at a loss to know why a man of General Smart's standing should make such statements. General Steele was an officer who was held in the very highest esteem and admiration by every Canadian who had the pleasure of his acquaintance. He had served continuously in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for some twenty-nine years, and he went to South Africa where he served with great distinction. Returning to Canada he was granted leave of absence from the Northwest Mounted Police, without pay, from the first of June, 1902, to enable him to accept a commission in the South African Constabulary. His leave was extended to 1903 when he was finally retired from the Northwest Mounted Police on pension. When the war broke out the then Minister of Militia, in the winter of 1914, appointed him Acting Inspector General of Western Canada. He subsequently proceeded overseas, the intention being, I think, that he should take command of the Second Canadian Division.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He went over in command of the Second Division.

Major-General MEWBURN: Before he left here he met with an accident in Toronto, and unfortunately he suffered another accident in England. He was in France for a very short time, returned to England and was given a command under the Imperial Government, known as the South Eastern Command in England, being in the pay of the Canadian Government. He continued in that command until sometime last year when it was practically abolished. Prior to that, the first I knew of General Steele's retiring, or of there being no employment for him, was the intimation from England that the Imperials did not require his services any longer because they had sufficient British officers available.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think the real reason was that Dover, which is in the South Eastern District, was established as a separate command of its own, and therefore General Steele would be only a Canadian officer after that.

Major-General MEWBURN: Well, there was no further employment for him, and although General Steele's ability and experience were highly regarded by the Imperials, they said that his services would have to be dispensed with, not because of any inefficiency, but simply as a matter of administration. I had several letters from General Steele who made every effort to be retained on the strength on pay until the war was over.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it on account of his age?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, but simply because there was no further employment for him. As there was no employment for him in England or in Canada the only alternative was to pension him.

Mr. POWER: If the minister requested the overseas military authorities to keep General Steele on the strength and they did not do so, is that one of the examples of the cordial co-operation that exists between the Overseas people and this ministry?

Major-General MEWBURN: I did not ask the Overseas ministry to keep him on the strength. There was no further employment for him, and naturally in such a case he would go on pension because his time had expired and he was three years over age. General Steele asked me, as a personal request, if he might be permitted to take his discharge in England instead of coming to Canada for discharge, and I gladly consented, and he was retired on a pension of $2,485. As to his having died of a broken heart, I may say that I have a certificate from Colonel J. A. Roberts, F.R.C.S., who was his medical adviser, in which he replied to a telephone conversation that I had with him when that statement appeared. I very much regret having

to refer to this matter, but under the circumstances I think it is my duty to read Colonel Roberts' reply:

Replying to your telephone conversation regarding my professional associations with the late Major General Sir Sam Steele, I would state that I performed the necessary operation subsequent to his accidental injury at Exhibition Camp, Toronto, in April, 1915.

Again in August of 1915 I attended him at Shorncliffe, England, when he was thrown from his automobile and sustained a slight concussion of the brain.

Approximately fourteen months ago General Steel consulted me at his home in Putney, London, and it was learned that he was suffering from diabetes. This condition persisted for over a year, to my knowledge, and in my opinion was directly responsible for his death.

(Signed) J. A. Roberts, F.R.C.S., Eng.

My hon. friend referred to Argyll House, which seems to be the most unpopular place there is in England according to some of the press. Give a dog a bad name and it never leaves him. Argyll House, as I have no doubt that many hon. members of this House know, is the headquarters of the administrative service in England and of the overseas forces. In the early stages of the war I understand there was considerable complaint about the administration and the handling of the officers coming from Canada. I heard it. Lots of us heard it. My gracious, if it were a case of investigating everything, I could myself make hundreds of complaints, but I do not know what good it is going to do. I think one of the troubles that existed at Argyll House was largely due to the number of battalions that went overseas in the earlier days of the war and which of necessity had to be broken up. There were many officers and there was no employment for them. I think that the mannerisms of some of the young officers at Argyll House caused some of the trouble. But I will say that when I was in England in 1918 I heard no complaints about Argyll House. I was in all the camps in England and France. In July 1918 the Overseas Minister laid down the policy that all officers fit for general service who had not served in France would not be given employment in England except in very special cases. I know that as far back as June, 1918, there was a total of 67, all ranks, employed in Argyll House of whom 49 had actually seen service in the front line with the troops in France, 11 were either over age or unfit, and only 7 had not actually seen service in France. The policy which was then adopted by the Overseas Minister has been adhered to from that time on in all the camps in England —any officer, if employed in any of these camps, who had not seen service, had to get out.

There is no special charge against Argyll House. I have no brief for Argyll House. General Smart and Colonel Pratt speak of the intrigue that is going on. When I was in France, during July, 1918, I found, from my observation and from talking with officers of all ranks, and non-commissioned officers and men in very many of the units, that there was the happiest co-operation. I found that the most wonderful team play existed in France from General Currie down to the latest recruit. I found in England that everybody had the utmost respect and esteem for General Currie. I never found any evidence of intrigue going on. On the other hand, I found that there was the most cordial co-operation. There may have been many complaints made; officers may have had personal grievances, but I have no knowledge of any complaints about Argyll House as to its administrative character.

As to the statements of Colonel Pratt, I may say that he went overseas in 1916. He had never had any military experience, as had General Smart, prior to 1916, when he was appointed Lieut.-Colonel and authorized to raise the 133rd Battalion of Norfolk county. Colonel Pratt, in conjunction with an old political enemy, although a great friend, Mr. Hal B. Donly, of Simcoe, worked night and day—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of the Simcoe Reformer?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes; the Reformer and the old Tory pretty nearly slept together during that campaign, but they did some splendid work and set a fine example to other places in Canada. They worked hard and they recruited some 800 men within that county when it was not so easy to get men. Colonel Pratt took his battalion to camp that summer. He went overseas with 665 men. His battalion was broken up within ten days after he got there. Colonel Pratt was employed with the British at Dunkirk, in France, and how long he was there I cannot say.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A good man?

Major-General MEWBURN: Do you mean as a military man?

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a military man.

Major-General MEWBURN: His experience as a soldier began when he took command of the battalion. I cannot make any statement about his ability as a military man, but I know that he worked hard to raise that battalion. He had in camp when

I happened to be there some 800 men and he took 665 men overseas.

Mr. COPP: Had he had any previous military experience?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand none whatever.

Colonel PECK: Have you any confidential report on Colonel Pratt?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is on file a confidential report on every officer. I do not know that it is for me to present any confidential report here on Colonel Pratt or General Smart. There have been confidential reports in connection with several officers. Colonel Pratt was in France, at Dunkirk, and was employed by the British. I saw Colonel Pratt in England last summer. He was then employed by the British, but he was not doing any military duty at that time. He told me that he was coming to Canada to look into the flax industry. I understand he did proceed to Canada in connection with the flax industry. I think in its relation to aeroplanes. As I say, I saw Colonel Pratt over there and I had a long chat with him. He and I have always been good friends and I have a great admiration for the way in which he took up the work of raising his battalion. I met him in Toronto not long ago before he had proceeded to England again. I have heard of him since he came back from England.

I do not propose to enter at any length into these statements which have appeared in the press particularly in regard to Rhyl. Colonel Pratt was not there and he could not have spoken authoritatively. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that what he read was simply the report of the coroner's inquest. I may state that there is a court of inquiry now being held whose duty is not yet completed. It is making a most thorough investigation of the whole trouble at the Rhyl camp and the report of that inquiry no doubt will be made public in due course.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): In order to be perfectly fair to Colonel Pratt is it not a fact that Colonel Pratt has on record an application, repeated no less than three times, to be allowed to revert in order to get into the trenches and serve there?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not deny that but I have no knowledge of it; that application would be overseas. I can say quite frankly that I think Colonel Pratt is a man who would be just as willing to go to the front as a private as he would be to go to the front as an officer, but as to any letter from him asking to be allowed to revert, I am not in a position to know. I do not know what age he is but I presume that he would be considerably over 35 years and it therefore would not be permissible under regulations to allow him to go to the front.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would not my hon friend say that also of General Smart?

Major-General MEWBURN: I dare say that General Smart would be equally willing; I have not the slightest doubt but that he would. I was informed that he was offered the command of a mounted rifle battalion which he declined, but I do not know the details as to that. An application was made to us that General Smart should proceed to France but the trouble was that we could not have him proceed there with the rank of Colonel. I have the highest respect for General Smart and for Colonel Pratt.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think I can explain that point. The cavalry went over at a certain strength. We broke up the regiment and formed it into a battalion in order that there might be no trouble in holding a certain part of the front. Colonel Smart was supplanted, but not through any fault of his own. Before the debate closes I will give my version of Colonel Smart's case in regard to this battalion at the front. Everything was honourable and straightforward, with regard to Col. Smart. He was a most efficient officer, but his health failed him.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have never suggested for one moment that Colonel Smart was not a most efficient officer and an officer held in very high esteem, but I do object to these charges being scattered around broadcast. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) made a statement regarding the trouble at Rhyl camp —speaking of Colonel Pratt's charges—with regard to holding back the Olympic and other large transports. As early as January 10, I had considerable cable communications with the Overseas Minister, and I then dealt with the question of speeding up the demobilization of the Canadian troops, advising him what we had been able to do regarding the use of various ships, and that we had arranged for five ships to repatriate civilians, when it was decided not to bring civilians back on the troopships. I also advised that we had

arranged for some 24 or 25 ships to accommodate troops. I need not read the cable, because it only goes into the question of disembarkation and the number of troops we could handle, information that I have already given to the House, but I may say that at that time these ships had broken away from the Ministry of Shipping and I sent the following cable overseas:

Agents here have not yet been able to obtain rates on Olympic, Aquitania, and Mauretania. Please negotiate direct with companies and cable rates quoted by them for confirmation by War Purchasing Commission.

We were attempting at that early date to secure those ships, and we only succeeded a short time ago in getting the Olympic back; the other boats have not yet been given back to us. But we have been doing everything in our power since December and January to secure those ships to bring back our men.

With regard to the trouble at Rhyl camp, I would not attempt to say what occasioned it until I see the full report of the court of inquiry

With respect to Col. Pratt's charges about the Flying Corps men being left stranded in England, the article my hon. friend read from the press appeared in the London papers, and it was repeated here. I may also read a cable from London which says:

Lt.-Col. Pratt's bribery accusations in the Ontario Legislature, evoked expressions of the deepest resentment at the military headquarters here. The feeling is these particularly mean attacks on defenceless officers, are the outcome of personal spite, or, the disgruntled failure of those whose own military career can in no way be considered successful.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who signs it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: What paper did it appear in?

Major-General MEWBURN: This was in the Montreal Star.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What paper was it published in in England?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is a special Star cable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It may be signed by Sir George Perley.

An hon. MEMBER: It may be signed by Windermere.

Major-General MEWBURN: It is not signed by anybody. This cable continues:

Regarding the charges of bribery from airmen, this statement is absolutely denied. It is pointed out that the charges must be untrue, because the Canadian Headquarters exercise no control over the repatriation of Canadians in the Royal Air Force, the sole responsibility resting with the Air Ministry.

I may say that when I heard there was any suggestion of any Canadians in the Royal Air Force not getting proper attention in regard to repatriation, I cabled twice to Sir Edward Kemp, and I took the responsibility of stating that if there were any Canadians from the Imperial service who were having difficulty in getting back to Canada he was to look after them and see that free transportation was furnished.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What answer did you receive from Sir Edward Kemp?

Major-General MEWBURN: I received no definite information. I did not think any answer was necessary. I simply requested him to take action. Since then I have seen a large number of Canadians who were in the Imperial Forces; and they tell me that they had no trouble at all, that they got their pay, discharge, and transportation from the Imperial authorities. Some of those men came by New York; in fact they came any way they liked. There may be a few isolated cases of distress, but I am not aware of any. However, when I saw that accusation I took the responsibility of seeing that action was taken to look after any such cases.

Mr. COPP: Is the hon. minister referring to Canadians in the Flying Corps in England being given transportation?

Major-General MEWBURN: The Royal Air Force.

Mr. COPP: I know of cases where Canadians in the Flying Corps were forced to pay their own way back.

Major-General MEWBURN: I say there may have been such cases, but none has come to my attention. Generally speaking, Sir, I feel that if the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), or any other hon. member is prepared on his own responsibility to make any specific charges, the Government should take immediate cognizance of them and order an investigation at once. But I do not think that where officers are returning from England —no matter who they are—and are making broadcast promiscuous charges and statements in connection with these matters, too much attention should be paid to them. I have gone out of my way when statements have appeared from different people in the press from time to time to look into them personally. As I said before, I am not responsible for the administration of any troops outside Canada, but I am pre-

pared to stand up in this House and defend honourable officers, who have been devoting their best talents to our Canadian forces overseas against promiscuous charges levelled against them behind their backs when they are not here to defend themselves. I am quite sure that the Minister of Militia and Defence Overseas, Sir Edward Kemp, will be here before long and he will defend himself. I may not have covered the ground as fully as it is covered in the long statement made by the hon. member, but I think in a general way I have dealt with the matter as fully as is necessary and shown that there is no maladministration overseas as far as our knowledge goes. I do not think that these promiscuous statements should be considered when they are not backed up by any definite, positive charges.

Mr. CYRUS W. PECK (Skeena): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we are all very gratified to see the Opposition showing a lively interest in the soldier. It is a little late, but at the same time—

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. An hon. member has no right to impugn the sincerity of hon. members sitting on your left in connection with the Canadian army.

Mr. PECK: I wish to assure the hon. gentleman that I meant my remarks in a very good-humoured way.

Mr. McMASTER: In a Pickwickian sense.

Mr. PECK: And I have no hesitation in withdrawing what my hon. friend takes exception to. I would be the last man in this House to impugn the loyalty and honour of the hon. members of the Opposition. If all hon. members will observe the same rules as I do, there will be less of these wanton, cruel, and foolish charges flung out against my gallant comrades of the war. Now, I do not rise to justify the whole administration of the Militia Department or the Government overseas.

It is one of our customs to think that the Government is responsible for all its officers and employees. Our Government is in a very bad situation in that regard, because a great deal that takes place in connection with administration in England is not known here for a long time afterwards. I do not mean to justify all that has taken place in Argyll House or in connection with the administration overseas; I may have occasion later to bring some of these things to the attention of the House. But I shall not do anything of that kind for the sake of cheap notoriety or of attaining some cheap political purpose. I saw a great deal of the administration over there, and I would not be doing my duty as a soldier or as a Canadian citizen if I did not stand up here and say that whatever mistakes have been made by Sir Edward Kemp, he is a very conscientious, hard-working patriotic minister.

Certain charges have been flung against General Turner. I repeat that I am not going to justify the administration of Argyll House, not for a moment. But no man who ever served his country did it with the same absolute patriotism and the same fine sense of loyalty as did Major-General Sir Richard Turner, V.C.

With regard to the administration in Canada, I do not say that I will not criticise it sometime, but I believe that the present Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) in his policy and in his conduct is as straight as he is in his personal carriage and appearance.

I have risen simply to say a word or two with regard to some statements made by General Smart in the Quebec Legislature. Whatever any one may say as to his statement, it read as though it was directed against the whole Canadian Army Medical Corps. I saw General Smart a few days ago. He seemed to think that I had a sort of Bolshevist notion, and I said to him at once: "There is one respect in which I do not agree with you; if you have anything against the administration of the army medical corps in England, that is all right, but you should not also make a charge against the whole Canadian Army Medical Corps." He said: "I do not do that." But the reports in the press, including those referred to by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), indicated that the statement was made against the entire medical forces overseas. Members may bring up anything they please by way of conducting a cheap political campaign or something of that nature, but nobody is going to play football with the reputation of my comrades in this war while I sit in this House. And, Sir, if there ever was an efficient service in any army in any country, it was the service of the Canadian Army Medical Corps in France. To make a cruel, inconsiderate statement against that service should be beneath the dignity of any member of this House unless he has most ample proof. I have had considerable experience with these officers. I have seen them in times of peril

and in times when we were at rest. There was never too much danger for the officers, and the personnel of the Canadian Army Medical Corps to face. When it came to going into the trenches or when we were in action, your medical corps was there, "Johnny on the spot" every time, doing their duty. No class of men made more sacrifices than the members of the medical corps. The great bulk of them were captains or majors, and up to last June the captains were drawing the magnificent sum of $4.75 a day and the majors corresponding pay. I know lots of men there who had a practice at home that brought them anywhere from $5,000 to $20,000 a year; yet they sacrificed it all, went overseas and served faithfully and uncomplainingly. And now we are forced to stand up in this House and defend that noble profession. I say, Sir, it is humiliating that such a duty should become necessary.

Mr. PETER ROBERT McGIBBON (Argenteuil): I read a story some time ago about Peck's Bad Boy, and, like others on this side of the House, who have probably read that story, I remember a few things in it. Peck's Bad Boy was an awful boy; he would say and do terrible things—but, of course, I do not say that the member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) is the same as he was.

I wish to point out that the medical profession has not been attacked by this side of the House; the discussion has been with regard to the management of affairs. A few days ago I was informed that some one wanted to speak to me in the corridor outside. When I went out I found that it was a returned soldier, an old friend of mine, and I took him to my room. I noticed that he was a little lame and I asked him what was the cause. He said he had been in the army and had got his leg broke in France. Before he was sent to England for medical treatment he was sent to a place where, he said, there were a few old maids and an orderly or two, but no doctors. He suffered nine days in that place with a broken limb; just think of it, Mr. Speaker. Of course, they were kind to him in other ways, and he got his board. He was going to break away and get out on the streets, but they got word to Sir George Perley, and he looked after him and took him to a Canadian hospital where there was plenty of room and lots of doctors and nurses. He made inquiry and found that at that hospital they had been without work for some time. Here was one of our good Canadian soldiers suffering day and night in a hospital where there were no instruments to treat his broken limb and where there was nobody to help him. I said: "Why do they treat the Canadian soldiers that way?" "Well," he said, "the Minister of Militia"—he was referring to the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes)—"had made good arrangements for hospitals, but after he was discharged—"

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McGIBBON: "—they would not keep a man in a hospital that the ex-Minister of Militia had arranged for, notwithstanding the fact that in those hospitals there were paid Canadian doctors and nurses." He told me that they distributed the men all over England and Ireland. I asked him what was the reason for that, and he said that so far as he knew anything that had been done by the ex-Minister of Militia was claimed by others as being not right and was not acknowledged at all.

That is one thing. Then he said there was another thing, if they did go to the Canadian hospitals, there was no chance of graft or of rake-offs, and that was, he thought, the principal part of it. He was side-tracked and lay nine days in this place without medical aid. I do not think any hon. member on this side of the House criticises the doctors.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. McGIBBON (Argenteuil): The doctors have done wonders. My sympathy goes out to members of this House and others who have lost sons in France in this great war and, it is not surprising that we endeavour to have an investigation in order to find out who is to blame. No doubt many other soldiers were treated like my friend with the broken limb, being sent to places where they did not receive proper attention. I think, with all respect to the Union Government, it would be in their interest to have an investigation, without politics being brought into it, in order to find out where the blame lies.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has taken a good deal of responsibility upon himself in placing before the House and the country the exaggerated statements which he has read to us to-day respecting the Canadian Army Medical Service. It is my purpose to deal more particularly with certain charges which have been made respecting the Canadian Army Medical Service and the policy adopted with respect to the treatment of wounded in 1916, at the time when the

Babtie commission was appointed. I purpose dealing with that period because it chanced that I was overseas in the fall of 1916 and was closely associated with Sir George Perley who has come under severe and, in my view, wholly unjustifiable criticism respecting the appointment of the Babtie commission.

Before, however, dealing with that period and the conditions which then prevailed, I desire to make reference to some of the sweeping charges which have been made by General Smart with regard to that gallant soldier General Sir Richard Turner and his gallant associates at Argyll House. It is a very simple matter to make general statements regarding a body of officers, but no general statement of a condemnatory nature regarding any body of officers in Great Britain can be true. Gentlemen returning to Canada may feel, with respect to certain officers with whom they have been brought into contact, that they might have been, let us say, more courteous or more considerate in any particular matter in which they were concerned, but to make a general condemnation of the officers of Canada at their Argyll House headquarters appears to me to be a proceeding absolutely without justification. I do not believe any such charges will find support in London where the situation is known, amongst the members of this House who have returned from overseas, amongst officers generally who have served overseas, or amongst the people at large.

General Smart is reported in the Montreal Gazette as stating with respect to General Sir Richard Turner that he is a weakling, surrounded by weaklings, and a man who listened too much to tattle and intrigue. I leave it to any hon. gentleman in this House who has served overseas if that is a proper description of General Sir Richard Turner. I saw him at the front before he was appointed to command in England, and I know of no man who had in higher degree the respect of the Canadian Expeditionary Force than had General Turner. He won the Victoria Cross, and it seems to me a most extraordinary thing that any returned officer should criticise as a weakling a man of his proven courage and high standing.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have never read General Smart's statement and I never heard before that he called General Turner a weakling.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am quoting from the Montreal Gazette of Saturday, March 15, in its despatch from Quebec:

> General Smart in telling of medical conditions brought condemnation to bear against certain high officials, and as regards general army administration described General Sir Richard Turner as a weakling, surrounded by weaklings, and a man who listened too much to tattle and intrigue.

In a cable report which I have before me General Turner is stated to have made, at a luncheon held in London on April 5, the following remarks with respect to these charges:

> General Turner followed, and said: "I have never spoken or written to anybody in Canada asking them to take up the cudgels on my behalf. I do not consider there is any need to do so. Criticisms have been made upon men associated with me at headquarters. I have been responsible for recommending to the minister the following officers: Generals Thacker, Hogarth and Foster; Colonel Hastings, and my personal aide, Major Nickle. Argyll House, which has been so much abused, consists of only 63 officers. I know what a load they carry. There have been remarks lately concerning lack of co-ordination and co-operation between Canada, England, and France. I cannot help feeling that these lying and malicious statements have been bred and fostered in many instances by disgruntled and discredited officers, some of whom have been returned to Canada for inefficiency or for other causes."
>
> General Turner concluded with the following comparison: Australians returned, from date of armistice to April 1, 50,400; Canadians, 117,500.

I ask this House if, within a period of four months, 117,500 men have been returned to Canada, if Argyll House can be so inefficient as is evidently the opinion of some of these returned officers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it a fact that 20,000 were returned since the Rhyl riots?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is quite probable, but the point I make is that if 117,500 men have been demobilized within four months, Argyll House must be anything but inefficient.

Mr. VIEN: Is the minister aware that most of the complaints are not as to the number of men returned, but as to the discrimination shown in giving the men places on the steamers; that there has been unfair discrimination in bringing back the men. In some cases the last to go overseas have been the first to return home.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The policy which the Government desired to have put into effect was that those who had been overseas the longest should be the first to return, but the Canadian corps themselves desired to return by units, and we have

had regard to the wishes of the Canadian corps. Consequently, some who went over later, by reason of their being in a certain unit, have come back earlier than some who preceded them overseas.

Mr. VIEN: Is not my hon. friend aware——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the House is not in Committee, and that the rule that a speaker shall not be interrupted except to ask a question, and with his consent, has not been followed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is one other matter I wish to refer to, and that is the charges that have been made against Sir Edward Kemp and Sir George Perley with regard to Canadian members of the Royal Air Force. As I understand it, that is an Imperial Force. I saw a statement, attributed, I think, to one of the officers whose names have been mentioned by my hon. friend this afternoon, that Sir George Perley ought to be crucified for his treatment of the Canadian members of the Royal Air Force.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would not go as far as that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cabled Sir George Perley to ascertain what he had to do with the members of the Royal Air Force, and he replied as follows:

> There must be some misapprehension as I have no authority regarding Royal Air Force. Have, however, on all occasions assiduously promoted their interests and done everything possible to give support to reasonable claims all Canadians serving in Imperial Forces. For example, I have intervened and secured that Canadian cadets in Air Force should be entitled to honorary commissions on discharge and outfit allowances. Have also taken up many personal cases and have arranged with Air Ministry for special investigation. Have also pressed in direction of expediting demobilization and must say my representations have been received sympathetically by Imperial authorities. Chief difficulty is inadequate shipping accommodation regarding which we are seeking in every direction for relief.

Sir George Perley responsible? He has no authority respecting the Royal Air Force. He has done everything a man could do. What does Sir Edward Kemp say about the matter? Replying on April 2, 1919, he says:

> Assume you refer to Canadians not on our strength but those who enlisted in Canada in R.A.F. or were transferred outright by us here to R.A.F. Imperial Government admits its obligation to repatriate these men free of charge. Difficulty is entirely one of shipping accommodation. On behalf these airmen for some time past we have been pressing Imperial authorities constantly with necessity making arrangements for their return to Canada. We have arranged for two hundred to sail on Megantic leaving to-day. There are eleven hundred still to go and Imperial authorities expect will be able to repatriate all of these during April. Will do all possible to assist.

I ask this House, is it fair to assail these two men—Sir Edward Kemp, one of the ablest administrators I have ever met, and one of the most honourable men that I know, and Sir George Perley, of whom I may say the same thing—with regard to their conduct respecting Canadian members of the Royal Air Force? Is it fair play? I ask my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) if it is fair play that these officers who have come back should assail these defenceless men in England who cannot make their defence here? Is it fair for my hon. friend to bring forward and sponsor these charges that they make against defenceless officers of the highest standing at Argyll House, against the Overseas Minister of Militia, and against the High Commissioner?

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (resuming): When the House rose I was dealing with certain charges made by General Smart against the overseas administration of Sir Edward Kemp and against Sir George Perley, the Canadian High Commissioner. In his discussion of the Rhyl riots General Smart makes the following reference as proof of the incompetency of Argyll House:

> Then the unnecessary delay. Almost every newspaper article about the Rhyl riots refers to delay. I don't want to place responsibility on the Admiralty, perhaps they are to blame, but more of the blame rests with the Argyll House in London. There is one case where the C. P. ship Minnesota was detained in Liverpool for one week because of poor staff work on the part of Argyll House. It was held up for a week, and we had to pay demurrage of $6,000 a day. That is no fault of the Admiralty.

To this allegation the overseas minister replies that General Smart's statement regarding the Minnesota, or as applied to any other ship, is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact. With regard to certain other references the cable from the overseas minister continues:

> Statements regarding friction between Canada, England, France and intrigue regarding Currie are without slightest foundation and have already been denied. On other hand, Currie stated publicly last week that he has had best of co-operation and support. Turner has also denied publicly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to what I desire to speak upon chiefly, namely, the charges made by General Smart with regard to the overseas administration of the Canadian Army Medical Service. When I was overseas in 1916 I visited many Canadian and Imperial hospitals, and talked with scores of officers at the front and in England, and I had an opportunity of consulting with medical men of the highest standing in London. I have on numerous occasions discussed all phases of the war with returned officers and men, and if there is one thing I have heard more than another in connection with the conduct of the war it is that the Canadian Army Medical Service is almost in a class by itself for excellence. I do not believe that any army in history has had the care that the Canadian army has enjoyed with respect to its sick and wounded. One does not like to boast about these matters, but I have yet to hear from any officer who has returned any substantial criticism of the work of the Canadian Army Medical Service. I have known officers to state that such and such a member of the staff, while highly efficient, was rather curt and somewhat uncivil, but they also admitted that the man had duties requiring his attention day and night, duties of the most arduous and responsible character; and it is very much better that a man should be highly efficient, even if he is occasionally curt, than that he should be inefficient though always courteous. The ideal, of course, is to have one who is both efficient and courteous—and I may say to my hon. friend that I think that is what he always finds in the present ministry. With regard to General Smart's charges against the Canadian Army Medical Service, I wish to read from his speech in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, as reported in the Montreal Gazette of Saturday, 15th March, 1919:

"I say without fear of contradiction from any impartial source that the medical administration overseas has been bad," said the General. "It has been callous and careless, and there is vast room for improvement Personally I have no confidence after four years' experience overseas in those who are administering the affairs in England to-day. I take it that those men who have suffered, officers and men, are entitled to the best that we can give them, that is the very least that we owe."

A few days later General Smart saw fit to moderate this sweeping condemnatory criticism of the Canadian Army Medical Service, and in a letter to the Montreal Star, dated March 29, two weeks later, he paid a very handsome tribute indeed to the treatment of soldiers in Canadian hospitals. He said:

The treatment given to sick and wounded in Canadian hospitals, both in France and England, was the best to be had anywhere in the whole battle zone. No words of mine could adequately express my admiration for the Canadian doctors and nursing sisters generally.

There were many medical officers of the very highest standing in their profession, from all parts of Canada, attached to Med. H. Q. London, among whom I might mention in addition to Col. Roberts himself, Col. Armstrong, Col. Finley, Col. Primrose, Col. Stuart, Col. Hutchison, Col. Martin, Col. Adami.

If the administration of the Canadian Army Medical Service overseas was so bad, how does it chance that the fruit of that administration is so excellent? How is it that from such an inefficient administration we get results probably greater than those achieved by any other army in the field? If the direction is so bad, how is it that the machinery is working so admirably? General Smart himself paid a tribute to the excellence of the care given to the Canadian sick and wounded in Canadian hospitals. He goes on to say, in his speech in the Quebec Legislature:

In 1916 a policy was enforced whereby the Canadian wounded coming from France were not sent to Canadian hospitals, but were scattered throughout England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. I understand and believe this policy was inaugurated by Sir George Perley, the High Commissioner of Canada. It was inaugurated in opposition to protests that it was not fair to deprive Canadian wounded of the very best treatment that could be had for them in the Canadian hospitals. Sir George Perley had his way, and that policy was put into effect with results that I will indicate later. The medical services of Canada at that time were under the control of the Imperial Medical authorities and there was a terrible mix-up between their hospitals and ours and their staffs and ours, and we supplied them with some ambulances. That was an unsound policy right along, but was shoved down the throats of the Canadian authorities by Sir George Perley. The Canadian Government sent Colonel Bruce to look into the whole question and surrounded him with a number of capable officers. He made certain recommendations, among them was the abolition of this system of scattering our wounded throughout the British Isles. I have not a copy of his recommendations before me, but I saw them, and say they were very sound from an administrative point of view. I am not attempting to criticise the professional side of the question, but I was responsible for administration and discipline. Shortly after we had a change in the Ministry of Militia, and Sir George Perley also became overseas minister of militia. It was quite evident that he did not fall in with the recommendations made by Col. Bruce, and in order to get rid of him, and I believe it was done deliberately, a committee was appointed to consider his recommendations, and that committee was presided over by Surgeon-General Sir William Babtie, one of the heads of the Imperial Medical Service. I would like to tell you who

General Sir William Babtie is. He was the medical officer who was responsible for the break-down of the medical services in Mesopotamia, and the Royal Commission who investigated that gave a finding that was strong in the terrible responsibility and crime that was perpetrated on the men in that particular campaign. It is almost unfit to print, the terrible things that those men had to endure, and this man, Sir William Babtie, was responsible for it.

There are two features of the indictment to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. First, he says that there existed a system of scattering our wounded throughout the British Isles. It is very difficult to refute, except by the evidence of those who have had experience, any statement in respect to the quality or character of the service in Great Britain or on the continent. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve said this afternoon that General Smart was a gallant officer and a good Conservative. These are high qualifications, and I am quite willing to accept my hon. friend's statement. I have known General Smart for many years, and certainly I have no intention of in any way reflecting upon his character or standing. My hon. friend knows however that General Smart is not a physician, nor has he had to do immediately with the problems with which the Canadian Army Medical Service has had to grapple. These problems have had to be dealt with by the officers of the Canadian Army Medical Service. As against this statement of General Smart, which generally condemns the Canadian Army Medical Service by reason of the policy which it states ought to be adopted, I desire to cite an opinion which will, I venture to say, command the attention and respect of this House. Only within the past few days, I have received a letter in respect to General Smart's charge. It is from a man of the highest standing in the medical world of Canada. I refer to Sir Andrew Macphail, D.A.D.M.S.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why did you not get a letter from Dr. Bruce?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to Dr. Bruce a little latter. I will deal fairly and justly with Dr. Bruce, who is of very eminent standing, and who has been a personal friend of mine for many years. But I am dealing just at the present moment with Sir Andrew Macphail.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where does he come from?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I might almost retort: He who says he knows him not argues himself unknown, but, as my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) is one of the best known men in Canada, that would not apply.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I asked a civil question, and I thought I would get a civil answer.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will; I was paying him a compliment. Sir Andrew Macphail is a professor in the medical faculty of McGill University. He served in Canada for five months and overseas for four years two of which were spent in France with the second Canadian division, and two in England at various camps, and at medical headquarters, London. I have received from him within the last week this letter:

To those who, like myself, are returning from overseas after four years' service in the British Expeditionary Force it was an extremely painful experience reading an account of the attack which was made upon the Canadian Army in the Quebec Legislature by Brigadier-General C. A. Smart, himself at one time holding a command in that force.

That part of this vague and wandering attack which concerns the medical service I feel competent to meet. I have been in this service continuously since November, 1914. During those years I served five months in Canada, two years with the Second Division in France and two years in England. At the front my service extended from Ypres to the Somme, and from the western front to the extreme limit of the bridge-head beyond the Rhine. In England it was my business to visit every hospital, and every camp in Scotland, and I was of that headquarters which is so wantonly attacked. With the experience so acquired it may fairly be considered that I am qualified to deal with one charge at least of which I have specific knowledge.

Brigadier-General Smart's most specific charge against the Medical Services is that "there is a scheme for scattering Canadian wounded throughout the British Isles."

The exact contrary is the truth. The whole policy of the administration is, and has been for years, to collect Canadian patients, as far as possible, into Canadian hospitals in well defined areas. Not for years have any Canadian patients been so scattered—none to Scotland, to Ireland, or even to the north of England. The Canadian hospitals in England are all placed in three areas; in the South-eastern area, to accommodate casualties from France; in the Liverpool area, for the reception and dispatch of troops; and in the London area for the local sick, and as a general reserve.

A complete organization exists for doing the very thing General Smart suggests, namely, to assemble Canadian patients in Canadian hospitals, and Col. Roberts was charged with this duty. There never was a policy of "scattering Canadian patients over the British Isles." The policy has been to evacuate casualties from the field with the utmost speed by convoys, and shelter these convoys for the time being, in any hospital available. Soldiers from all over the Empire fall side by side. There is no time on the field of battle to sort these men according to their place of birth. The battle of Messines Ridge opened at daybreak, and by luncheon the

wounded were coming by train-loads into Charing Cross.

Canadians who happened to be in an ambulance convoy cannot be left on the station platform, and a special ambulance train cannot be provided for a small number of men.

At all times during the war provision had to be kept in reserve for 10,000 Canadian casualties, and part of this reserve was in English hospitals. Otherwise it would have been necessary to keep 10 Canadian hospitals empty, though fully staffed, against such an emergency. Apart from the wastefulness of such a policy there are not ten buildings in England available for standing empty against the hour of need.

The Canadian Army was not an allied army. It was of the very essence of the force. Canadian casualties could not be immediately separated from their stricken comrades who were not Canadians. In the early days when hospital accommodation was yet incompletely organized any refuge—even V.A.D. hospitals—was welcome.

The movement of patients is one of the most delicate and technical in the operations of war, and all movement would cease if a rigid rule were made that every wounded Canadian should in the first instance be sent to a Canadian hospital.

The speed with which cases could be passed through Canadian hospitals depended in turn upon the speed of evacuation to Canada, and that was governed to some extent by the activity of German submarines. Now that hostilities are suspended there are comparatively few Canadians in English hospitals so that the policy of the service is being fulfilled and General Smart's objections met.

Andrew McPhail.

I stated that a couple of weeks after his speech in the Quebec Legislature General Smart addressed a communication to the Montreal Star, and on reading that carefully I find that he practically withdrew the charges he had made against the Canadian Army Medical Service and its staff, with the single exception, so far as I understand his statement, of those against one or two men. Therefore, so far as these charges against the Canadian Army Medical Service are concerned, General Smart has practically refuted himself. And yet my hon. friend brings his statement before the House with the intention of having the country believe that these charges of negligence in the care and treatment of the Canadian sick and wounded soldiers are well founded. I do not know anything more calculated to distress those people of Canada who have wounded or sick sons or other connections overseas.

Before taking up the question of the Babtie Commission, which alone remains of the charges put forward by General Smart, I desire to refer to one of the specific charges. I have stated that it is difficult here in Ottawa to refute general charges made with respect to the administration of a service in Great Britain or on the continent. It is impossible, apart from inquiry, to meet specific charges, which may or may not be founded in fact. One of General Smart's specific cases by which he would substantiate his charges against the Canadian Army Medical Service is as follows:

Then there is another case. A friend of mine living in London told me—

Second-hand evidence.

—that on his visits around the various hospitals looking for Canadians to do something for them, he came across the case of a Canadian who was suffering from a severe wound in the spine—so severe that he would never be right again and would not live long. Instead of being taken care of in one of the Canadian hospitals, where he would get the best treatment from trained nurses, he was in a lean-to attached to a V.A.D. hospital. (Cries of "shame".)

On the statement of a friend of his General Smart makes a charge that a Canadian, severely wounded, had been placed in a lean-to attached to a V. A. D. hospital, and such was the impression made upon the minds of those who heard him that there were cries of "Shame." The attention of the Overseas Minister was drawn to this matter, and he cables me as follows:

First, the case of man with wounded spine. Is doubtless case of tuberculosis of spine. Man was sent to be treated at hospital within three miles of home of his people, the recognized treatment being open air. Lean-to is a chalet, an open-air structure specially built for such cases. Man is being treated among his own personal friends and relatives by medical officer who fought with him and shared his dangers in firing line. Man himself has earnestly expressed wish that he be allowed to remain and continue treatment in neighbourhood his family. Also may add he is improving.

Now, I ask this House, is it fair to make a charge against an overseas minister based upon a statement made in conversation by a friend without inquiry by General Smart? Is it in the national interest at this time that a man burdened as Sir Edward Kemp is, with the duties of administration of the Canadian forces, first in Great Britain and then in Canada, should have to make inquiries with regard to a charge of this kind, which rests absolutely upon no foundation? And I refer again to what I stated before six o'clock, that it does seem to me that it is objectionable in the extreme that charges should be made against defenceless ministers and defenceless officers overseas. Many of these men at Argyll House, it has been drawn to my attention, are working literally day and night. They are making great personal sacrifices. Their private affairs urge

their return at the earliest possible date; yet, impelled by the sense of duty and devotion which has carried them so far, they are going on. But charges of this kind made in Canada by returned officers is tending to demoralize those men, because they feel absolutely helpless and defenceless. They do not know what charges are being made behind their backs, they are not here to answer for themselves, and it seems to me that the least that could be done by returned officers, if for no other reason than a sense of chivalry, would be to communicate their charges to the officers overseas against whom they are making them, so the latter may have an opportunity of reply and defence.

Before I leave the matter of the Rhyl riots, let me repeat what was stated by the Minister of Militia this afternoon, that a full inquiry is being held into that matter. It does not appear to me, therefore, that it is open for discussion, pending the findings of the court of inquiry which was at once constituted by the Minister of Militia. I do not, of course, desire to limit the freedom of the House in debate—I have neither the power nor the will to do so—but it seems to me to be a recognized rule that where a matter is under judicial inquiry it is well that comment should be refrained from until the inquiry is completed and decision rendered.

But the member for Maisonneuve referred to the fact that shipping had been available since the riot. I wonder whether the hon. member realizes what the shipping situation of the world has been since the armistice. Consider the supplies that have to be taken down the Mediterranean to areas where there are still forces of the Allies, to Mesopotamia, and to other ports of Asia Minor; consider the shipping required for the transportation of the troops back to India; the shipping required to move the Australian and New Zealand contingents home; the shipping required to bring home the troops of the United States and to bring home our own troops. And in addition to all that, shipping is required for commercial purposes on an ever-increasing scale. The demands upon the shipping of the world since the armistice have been tremendous and it is with the greatest possible difficulty that shipping is arranged for in advance. Even after arrangements had been made in perfect good faith between the Admiralty and the Overseas Ministry, sailings sometimes have to be cancelled; arrangements cannot be carried out because of the exigencies of after-war conditions. That is not to be wondered at. It is normal for a period of this kind; it is what you must expect. In the face of these shipping difficulties, the Canadian Overseas Ministry and our Militia Department here have demobilized to Canada nearly 120,000 troops in four months. It is a wonderful achievement, Mr. Speaker; I do not believe there has been a like achievement on the part of any of the Overseas dominions. We are closer to Great Britain than Australia or New Zealand and more shipping is available as between Great Britain and the American continent than between Great Britain and Australia and New Zealand. But after stating that, it must be recognized that the feat of bringing practically thirty thousand men a month—dependent as we are upon two railways to the Atlantic coast and the accommodations of our ports there—reflects the highest credit upon all concerned.

My hon. friend suggested that if the riots had not occurred possibly as many men would not have been brought back; in other words, that the riots brought about a greater amount of shipping for the transportation of Canadian troops. Well, I do not say that that is true, but assuming that it is, is there any reflection upon the Overseas Minister of Militia or the Militia Department here? How is Canada to obtain shipping from the British authorities except by influence and persuasion? Ever since he went overseas Sir Robert Borden has used his best endeavours—and I do not know of any man who is more influential with the British authorities than he—to obtain as much shipping as possible, not only for the transportation of our troops but for the movement of commerce to and from Canada. Sir Edward Kemp has given the matter assiduous and continuous attention, and so, to my knowledge, has Sir George Perley. That being the case, suppose shipping was not available before the Rhyl riots and that as a result of the riots certain shipping which had been allotted to other purposes was allotted to the purpose of bringing home Canadians; is the Overseas Minister of Militia to be blamed? Not if he had used his best endeavours to secure shipping—and I have stated that he has used his best endeavours, and that the Prime Minister has supplemented those efforts in every way possible. I recall that before the armistice, as high an authority as Lord Shaughnessy— and there is no higher authority upon transportation — estimated that it would take at least ten months, if not longer, to bring home the Canadian forces at the front. Yet, such has been the ad-

ministrative ability of the Overseas Ministry of Militia and the services there that they have demobilized in England some 300,000 men, of whom 120,000 have been returned to Canada—all in the period of a little more than four months.

Now I come to the Babtie Commission. General Smart visits severe condemnation upon Sir George Perley, holding him responsible for the appointment of the Babtie Commission, and suggesting that his purposes were not creditable. He says that Sir George Perley desired to get rid of Colonel Bruce and that he appointed the Babtie Commission for the purpose. My hon. friend said this afternoon that Sir George Perley found Colonel Bruce's report so severely against the Government that he appointed the Babtie Commission. He says that Colonel Bruce made a report and that it was ridiculous to have other commissions investigate that report; now he asks us to investigate the report of the Babtie Commission. Let us hear what General Smart has to say about Sir William Babtie:

> He was the medical officer who was responsible for the breakdown of the Medical Service in Mesopotamia, and the Royal Commission which investigated that gave a finding that was strong in the terrible responsibility and crime that was perpetrated against the men in that particular campaign. It is almost unfit to print, the terrible things that those men had to endure, and this man, Sir William Babtie, was responsible for it.

Now let us find out what this man Sir William Babtie is. He graduated from Glasgow University, entered the Army Medical Service in 1881, served in the South African war and received a medal and five clasps, also the Victoria Cross. General Turner, who is also a winner of the Victoria Cross, is spoken of by General Smart as a weakling. Sir William Babtie, winner of the Victoria Cross, is spoken of as a man who committed a crime in the Mesopotamia campaign. He says that it is "unfit to print the terrible things that these men had to endure," and that "this man Sir William Babtie was responsible for it." It seems to be a bad day for the winners of the Victoria Cross—one of them a weakling and the other guilty of a crime. Let us see what else Sir William Babtie is. In 1901 he was the Assistant Director General of the Army Medical Service; in 1907, Inspector of Medical Services; in 1910, Deputy Director of Medical Services; in 1916, Director General of the Medical Service of India, and, at the time he was chairman of the board, Director of the Medical Services at the War Office.

Sir William Babtie did come under certain animadversion in connection with the Mesopotamian campaign, but I find that in the British Hansard of the 17th June, 1918, Sir William Babtie is referred to in the following manner:

> —is not only under no personal aspersion from the Mesopotamia investigation, but has since been advanced to Inspector of Medical Services. Babtie has also just been promoted from Major-General to Lieutenant-General.

Winner of the Victoria Cross, with the experience in the army which I have mentioned and having been recently promoted to be Lieutenant-General, General Sir William Babtie ought not, after all, to be so bad a man to associate with.

In the fall of 1916 I happened to be in England, and I want the House to realize the condition at the front and the condition behind the lines at that time. It was in November and the battles of the Somme had been going on for months. This was one of the most critical periods of the war and a time of the greatest British and Canadian casualties. This war was not won in the last two weeks before the armistice; it was won in every one of the fifty months of its duration, and the hammer blows of the British army at the Somme, following the heroic resistance of the French at Verdun, wasted the German armies to such an extent as to make the campaign of the next year and the victory of last year possible. Sir Douglas Haig was applying the strategy of attrition, the same kind of strategy which General Grant used against General Lee at the battle of the Wilderness. It was a strategy of attrition, of wastage, of victory by killing. Sir Douglas Haig told me that at the Somme in 1916 there were 550,000 casualties in his army, and that he calculated the Germans had sustained a loss in casualties of over 700,000, a balance of 150,000 of wastage, of human casualties, in favour of the British and against the Germans. That is a terrible way of looking at the matter, but it was a condition of that static war. Think of 550,000 casualties, with the wounded to be brought back from the front to dressing stations, to base hospitals, to be brought in convoys across the Channel, to be taken to British or Canadian hospitals and, in fact, to be taken any place where there was a hospital or hospital accommodation. The British expected that their wounded would be counted by the thousands; they were counted by the tens of thousands and by the hundreds of thousands. I am told that the V.A.D. hospitals throughout the United Kingdom had in their care, in the fall of 1916, 53,000

patients. This meant providing accommodation equal to that of 53 hospitals of 1,000 beds each. I discussed the matter with the British as well as with the Canadian authorities, and they required all the hospital accommodation there was in the British Isles to take care of the wounded being brought back from the front.

I come now to speak of the report of Colonel Bruce and of the appointment of the Babtie commission. Colonel Bruce is one of the ablest surgeons in Canada. He is a man of international reputation as an operator. He has long held a distinguished position as Associate Professor of Surgery in the University of Toronto and as head of one of the surgical services in the Toronto General Hospital, and he had also other high professional positions. The then Minister of Militia, the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), believing that the Canadian Army Medical Service in England required re-organization, appointed Colonel Bruce for the purpose of making an inquiry and reporting upon conditions. Colonel Bruce made his report.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Colonel Bruce and the committee.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it is Colonel Bruce's report. Colonel Bruce had associated with him certain assistants, some of them well known to me, amongst others Dr. McEwing, a personal friend of mine.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Colonel Wilson.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He had certain associates with him. I talked the matter over with Colonel Bruce, Sir George Perley and many others whom I knew, surgeons and physicians from Toronto; and I was of the opinion then, as I am now, that Colonel Bruce's report was on the whole an excellent one. The difficulty about this controversy in regard to Colonel Bruce's report and the Babtie commission is that the facts are not understood. One would think that there had been some conspiracy against Colonel Bruce; that some commission had been raised up to destroy him. On the contrary, I recognize, Sir George Perley recognizes, General Carleton-Jones recognizes and the Babtie commission, as I shall show, recognizes, that there was very great truth in Colonel Bruce's proposal. I remember saying that I thought 80 per cent of the report was thoroughly sound; so let me make myself perfectly clear that I have no reflections whatever to make upon Colonel Bruce, quite the contrary.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why suppress the report then?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that. I think the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), who was my colleague at that time, acted wisely in appointing Dr. Bruce for the purpose. Dr. Bruce made on the whole an excellent report. Why was it necessary to appoint a commission for the purpose of passing upon Dr. Bruce's report?

Mr. LEMIEUX: First of all, why was he shelved?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not think he was shelved.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was sent to France.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think not; I think he went to France himself. When I went to London in November, 1916, I found this condition. A fierce controversy was raging in the Press and throughout the entire Canadian community with regard to what was called, and I think erroneously called, the question of segregation. It was almost as if the Canadian community was divided into two camps. I found the great majority of those men in the Canadian Army Medical Service, men whose distinction and ability were unquestioned, with whom I discussed the matter, were of the opinion that Colonel Bruce's report, while excellent, as I have said, up to a certain point, was not such that it could be put immediately into effect.

There was a very strong feeling prevailing in the Canadian Army Medical Service because in his report—I am speaking from memory, but I think I am right—Colonel Bruce had stated that the Canadian Army Medical Service needed reorganization from top to bottom. It was also put forward—because the men of the Canadian Army Medical Service were men who had given up their profession and had gone overseas at a great sacrifice—that Colonel Bruce had not sufficiently regarded the very heavy tasks and responsibilities which had devolved on General Jones and the Canadian Army Medical Service in the first two years of the war. Colonel Bruce, in his report, no doubt because he had immediately before him the question of making recommendations, had entirely overlooked the good work that had been done and was being done by the Canadian Army Medical Service in Great Britain and France. The spirit of the Canadian Army Medical Corps for the most part was offended by the report, because it failed to give them what

they regarded as their just meed of praise and appreciation for the work which they had done.

It is only fair to say that many members of the Canadian Army Medical Service, and distinguished men, too, whom I know personally, and in whom I have high confidence, were strong votaries of Colonel Bruce. They believed in his report. But I recall distinctly talking the matter over with two of these men, outstanding men in the medical world, who believed that the Bruce report was sound for the most part, but that it was not practicable to put it into effect at once. Now Colonel Bruce wanted to put it into effect at once, and there was a great deal of feeling about the whole situation.

More than that—and I come now to the most important point in Colonel Bruce's report—his theory was that the Canadian sick and wounded should be assembled, so far as possible, in purely Canadian hospitals in England.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I say "Hear, hear," too, if it would have been practicable and fair to do as he proposed, having regard to the arrivals of British sick and wounded from the front. Colonel Bruce, while an eminent surgeon, had had no military experience so far as I know. Just let me put it this way to the House: Supposing we had set out to build Canadian hospitals to accommodate all Canadian sick and wounded in London. That would mean that we must have a maximum of hospital accommodation. Supposing that after a great engagement there were thirty thousand Canadian casualties. To accommodate that number we would require thirty Canadian hospitals of a thousand beds each. Now the Canadians might not again be in action for months, and your hospitals would be gradually emptying. Let us say that through the gradual discharge of these patients you have 15,000 beds vacant, what are you going to do with them? Are you going to await the next great action in which the Canadians are engaged, or will you allow the Australians and the New Zealanders and the English and the Scotch and the Irish to go into those hospitals? If you say, "Yes, we will let them in to the extent that the hospitals are empy of Canadians," you have the hospitals filled. Then may come another great engagement of Canadians, and where are you going to put the casualties? The fact of the matter is that it was absolutely necessary that the hospital resources of the United Kingdom should be pooled for the purpose of taking care of the hundreds of thousands of sick and wounded from the front, no matter whether they were English, Scotch, Irish, Australian, New Zealand or Canadian wounded. Not only that. In all the hospitals that I visited I talked with hundreds of Canadians lying side by side with English, Scotch, Irish, Australian and New Zealand comrades, and enjoying the conversation of them all, and I asked them whether they believed that Canadian hospitals should be used solely for Canadian wounded. They said: "No, we do not want that; that would not be fair. These men have fought with us at the front, and why should they not have the advantage of these hospitals as well as ourselves?" They did say this, however: "We like a substantial number of Canadians in our hospitals, two or three hundred Canadians perhaps, because then we feel at home; but so far as the additional beds are concerned, by all means let them be filled up with the English, Irish and Scotch casualties and the wounded from the other overseas dominions." They liked to talk and exchange ideas with one another.

Now the controversy was raging in London, and it was put forward that Colonel Bruce's plan contemplated the segregation of Canadian wounded, or what is called in the Babtie's Commission's report "a watertight compartment for the Canadians." Now I do not believe that Colonel Bruce intended that; I want to be scrupulously fair.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did Colonel Bruce say that he wanted that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know that he did.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Better be sure.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not made the charge, but am simply stating what the condition was in London. It was put forward by members of the Canadian Army Medical Corps, and by men high in the public service, that Colonel Bruce's plan as regards the keeping of Canadian hospital accommodation for Canadians was not practicable. So strong was this feeling that a representative of one of the great Canadian universities told me that if Colonel Bruce's plan was put into operation he would ask his university to endeavour to get leave to withdraw their unit. That was the situation with which Sir George Perley and myself were confronted in November of 1916. Colonel Bruce had made

his report; he believed implicitly in that report; he desired to put it into effect. On the other hand, you had this divided opinion I have spoken of in the Canadian Army Medical Service, the weight of opinion there being against the plan. While this controversy was raging, battles were going on at the front, and casualties by the tens of thousands had to be taken care of. In that situation, what was the thing to do? My belief is that Colonel Bruce should have exercised patience. He should have taken time, working with Sir George Perley, to bring his plan into effect, because on the whole I believe it was a good plan and my hon. friend stated this afternoon that it had practically been carried into effect since. Now Sir George Perley had not the idea that for Imperial purposes the Canadian wounded should be scattered all over the British Isles. It is an absolute slander of Sir George Perley to state that. I know his views, because he discussed the question with me on numerous occasions. He believed that all the hospital accommodation in Great Britain, including the V.A.D. accommodation, was necessary for the casualties that were coming from the front. He believed that there should be a pooling of the hospital resources of Great Britain for the purposes of the whole Empire, but he believed also that, so far as practicable, Canadians should be gathered in Canadian hospitals with their own people, and receive the attendance of Canadian physicians and surgeons and the ministrations of Canadian nurses.

That was Sir George Perley's position, and I think it is a fairly sound one. Sir George Perley not only took the trouble to consult with members of the Canadian Army Medical Service in London, and with those whose opinion on the subject was valuable, but in company with myself he visited every divisional headquarters in France and Belgium. and discussed this question with the divisional commanders and their staffs. The one opinion was that the scheme was not practicable to be put into immediate effect. Sir George Perley and I were not experts. Here was this divided opinion, this controversy raging in London, and here was Colonel Bruce's report. What was to be done? Sir George Perley came to the conclusion, wisely, I think, that we should constitute a commission to make as rapid an inquiry as possible consistently with accuracy, and to advise Sir George Perley, as overseas minister, as to what should be done. If they found in favour of Dr. Bruce's report it would be almost conclusive evidence that the objections which had been brought against that report were unsound. How did we select that commission? I noticed that this afternoon my hon. friend used the expression "Sir William Babtie and some associates." Who were the associates? It has been suggested in this House once or twice that the Babtie commission was handpicked. Let us see whether it was or not. Sir George Perley's one desire was to get the best men he could to advise him upon that situation, and he chose men representative of three great Canadian universities. General Fotheringham, of Toronto University. was at the front in the First or Second Division, and he had no desire whatever to take part in this inquiry. Sir George Perley had difficulty in getting these men to act because they had their duties at the front. He got General Fotheringham of Toronto University; Colonel Ross of the medical faculty of Queen's University, a man of exceptionally good sense and sound judgment; and, representing McGill, he secured a man whose name stands as high in Montreal as does Dr. Bruce's in Toronto, —Dr. Elder, in charge of the hospital of the McGill University unit at Boulogne. These are distinguished names. Will any hon. gentleman in this House suggest that these men would conspire to make an improper finding with regard to Colonel Bruce's report? In addition there was Colonel Ashton, who, as is known to all the members of the House, has been a practising physician at Brantford, and was of outstanding executive ability, and conversant with the situation. These were all practical men. And I do not believe that Sir George Perley knew Sir William Babtie. It was desirable, as this was an army inquiry and as Canadians were part of the Imperial army, that the Imperial authorities should be represented on that commission, and the recommendation which Sir George Perley got from the proper department—probably the War Office—was General Babtie. That commission met and reported. We have heard a great deal in this House about the Babtie Commission report. It is an exceedingly fair report, and is in every way considerate of Colonel Bruce. It disagrees with him in certain essentials, but—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not let the public see it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was laid on the Table. Let us see this report about which we have heard so much.

Mr. CANNON: Is it numbered as a Sessional Paper?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say. A number of copies were laid on the table of the House in 1917—I think some forty copies—all we had. This one I got from the Prime Minister's secretary. The report has been made public and I will read the essential portions of it to-night.

Mr. CANNON: What about the answer of Colonel Bruce?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Colonel Bruce made no official answer, as far as I am aware. The Prime Minister stated that the report which Dr. Bruce made was not an official report. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in 1917, said—page 4954 of Hansard:

> On various occasions some hon. gentlemen have expressed their desire that a memorandum made by Colonel Bruce with respect to matters set forth in a report of the commission of which General Sir William Babtie was chairman, shall be laid upon the table of the House. I have given the matter the best consideration that I could, and I do not think it is a document which ought to be laid on the table of the House by the Government. It is not an official report, as Colonel Bruce was not requested or empowered by any competent authority to make the memorandum in question.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not a communication addressed to the Government, or officials of the Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have never seen it, and consequently I am unable to answer. I am reading simply what the Prime Minister said to the House in 1917.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Are we to understand that it is not official because he was not instructed to make a report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He was not empowered to make it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Wasn't Dr. Bruce at liberty to make a reply to Dr. Babtie without being requested by the Government to do so?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That might be, and yet his reply might not be an official report which the Prime Minister might feel called upon to lay on the Table.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Considering that Colonel Bruce was dismissed after his first report, would it not be an act of courtesy on the part of the Government to receive his defence?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not aware personally that Colonel Bruce was dismissed. It is news to me if he was dismissed; besides, I have not seen his report at all. I have read to the House the words of the Prime Minister dealing with it. Now, the board was constituted of the members I have mentioned, and was instructed to report as quickly as possible on the following points:

> (a) The criticisms made by Colonel Bruce: as to whether they are justified, in whole or in part.
>
> (b) The recommendations made by Colonel Bruce; as to whether the Board endorses and concurs in them; if not, in what respect does the Board differ from Colonel Bruce, and its reasons therefore.

The report goes on to state:

> It will be convenient to summarize here the principal points emerging from Colonel Bruce's report. These are:—
>
> (a) The concentration of Canadian sick and wounded in Canadian hospitals.
>
> (b) The suitability of V.A.D. hospitals for the care and treatment of Canadian soldiers.
>
> (c) The system of Medical Boards.
>
> Before offering any general remarks on these topics, the Board thinks it right to explain that up to February, 1916, the accepted policy was to provide special hospital establishments for Canadian patients; that about that date, owing to various considerations, practical and sentimental, it was determined, with the consent of the War Office, to deal with Canadian patients in the same fashion as British patients are dealt with, that is, by distributing them through the United Kingdom to the great series of central hospitals, each with its group of affiliated auxiliaries.

In the report of the special Inspector General—

That is Colonel Bruce:

> —the latter system is condemned, and a return to the policy of Canadian hospitals for Canadian sick and wounded advocated. The issue is a fair one, for there is much to be said on both sides, but the board after very careful consideration, has come to the conclusion that the policy therein recommended is not only unwise, but impracticable, having regard to the amount of accommodation that would be required owing to the increase of Canadian troops in Europe.
>
> All through the report of the Inspector General the dominating idea is a conception that the Canadian Expeditionary Force is something separate and apart from the Imperial Army, a conception that may be summarized as the "water-tight compartment" policy in matters medical. The board is of opinion that as long as the Canadian Expeditionary Force forms an integral part of the Imperial Army, such a view is no more possible in the United Kingdom than it is in France, and so long as Canadian troops continue to operate under the command of the Commander-in-Chief, British Expeditionary Force, it must continue to be impossible to discriminate in the medical arrangements of Canadian and British troops. The personal experience of the majority of the members of the board amply confirms this view, so far as the arrangements at the French front and at the overseas bases are concerned, and

the board has satisfied itself that it would be inadvisable to attempt separation on the return of the sick and wounded to the United Kingdom.

It appears to the board that to separate, on their return to England, men who have fought side by side, must tend to undo the bond of brotherhood sealed in the face of the enemy. The board is aware that these considerations of high policy do not strictly come within its purview, but cannot refrain from adverting to this aspect of the matter, because it would almost appear as if the report under consideration was based upon the conception that the Canadian Forces had a similar relation to the British Armies as that held by the Allied nations.

The policy that the board ventures to attribute to Colonel Bruce would have prevented the use of Canadian Medical Units in the Mediterranean, because Canadian troops did not happen to be employed in that theatre of war, and the sending of Canadian hospitals to Paris for the use of the French sick and wounded.

The board, too, is at variance with the contention that the services of the Canadian Army Medical Corps should in the main be confined to Canadian troops; Field Ambulances serve primarily the Canadian formations, but in the case of the Line of Communication units, their work must, of necessity, be largely with other than Canadian troops. This aspect of the case, it is fair to say, was repudiated by the Inspector General when placed before him.

The board feels bound to place on record that in some of the opinions—

In some of the opinions.

—expressed by Colonel Bruce he is misled by a lack of intimate knowledge of army organization and of the inter-relation of the various branches of the service, as, in some of his criticisms he has failed to make allowance for the sudden expansion of the army and for the unavoidable want of specialized training in its ancillary services. Such imperfections as have existed are rapidly being remedied, and it is plain truth to say that in no war in history has sickness been so well controlled or the sick and wounded so well cared for. The board, relying on its own observations and the evidence laid before it, is abundantly satisfied that the Canadian sick and wounded have been thoroughly well cared for, not only in the Central hospitals, whether British or Canadian, but in the Voluntary Aid Hospitals, which Colonel Bruce criticises. These latter hospitals are the outcome of a mobilization of the medical resources of the United Kingdom, and in them Canadian soldiers are not only well cared for professionally but are comfortable, happy, and at home. The board desires to emphasize its dissent from the criticisms of these institutions, which it believes to be unjust and undeserved.

Then the report goes on:

The other principal issue raised in the report of the Inspector General, the system of Medical Boards, is dealt with in detail hereafter, and the board agrees that there is much justice in the criticisms levelled at the complicated arrangements that have been permitted to grow up. With the reorganization proposed, the board is unable to concur, and has ventured, as the result of the combined experience of its members, to suggest a system that it believes to be simple and likely to be practical in operation.

[Sir Thomas White.]

There is no violent attack upon Colonel Bruce in this report. The report recognizes the good features of Colonel Bruce's report and agrees with certain of his criticisms. They do not agree with him as to the practicability of confining Canadian troops to Canadian hospitals having regard to the conditions prevailing at the front and the limited hospital accommodation at the time in Great Britain. The report goes on:

The Board does not concur in Colonel Bruce's view that a complete reorganization from "top to bottom" of the Canadian Army Medical Service is necessary. In its opinion the reforms he suggests would not remedy the defects he deplores, which are not due to the system but to inexperience on the part of officers, military and medical, and to defaults in administration which are commented upon in the detailed criticisms that the board has felt it its duty to record.

Then the board goes on to pay a tribute to the good work done by Surgeon-General Jones and his staff under circumstances of novelty and great difficulty.

The Board has not hesitated to criticise those matters, wherein, in its opinion, the Director of Medical Services has failed, but does so with great reluctance, for it is satisfied that much of what has been accomplished has been the result of his zeal and industry, while the good relations of the Imperial and Canadian services are largely due to the tactful performance of the many delicate duties that fell to his lot.

After dealing in detail with the question of the distribution of casualties and the concentration of hospitals, and pointing out that it is impracticable to earmark and collect Canadian casualties at the base in France, and that it would be difficult and inconvenient to direct them solely to Canadian hospitals in England, they go on to point out:

The special advantages that Colonel Bruce claims for a policy of concentration can be attained with existing arrangements, which are sufficiently extensive to permit of the utilization of the special skill of Canadian physicians and surgeons in all branches of medicine and surgery.

There are twenty thousand Canadian soldiers in hospital in the United Kingdom to-day, and the provision of special Canadian hospitals for them all would necessitate additional accommodation for nine thousand, and even this would not allow a margin for battle casualties. Of this number, the board is informed that between two and three thousand are being provided for by special arrangements with the Ontario Government and the Red Cross, and there are a large number of patients now in the United Kingdom who the board agrees should be returned to Canada, as they are unlikely to be fit for general service within a reasonable period.

The board cannot agree that there is a lack of efficient medical inspection in hospitals, but, while not reflecting on the efficiency of these inspections, the board agrees with Colonel Bruce and Surgeon-General Jones that additional in-

spection of Canadian hospitals, and of Canadian patients in British hospitals throughout the United Kingdom, is desirable, from a Canadian standpoint.

The report also makes the observation:

The comments made in Colonel Bruce's report on the V.A.D. Hospitals have been widely resented, and this Board is of opinion that these strictures are unjustified and regrettable. While the Board agrees with Colonel Bruce that patients could sometimes be more advantageously treated in, and more speedily evacuated from, large military hospitals, the advantages of the V.A.D. system should not be overlooked in this regard. In these hospitals the board found the Canadian patient well fed, comfortable and happy, and receiving an amount of care that is only possible in institutions organized on the line of "the home." This has been an enormous asset in the case of soldiers widely separated from their kith and kin.

Then there is this extract:

The Board disagrees with Colonel Bruce and is strongly of the opinion that the forces and resources of the Empire must be pooled to the utmost in this struggle, and that, therefore, interchange of personnel is desirable and necessary, in the interests of both services.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask the minister to explain where the question of responsibility would come in?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As to what?

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the officers are going to be distributed, as stated, where would the question of responsibility come in?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not enough technical information to answer my hon. friend, but without agreeing with Colonel Bruce that inspection is necessary, I have no doubt it would be possible, under a proper organization, to maintain a measure of supervision over Canadian soldiers in V.A.D. hospitals. The situation, as I understood it when I was over there in 1916 was that the V.A.D. hospitals were absolutely needed. I am speaking from memory, but I am positive the number was 53,000 in V.A.D. hospitals, the equivalent of 53 hospitals with an accommodation of 1,000 each.

The Report goes on to state:—

With reference to the remarks of Colonel Bruce that "the present Medical Board situation is a disgrace to the Canadian Army Medical Corps," and that "Medical Board work has often degenerated into a farce," the Board thinks it right to begin their comments on this section by remarking that on examination Colonel Bruce agreed that the use of the words first quoted were unjustifiable and had little or no application to the part taken by the Canadian Army Medical Corps in carrying out the procedure prescribed for them.

The Board agrees that there is a necessity for reformation in the Medical Board situation and in the classification of casualties, and is of opinion that an easy solution of the problem would be to adopt the British system so far as applicable.

Then with regard to the matter of records:

The criticisms made by Colonel Bruce are generally agreed to by the Board, which, however, would point out that they are of universal application and apply to all Medical Services in all wars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to read further from the report. I have dealt with the essential features of its criticisms, unfavourable and favourable, of Colonel Bruce's report. But I desire to make this point again. There has been a misunderstanding of Colonel Bruce's report and of the inquiry held by the Babtie Commission. My personal view is that it is a case where medical authorities differ, as frequently happens. They differed upon the important point whether it was practicable to carry into effect the recommendations of Colonel Bruce with regard to the assembling of the Canadian sick and wounded exclusively, or so far as possible, in Canadian hospitals.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the hon. minister give us the dates of the Bruce report and the Babtie report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that I cannot give my hon. friend the date of the Bruce report, but I think it would be October, 1916.

Sir SAM HUGHES: September and October, 1916.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Babtie Commission's report is dated 22nd December, 1916. Whatever was done was done in absolute good faith and to meet an exceedingly difficult practical situation which confronted Sir George Perley. He agreed with many of the proposals put forward by Colonel Bruce, but in the face of the adverse opinion of many of the Canadian Army Medical Service and of the doubt as to the practicability of carrying the proposals into effect, Sir George Perley felt justified in asking to be advised by a commission of experts who had had practical experience. That is all there is in the matter. In order that I may not by any possibility be misunderstood, I desire to say that I know Dr. Bruce to be a man of the highest professional ability, that he entered upon his work in all good faith, and that he made valuable findings, with most of which, so far as I was able to judge, I was in agreement. The question was: Could they be carried into effect? And in the situation

which I have described—and I think fairly described, because it developed quite naturally—the course taken by Sir George Perley was one for which I think he should not be criticized, to say the least. Whether the findings of the Babtie report are sound in all particulars, I am unable to say. I think to-day in England and on the Continent among authorities in the Canadian Army Medical Service and the Imperial Army Medical Service a difference of opinion would be found. Doctors differ; they differ in hospital practice, and they differ in military practice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with all the charges brought forward by General Smart, and I submit that, on his own admissions and on what I have placed before the House to-night, they are without foundation. It does not appear to me that any purpose connected with national interests could be served by an investigation of the findings of the Babtie Commission or of the situation that existed in England from 1916 down to the present with regard to the concentration or the disposal of our Canadian sick and wounded soldiers. There are no charges brought against the integrity of any person. At most there was a difference of opinion, which Sir George Perley tried to resolve by the appointment of a commission of experts.

With reference to the laying upon the Table of Colonel Bruce's report and the report of the Babtie Commission, I find that on the 7th of February, 1917, the Prime Minister laid both upon the table of the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does the hon. minister say it was printed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I thought it was; I am unable to say.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Was a printed copy laid upon the Table? It was not ordered to be printed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is the most innocuous report I have ever read, having regard to the amount of criticism it has undergone in this House. If any hon. member wants to see this report of the Babtie Commission that I have in my hand —it is the only copy I have—

Mr. VIEN: Would it not be well to have it printed in Hansard?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is pretty long. It will be sufficient to just put in the extracts I have quoted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the reply of Dr. Bruce?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Dr. Bruce's report is there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To complete the whole record.

An hon. MEMBER: Why not add the Jenkins report at the same time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have taken longer than I intended, Mr. Speaker, but I do feel that it is desirable that this question should be discussed in order that hon. members may be in possession of all the facts. The charges which have been made appear to me to be exceptionally objectionable, the more so by reason of the fact that those against whom they are directed are not in a position to defend themselves. Sir Edward Kemp will be in Canada within the next few weeks, he will be able to attend the present session, and I can promise the House that once he is in his place he will not refuse to answer any questions that may be asked him touching his administration overseas. I do not know any more capable administrator than Sir Edward Kemp, nor any man who has more unreservedly devoted himself to the onerous duties of his office during all the years of the war.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. minister ask Sir Edward Kemp to bring with him the Jenkins report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall take that into consideration. I never heard of the Jenkins report until the other day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am sorry. You will hear of it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Possibly. Just a word as to Sir George Perley.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Why don't you read it? You have got it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. I am told that Dr. Jenkins is awaiting the pleasure of the Government.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Why don't you read it yourself?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Sir George Perley, my former colleague, who is now Canadian High Commissioner in London, during this war has rendered service to this country upon which it would be difficult to place too high a value. I have been in almost daily cable communication with him during the war upon all manner of subjects, and I can confidently say that he is without exception the most capable business man that I have ever had communication with

respecting important subjects. His efficiency is of the highest possible character. Any matter that has been entrusted to him has been handled promptly, efficiently, and in a way to reflect the highest credit upon himself and his office.

I do not believe that the burdens which are cast upon these men in war time are generally realized. I think it is not too much to say that Sir Edward Kemp and Sir George Perley literally worked day and night during this war. They have had exceedingly heavy responsibilities. They would be the last to ask for any sympathy on that account; I certainly do not ask it for them. But when charges are made against men discharging the important duties that they have been and are now discharging in our national affairs, they should be capable of complete substantiation, and, it seems to me, should first be brought to the attention of those against whom they are made in order that opportunity of answering them may be afforded. We have come through the war, but we are in the midst of the most critical conditions ever known in Canada or in the world. These men are burdened with day-to-day duties, and it seems to me that it is unfair to overburden them with obtaining information on all manner of subjects in order to answer charges made against them in their positions overseas.

Lt.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House, namely the charges of General Smart, Colonel Pratt, and Colonel Price, for the simple reason that I have not yet had the privilege of reading their letters or their speeches. I missed the papers containing the reports and have not since obtained them. In any event, I shall not enter into a discussion of these things tonight.

I congratulate the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) on the very plausible statement he has made in regard to the Babtie and Bruce reports. I watched for these reports in this House, and tried to find out whether they had been laid on the Table. I went to the committee room and endeavoured to ascertain if the reports had been laid on the Table in order that I might see the Babtie report; but whether they were laid on the Table or not I have never yet been able to obtain—and I tried twice—a sight of either. I have the Bruce report but I have not the Babtie report; and the Bruce reply to the Babtie report has not yet been published. If the Acting Prime Minister were actuated by a spirit of fair play, as he professes to be, he would have seen that the Bruce reply to the Babtie report was presented to the House to-night. He knows that it is in existence; he knows that it is within his reach. Why the Babtie report is presented here to-night and the Bruce reply thereto is not presented passes my comprehension.

The Acting Prime Minister has stated that he is sorry those who make these charges do not run to Messrs. Perley and Kemp and to the officers at the front with their complaints with regard to maladministration and so on. But has the Acting Prime Minister himself been in the habit of doing this? Has he gone direct to men against whom complaints were made—men who were within his reach? I am afraid that the policy has been that the matter has gone in whispers when the gentleman to whom such a report might be communicated was within easy reach. Side-stepping and choosing the back-door way has been the policy of these gentlemen.

I do not agree in the slightest that Sir George Perley is a great business man. I had experience with him from the start in the war. One of the first things that met me in 1914 when I reached England was that concurrently with the arrival of the Canadian Corps, Sir George Perley, in conjunction with Harrod's and Sir Edward Ward, had made an arrangement to tax Canadian officers large sums daily for their rationing at Salisbury Plains. I had rationed the boys for twenty-five cents a day at Valcartier, and they were well rationed; but they were being charged, if I remember aright, seven and six pence, or something of that kind, on Salisbury Plains. I declined to accede to the business arrangements made by Sir George Perley, and two shillings a day, I think, was all I allowed officers to pay for rations in addition to the rations supplied. I could point to scores of other business transactions of a similar nature on the part of that hon. gentleman in connection with the force. So far as I could form a conclusion they all gravitated around the society influences of London, not around that which would benefit the Canadian service.

So far as Sir Edward Kemp is concerned, I have nothing to say with regard to his administration, as I was not there. But I was somewhat surprised to see that the policy now theoretically advanced by the Acting Prime Minister in regard to the criticism of other officers has not been car-

ried out by the Government in regard to General Smart, Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price. These three gentlemen are personal friends of mine; three good Tories, I am proud to say; three loyal men; three men who have served the country faithfully and well. Whether their criticism is right or wrong I am not saying, because I have not read the reports; possibly I do not know the details of them, anyway. But whether they are right or wrong, there has been a persistent attempt on the part of every Government newspaper, on the part of every Government propaganda, on the part of every Government camouflage, on the part of hon. gentlemen in this House, to belittle the standards of these gentlemen. That is not in conformity with the principle of manly fair-play that you would expect to exist between one Britisher and another. General Smart was one of the finest administrators it has ever been my privilege to meet. A year or two before the outbreak of the war I visited the camp at Farnham, of which he was in command at that time, and I found that there had been a smallpox scare, and some of the "stores" people were complaining that he had ruthlessly burned tents and blankets. I said: "What did you do in the matter, Smart?" He said: "I was requested by the Quartermaster General's department to hold an inquiry to ascertain whether or not these blankets were infected. I became satisfied, from the information of the medical officers, that the men who had slept on these blankets had had smallpox, so I burned the blankets first, and now we will hold an inquiry afterwards." A proper administrator was Colonel Smart then; a proper administrator, I venture to say, was General Smart in England.

As to the hint that General Smart was sent back from the front, it is not manly to send abroad the impression that there has been an attempt to create here to-day, namely, that General Smart was sent home from France because of incompetency or something of that kind. A cavalry regiment consists of about six or seven hundred men; a battalion of infantry has upwards of a thousand men. You can easily understand that five battalions of infantry would not fit into a line with five regiments of cavalry; so we decided to break one of the cavalry divisions up and divide it into infantry battalions. Accordingly, some commanding officers were disposed of. General Smart was not given the command of a brigade as he had expected, and he felt aggrieved. However, he was taken ill about that time—remember, he had served a considerable time in France before this, and had served valiantly and well. He is rather an outspoken man, and I do not know whether he would win the approval of those in the highest authority or not. He was not the type of man who would win the approval of those who did not want to hear the truth.

I would point out to the Acting Prime Minister and to this House that the whole trouble from start to finish in the administration of Sir George Perley—and I believe it is carried on more or less at the present time —is the suppression of facts. The Baptie report was published broadcast; the Bruce reply to that report was not published. Statements were made from time to time in the press in regard to inquiries into the Rhyl mutiny and all that sort of thing, and the public have had no facts given to them. Let us say an inquiry is proposed in connection with something in the Old Country. I can give the Minister of Finance and the House the result of one inquiry regarding charges made as to malfeasance in connection with one of the departmental subordinates who had been manipulating supplies for the benefit of certain officers. The senior officer against whom the charge was made took the matter up, and I have a letter written by an officer stating: "I have just been in consultation with the Minister of Militia overseas and we have Major So-and-So,"—the officer named who preferred the charge—"fixed, and he will go to France." That was the punishment inflicted on those medical men who stood out and demanded that there should be no malfeasance in any of the camps. While I was Minister of Militia, we had this sort of thing to deal with, and three times in succession the officer in charge of Taplow hospital sent men to the front line trenches because they had refused to be parties to manipulating to their own ends supplies destined for the men. This sort of thing went on and it has gone on since then. When the Jenkins report is produced —and there is or was a Jenkins report— it will show that end of the case up much more clearly than ever was dreamed of in the old days.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend know for what purpose Jenkins was appointed?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I really do not know. The first I heard of his report was when the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) asked a question about the "Jenkins report." I made inquiries and I found

out about it from the boys, because any fellow coming home can tell all about it. There is no secret about the Rhyl riots. I have talked with two of the ringleaders in the Kinmel riots who have returned home hale and hearty, and they have no hesitation in giving the facts. The statement is openly made by officers that the cause of the riots in the Rhyl camp was a cablegram sent by the Government of Canada to the overseas military authorities not to send any more troops out, to cancel the steamers because they could not get the men away by rail and could not demobilize them quickly enough in Canada. And this is confirmed by a statement made by Sir Edward Kemp the other day at the same public dinner to which the minister referred when he spoke of this love feast between Turner and Currie and Perley and Kemp and the whole gang of them—I do not know at what period of the dinner it occurred — that the Canadian authorities were wrong in seeking to keep back the demobilization of the men; that his, Kemp's policy from the beginning has been to shove them over, but that he had been held up by the authorities in Canada.

Major-General MEWBURN: Does the hon. gentleman make the statement that a cablegram was sent overseas to stop demobilization?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The minister should know about that. I do not know anything about it.

Major-General MEWBURN: I say distinctly that no such cablegram was sent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Then all I have to say is that the Minister of Militia should deal with his colleague overseas, Sir Edward Kemp. Moreover, I want to point out this fact, that the night when the 8,000 boys at Rhyl had been ordered to get ready to go to Liverpool, and the order came cancelling that, a Canadian officer who was in touch with the Admiralty was informed by the Admiralty that night that the ships were not going to sail, and the Canadian officer stated to the Admiralty officer: "Then there will be a riot." The Admiralty officer handed him a memorandum and said: "Do not blame the British authorities; blame the Canadian Government." I was not there but I have every confidence that that is absolutely true, and also that some instructions were sent by some one in the Government of Canada to stop these troops from coming home. I am not finding fault with that. But that is not the way to deal with the men; let the men demobilize themselves, and let us put a stop to this eternal spoon-feeding of the men. I am not criticising especially; I am merely stating the facts.

As regards General Turner and Argyll House, I have not one word to say against General Turner except that he was compelled to give up his command at the front, where he should have remained in command of a Canadian corps, and to come back to England where it would be an utter impossibility for any man to carry on the administration as he was expected to carry it on.

As to the harmony existing between Canada and England, I know nothing further than that I could, if I chose, make some revelations. All was not smooth sailing between Canada and England after the dual control was created; but a love feast was held last year, whereby the friction which had been going on between the Canadians in Britain and the Canadians in France was smoothed over as far as possible for the time being, but every one in the force knows about the bad feeling that existed then. Why should those men communicate to the public the charges against the people of Argyll House? This is the place to make charges, and if the people of Argyll House, or the ministers, feel aggrieved they have every opportunity of setting forth the facts in this House. All these reports and copies of the cables cancelling the sailings of those ships should be tabled. Then the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) could read them, and if he found he was misinformed he could have refrained from bringing in his motion and wasting the time of the House as has been done to-day. I wish to point out that while I was minister there was an order: Let the clear light of day get in on these things, and then we shall know where we are at.

I have on the Order Paper motions which, before the end of the session, I shall discuss in chief and without any equivocation. These motions deal with much that has been discussed here to-day, and I shall, therefore, not detain the House on the present occasion, but I will say this as regards the Bruce report. When war broke out we went overseas, we found everything under the control of the British War Office, and I was amazed to find it stated in the Babtie report that it was advisable that there should be Imperial control of the medical services. That is what I fought against in regard to every service during 1914, 1915 and 1916 while I was overseas. So far as the British Government is concerned, the moment anything was referred to them they understood the situation; but when one

came to the subordinate military officers no one could be found who was not anxious to grasp and control everything. When I went overseas first as Minister of Militia of the Dominion of Canada I was not even recognized by General Alderson as having any say in connection with the force. Lord Kitchener himself, as I pointed out before in the House, said to me: "You do not claim any control over these troops, do you?" I said: "None excepting what the law allows." Sir George Perley said to me: "You do not pretend to have anything to do with these soldiers, do you?" I told him I was not aware that he was thoroughly posted on military questions and I did not want to discuss the matter with him. When Lord Kitchener asked me what control the law allowed, I referred him to Section 177 which is the one that deals particularly with troops such as we were sending over, that is, where a colony raises and pays for her own troops in the field.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the Army Act?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. I have brought that up half a dozen times in this House. The British law says that a colony raising and maintaining her own troops in the field is supreme with those troops as regards making every appointment from the highest to the lowest, and in the management of those troops in the field except as regards the direction of the Commander in Chief of the British Army. Under the law the British authorities have no control direct or indirect of the training at Salisbury. Under the law they have no control of the rationing of provisions or supplies. Under the law they have no control over discarding wagons and harness and saddlery and things of that kind, all of the very best and unused. At Salisbury we had no say. I took the matter into my own hands the next year, and over-rode them completely. When the Canadian troops left Salisbury Plain, they left millions of dollars' worth of Canadian material piled up there in the mud that had been discarded by the British and supplanted by other equipment. They discarded our trucks costing from $1,800 to $2,400 apiece. They said we had three different kinds of trucks, and they could not get supplies for them in France. They supplied us with 51 trucks of seven different kinds; the details are all on Hansard, I have given them time and again. These fifty-one trucks cost us fifty-five thousand pounds sterling, or a little over twice the price we had paid for just as good a truck.

I challenge any one to name one solitary item of equipment of any description that these subordinates of the British War Office did not attempt to throw out at the beginning of that campaign, and supplant with their own equipment.

It was the same with the Pay Corps. While I was over there in 1914 I received a cable from Canada: "Are the Canadians in action?" I wired back "No" and a cable came back from my home county saying that so-and-so, a British reservist who went over with the Canadians, was reported killed. I looked the matter up and found that he had been drawing his pay up to a day or two before I looked at the record. And yet the British record showed that he had been killed in Flanders. We had muster parades then, and at the first parade a thousand men who were reported to be present were absent. We wiped out the British system of pay, and I put General Carson in charge. All I could get from the Canadian Minister of Finance and the Canadian Cabinet for General Carson was that he should "look after supplies," but I managed to slip in the words "and for other purposes." That is all I could get after a bitter fight. The whole thing was kow-towing to these subordinate officers of the British War Office who wanted to run the whole Canadian show. I said: We will run our own pay service, and put a stop to these fellows carrying money around in valises which very often got lost. We put a stop to that, and had every man paid by cheque. From that time on, although the Minister of Finance was worrying his great brain about the condition of affairs in England, on the financial side, when he came back from that famous trip to England with the Auditor General, he was forced to admit that he found the pay system perfect in every way from start to finish.

We were being charged two prices for our supplies. I wiped that out ruthlessly. I did not ask permission of the Canadian Government, because I knew it would take six months to get their consent. It took three months to get Max Aitken, the greatest man in the Empire, one who has done more to win this war than any other man living, appointed an officer. The objections came from here, not yonder. I will say this much: Lloyd George, Kitchener, Bonar Law, all recognized the rights of Canada at once. Section 177 was taken as the standard, and we were treated by them as an independent entity, subject only to the commander-in-chief.

When it came to the question of supplies I put Colonel Murphy and Colonel McRae

in charge, and everything went smoothly and well; but it was an up-hill fight. The medical service was run on British lines in the same way as the pay service and the transport service had been, all being run by subordinate officers in the British service. That was done away with. Our Canadian men who knew more about transport in five minutes than these men had known in a lifetime had to take the advice of young sprigs from the War Office.

I also objected to the canteen system over there, and wanted to follow our practice in Canada, where each battalion runs its own canteen. I was politely told by a British officer—you never saw anything to equal the politeness of these grafters—that this was a matter wholly within British control, that contracts had been let, and that these people could charge our fellows what they wanted. We soon regulated that, but it was an up-hill fight.

The next step taken was in connection with the medical service. I was not satisfied with it when I went over there in 1914. I was satisfied with the men, mark you, because no finer body of men, no equal body of men ever donned the uniform of a medical officer in this or any other country. When the Minister of Finance says that one of our universities was talking of withdrawing their unit, why was he not fair enough to say that the plan proposed was to divide these university men up amongst the different hospitals, so that instead of one hospital having four or five or six men from the best university in Canada wasting their time in one hospital their services could be utilized in other hospitals helping the more inexperienced men? I challenge comparison between the Bruce and Babtie reports. I will back the Bruce report every day in the week, and every week in the year. I challenge any one outside of the V.A.D. and the society organizations that wanted to keep these hand-holders and brow-rubbers going, to find a solitary word against the Bruce report that is worthy of consideration.

I want to speak of the Medical Service. In 1915 when I was over there I went to review a battalion, and only 300 out of 1,000 men turned up. I inquired the cause, and was told that they were convalescing here and there around the camp. I asked what the mischief convalescing men were doing around there. These men were doing no good to themselves nor to the men in training when they were allowed to convalesce around the camp in that way; so we had the convalescents gathered in central camps, and arranged in fifteen different grades, so that when a man stepped out of the fifteenth grade he was fit to take his place in the line against the Germans the next morning. The result was that instead of returning only about thirty per cent of our wounded, within a certain period we returned sixty-five per cent, which is nearly double the percentage ever shown by any other force in the world. That saved the country millions of dollars.

What else did we find? I asked General Jones, for the Prime Minister, then in England, for a list of hospitals where Canadian wounded were the first morning I arrived in England. Nearly three weeks later I got it. One week-end I was taking a run out into the country to call on some of these hospital people, and in Oxford I found sixty Canadians wounded, and not a solitary report from General Jones on these men. I went on to Cheltenham, Aberystwith, and to Cardiff, where 200 were reported to be present, and I found only three. General Jones' report was not worth the paper it was written on. The next year, in 1916, I found that a great many of our men were teetotally lost. However, I will not go into that aspect of the case further than to say this: I asked, with the authority of the Canadian Government, that Colonel Bruce should be appointed with a good strong committee of the most capable men to report upon the whole situation, and his report stands there.

The society influence around London has had a detrimental effect in this respect, but they have been forced to accept almost every recommendation he made in that report, and have adopted it to-day, I see, with the exception of these society influences around London. I shall not enter into that aspect of the matter to-night, as perhaps it may come again. At that time I went out of office. Colonel Bruce was not continued in office by the Canadian Government, but through the influence of friends, of whom I have the honour to be one, he was given service in the British army and his work was well recognized and has redounded to the credit of himself besides being of great advantage to the British army. But if his report had been carried out the men would have had the service of these splendid medical men who were wasted to a certain extent, being duplicated instead of being more generally distributed among the hospitals. As regards the segregation of these men, there is a society aspect that I shall not touch on at the present time, but which was a strong influence in

preventing the segregation of Canadians in Canadian hospitals. So far as the V.A.D.'s are concerned, Dr. Bruce objected to them because of their total inexperience, lack of proper supervision and isolation. We were paying seventy-five cents a day for the untrained nursing of our soldiers, and the British soldiers were getting our highly trained nurses, and were only paying seventy-five cents a day, which was unfair. I remember one morning the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy), who occupied your place for a time to-night, sent me a telegram stating that the mother of a soldier had spoken to him in regard to her son, who was in Welsh hospital and had written her a letter saying that he was dying, and would like to be taken to a Canadian hospital. The hon. member wired me to know if I could do anything in the matter. Within twenty-six hours we were notified by Gen. Carson that the boy had been taken from the Welsh hospital, where he did not understand the language, to a Canadian hospital; and three weeks later we received a second telegram saying that he was absolutely restored. I could give thousands of instances where boys cabled to be removed, and when I was in England they begged me, scores of times, to send them to Canadian hospitals where they would be among friends and not total strangers. There was a question of administration. Colonel Bruce undertook to hunt up lost cases, and it was found that there were seven hundred that were absolutely lost sight of. The medical department had totally lost them, but they turned up in less than a week, and hundreds more every week thereafter. Hundreds were lying around England that should have been sent home. There was no suppression of facts then, and wherever an officer was found to be negligent, or where it was discovered that there was anything wrong, we wanted matters remedied as quickly as possible, whether or not any one was hurt. Of course, we did as little as we possibly could to hurt any one, and if any excuses were offered we were willing to listen to them; but we took pains to see that the work was properly done. If not, those who were at fault had to make place for others. I shall not enter upon anything of a controversial nature.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has spoken of Brigadier-General Smart. Can he give us his opinion as regards Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am sorry I forgot Colonel Pratt. A seemingly confidential report has appeared in the Ottawa papers against Colonel Pratt. I do not for a moment think that the Minister of Militia and Defence in Canada would permit a report of that kind to get out, but it has got out. What are the facts of the case? Colonel Pratt offered to go over in any capacity in order that he might fight. He was too old and so they put him in a command at Dunkirk.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He raised his regiment?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. He had no military experience. But ninety-nine per cent of our boys had had no military experience, and some who had military experience were not too ready to go to the front, and so we took men like Colonel Pratt who was anxious to go. The point I want to make is that Colonel Pratt was at Dunkirk. The senior officer did not like Colonel Pratt's energetic, free and easy Canadian way, and so spoke of it. But when this old gentleman got into trouble with the Chinese coolies, Colonel Pratt undertook to handle these fellows, and in less than three hours he had restored peace among these five thousand Chinese and saved the butchery of a lot of Chinamen because they got scared at the shelling of the German guns. The senior officer was practically helpless. I do not think anything can be said that is too complimentary of Colonel Pratt's work in this war. When I was a member of this House twenty-five or thirty years ago, I found that sneaking reports could be made by divisional officers, some of whom held their positions because they could not earn their own living at anything else. These reports could be put in against a man, and the officer would not see them. I fought session after session until I forced the Minister of Militia and Defence to see that no adverse reports should be made against any officer by a senior unless a copy of the report was signed by the officer. I have never heard, directly or indirectly, one word derogatory of Colonel Pratt, and if this officer at Dunkirk has passed any such report, he has violated all the rules of honour. Colonel Pratt is impulsive, but it is the impulsive and daredevil men who do great deeds and not the easy-going men. I have never heard any criticism of Colonel Price. He is a gentleman of the city of Toronto and raised a splendid battalion. Military men are somewhat like preachers and doctors. I remember once having heard an old lady say that if you want to get into the good graces of a preacher you must disparage

his rival. The same truth applies to military men. Tell a military man that he is a much greater soldier than Colonel So-and-so, and he is highly pleased, and there is a great deal of that sort of thing going on in the military service.

An hon. MEMBER: It is human philosophy.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It may be, but it is cowardice. I have studied the characters of Canadian soldiers, and while some have faults and weaknesses, I do not think you can find better officers and men, taking them altogether than the Canadians at the front.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): After hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), I have come to the conclusion that Canada owes him a great debt of gratitude. He has saved us from the ravages of Imperialism, and has been able to go to the highest authorities in Great Britain and tell them that the Canadian soldiers were entitled to certain things, and to get them. I have always had a high opinion of my friend, the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and I take this opportunity of expressing it to him in the House. He has said, very properly I think, that the answer of Colonel Bruce to the Babtie report should have been taken cognizance of by the Government, and tabled. Colonel Bruce, who was a good soldier and a good medical man, made a certain report, eighty per cent of which is approved by the Acting Prime Minister; yet, the Government profess to have heard nothing from ever about certain aspersions cast upon him. Almost every one else has heard about them. It should have been the duty of the Minister of Militia, or of the Acting Prime Minister, to have inquired into this matter.

I listened very carefully during the whole course of the speech of the hon. Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn) I have always found him to be very frank on all questions in regard to which I have had dealings with him, and he was almost equally frank this afternoon. In making his answer to the Smart Pratt charges, he stated, in almost every case that he did not know. Every time some hon. member asked him for some information, the minister would say: Overseas knows; I do not. I have come to the conclusion, therefore, that the co-operation of which the minister was so proud this afternoon can hardly have existed to the extent which he boasted. If it does exist the minister should at any rate have more information from the other side. I think that, in this Parliament of Canada, we should have some one able to answer any questions we may ask in regard to our boys at the front, their treatment, and the general conduct of the war. I am not intending this as any great criticism of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia; as I said before, I have the greatest respect for him. But, constitutionally, some one should be in this Canadian House of Parliament to answer questions. I think that to a great extent the Minister of Militia is suffering from some of the faults of his immediate predecessor, and perhaps a little also for the faults—for he had some—of his former predecessor. Therefore, while giving him all the credit I can, I am simply making the statement that perhaps if he had been more ready to stand up like his predecessor and say to the people in England, and to the overseas ministers: "I want this done; I want it quick and I want you to ruthlessly cut off any expenditure"—and if he had carried on, in a word, as his predecessor did, we would have had greater satisfaction in this House.

To sum up the answers to the charges made by General Smart and Colonel Pratt, I have found them, as given both by the Minister of Militia and the Acting Prime Minister, to be to a large extent these: General Smart does not know anything about it; Colonel Pratt does not know anything about it; these men should not have carried on this way; they should have come to us and told us about it; we are the people they should have come to instead of going and telling the people of Canada that the boys were badly treated at the front. Is that the answer that is wanted? Is that the answer that the House of Commons is entitled to from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Militia? It is no answer to say that General Smart remained in England and that he was only 72 days in France. From the fact that these charges concern England, and England alone, General Smart would be in a better position to know something of the hospital administration there than if he had been in France for four years. The same thing would apply to Colonel Pratt. It is no answer whatever to say that these officers, both of whom had excellent records, did not go to France. One of them, we are told, offered to revert in order to go to the front. The other one was prevented, on account of the organization of the unit to which he belonged, and he later offered to revert to the rank of Colonel in order to proceed to France. It was found that there

was no place for him as a colonel in the Expeditionary Force in France. If he was not fit to be a colonel in the Expeditionary Forces, why is it that they kept him as a general training our Canadian troops?

To come to the main question, I have no doubt that had any complaints reached the Minister of Militia when he was in England he would have done his very best to remedy them. But it is not the custom in the army —it has never been the custom, and it is something which has been greatly discouraged—for army officers to go over the heads of their military superiors and make complaints. If they did make complaints, as happened in this case, if they did divulge some of the knowledge which they are presumed to have, we would find, as in this case, that they would be attacked by every sheet that is Government owned and Government controlled. In this case they are told that even their private lives will be exposed and that their conduct is discreditable. These men who have served in France must not, at the risk of their own reputations, or advancement, make any charges or statements.

In so far as the medical services are concerned, I was an orderly in that service myself, and I have nothing but praise for my gallant comrades, those men who, under fire of the worst possible description—stretcher bearers, doctors, and orderlies—were always able, courageous, and willing to perform their duties as Canadians should and to the credit of the Canadian service. I have nothing to say of the conduct of the men of the Canadian Medical Corps. I have nothing to say of the majors, captains, and sergeants. But in my opinion—and I have a certain amount of knowledge on the subject—the administrative end of the Canadian medical service, in so far as the higher command was concerned, was not, in 1915 or 1916, what it should be. I can very well understand that such should be the case without attaching any particular blame to any one. The Government of Canada were anxious to obtain for the service the very best doctors. They went to Montreal, Toronto and all the large cities and obtained them. They could not reasonably hope that a man who had a practice of $20,000 or $40,000 a year would work on the pay of an ordinary captain. Therefore, they made these medical men colonels, and these colonels, as a rule, were placed in administrative capacities at the head of hospitals. It is not reasonable to expect that an eye, ear, nose and throat specialist, or even a family physician, the moment he becomes a soldier, will be able to administer a hospital containing a thousand beds.

So it is only natural and a logical consequence of the state we were in that there should have been mismanagement and inefficiency in the higher command of the Canadian army. If there was no inefficiency after the Bruce report and the Babtie report were made, why was Sir Guy Carleton Jones later returned to Canada? I understand that shortly after these reports were made the then Director of Canadian Medical Services, Sir Guy Carleton Jones, was literally deprived of his command. If there were no administrative mistakes why did the Babtie report say there had been mistakes made by the administration? And that, Sir, is about the foundation of the Smart and of the Pratt charges. Why, therefore, should the hon. Acting Prime Minister say that these men are not doing their duty by their country and are not good officers when they make such charges?

Now the question of so-called segregation. In 1916 I was in hospital just a little outside London about the time the Acting Prime Minister stated he was there, and I remember the controversy which raged about this question. I think it was an extremely difficult question, a question which required the very best men to handle and a question about which, as the hon. minister says, literally one-half of the Canadian forces was against the other half. However, if the question was handled and decided only from the standpoint of the efficiency of the Canadian service, I agree with the Acting Prime Minister that it was properly handled, because at that time with the number of casualties coming in, I maintain, it would have been impossible to have segregation of the Canadians. But if the dispersal plan was adopted merely to please the Imperialistic friends of Sir George Perley who were parading the streets of London, or the medical men who were on the Babtie commission and stated as their principal reason for adopting such a system that they wanted to improve the Imperial ties, then, Sir, I am against it. I do not believe in carrying on Imperial propaganda at the expense of the casualties inflicted in the war.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of Argyll House. I have had very little experience with Argyll House. On most of the occasions that I had anything to do with it I was too junior an officer to be admitted to anybody I wanted to see—I did not even have a chance to get near him. But although the Minister of Militia may not have heard

of any complaints in regard to Argyll House, I can assure him that I have, and I know scarcely an officer or a private who has ever had anything very much to do about Argyll House but will say that it is one of the worst and most mismanaged institutions in the world. As to General Turner, I know him personally. He is a Quebecker —and I would like to say for the benefit of some hon. gentlemen opposite that there were eleven other generals from the city of Quebec in this war. So if these hon. gentlemen complain that we did not send the brawn to the war, at least we furnished the brains. General Turner is a hero. He won his V.C. by the greatest gallantry in the field in South Africa; he carried on in France; and there he attained as great success as any general in the British or Canadian army. He was taken away from the front and brought to Argyll House. I have heard it said that the appointments made in Argyll House were mainly political and mostly from Canada. The appointments were of such a nature that there is hardly a man in the Canadian force who did not have a word of complaint or something derogatory to say about Argyll House. Complaints were general. Nobody wanted to make any specific complaints, because he was afraid, as I have said already, of losing his place or chance of promotion in the Army; but nobody who could possibly avoid having anything to do with Argyll House went near it.

The question of demobilization has been raised. I wonder if the hon. minister is aware that either late in 1916 or early in 1917 a committee was formed in England, with Sir George Perley as chairman and Sir Montague Allan or Sir Andrew Allan as one of the members, and Major Sullivan of Winnipeg as secretary. That commission set to work and planned for the demobilization of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I congratulate the Government of the time upon having taken those steps; but the complaint I have to make is that a lot of time was lost in useless work. For instance, some practical jokers got busy, and sent out questionnaires asking for information of your wife's ancestors, and, in the style of the Ordnance Department, in describing your wife you would have to add " female," and so on and so forth,—this department got to work and those questionnaires were sent out all over the country. A plan was arrived at I understand—the hon. minister will correct me if I am wrong—by which the Canadian troops were to be demoblized by trades or occupations; that is to say, trades most needed in any particular district were to be sent home in their order of urgency, probably transport workers first, carpenters second, and so on. I do not know whether this plan was adhered to very long, but I think it probably could have been carried out. At any rate, when the armistice was signed we found the Government without any very pronounced plans. We found that there were complaints with regard to the boats when the first troops returned; we had an inquiry into the Northland, then we had the Metagama trouble and other troubles about the accommodation on the transports. The plans for demoblization were changed again, and very recently it was decided that the men wanted to come home by units. It seems to me that when these questionnaires were being sent out in 1917, and later it might have been ascertained by these same process as now whether the men wanted to come home by units or not, and the matters might have been arranged in far better fashion than they were. I was informed the other day by an officer in France who had just recently left the Rhine district, that at least three days a week the men were paraded to answer another lot of fool questions, and they were getting just a bit fed up on it. The rumour was about—I do not know whether it was true or not, but I think it was—that the Canadian Government had given up the Olympic and the Aquitania to the transportation of the American troops back to the United States, leaving the Canadians who had been over there for four years to freeze in English camps. I think that was one of the proximate causes of the Rhyl riots. It is more than likely that the extreme expedition with which our troops are coming home—expedition with which I agree—is due in large measure to the Rhyl riots. Inquiry was made in the House this afternoon as to how many men have been returned since these riots. I do not know, but I think that a very large percentage have been returned since that time. It is a fact, however, that the Olympic and the Aquitania have been taken away from the work of transporting American troops and have been bringing our boys home. That would seem to be somewhat of a justification of the riots and somewhat of a condemnation either of the Minister of Militia here or of his colleague overseas.

I understand also—and this I say to the credit of the Minister of Militia—that within the past month the authority which Argyll House had with regard to the em-

barkation or the disembarkation of Canadian troops has been taken away and has been vested more particularly in the Canadian Minister of Militia. If such is the case, the charges made against Argyll House would seem to be proved by the very action of the Canadian Government.

We should have a full, fair and frank investigation of these charges. If they are not true—and I do not know whether they are true or not—the Government has no reason to fear them. If they are true, then the Canadian Government and the people of Canada have a right to know how the Canadian soldiers were treated overseas. I maintain that if any Canadian soldier, whether he be an officer or the meanest private, has been ill-treated in a British or in a Canadian hospital to such an extent that he suffered physically in any way or to such an extent that he died; if Canadian soldiers are being kept in England or were kept in England beyond the time for demobilization by the inefficiency of Argyll House or of any other body, those who were guilty of such inefficiency and neglect should be brought to book. I believe that the people of Canada share that view.

Some charges were made this afternoon against British hospitals. Constitutionally, tempermentally and racially, I have had no great liking for England. But during the years that I was there, on the two occasions on which I was wounded I went to British hospitals, and for the brave nurses, the doctors and the orderlies of those hospitals I have nothing but the highest praise. I was in Miss Pollock's hospital on Weymouth street, London, for something like a month and a half, and later went to an English convalescent home. The treatment there was the very best you could get in any civilian hospital. On the second occasion I spent almost a year at the Royal Herbert hospital in Woolwich, one of the largest and oldest hospitals in the British Empire. There also everybody was kindness itself; all those engaged in work there went out of their way to do what they could, particularly for the colonials, more particularly for Canadians and Australians. They said: "These poor boys are from across the sea; there is nobody to look after them; we will look after them." We were looked after in the British hospitals so well that I cannot but refute any statement made against the people of England or the medical authorities in England with respect to the treatment of Canadian soldiers in English hospitals.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): The member for Muskoka (Mr. Peter McGibbon) intended to say a few words this evening, but had to leave to take a train. I had not intended saying anything on this subject, but as there are in the House three members of the medical profession who have served at the front, it might seem strange if they did not say a word or two to show that they are not absolutely ignoring this discussion. Of course, the three members of the medical profession who are in this House and who served at the front were not among those distinguished medical men mentioned by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White); they were just ordinary captains serving over there. Consequently, the trickeries that Argyll House is accused of are not, perhaps, within their purview.

The member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) through the generosity of his heart, made a defence of the medical men this afternoon. The reason that the medical men themselves have not risen to make any defence is that we are of the opinion that the medical men at the front require no defence. I look upon these charges as being directed not against the medical men, but against the administration of the medical department; so that those of us like the member for South Essex (Mr. Brien), the member for Muskoka, and myself, who served in various branches from the base hospitals to battalions in the lines and who are probably familiar enough with many phases of this question to contradict some of the statements made to-day on both sides of the House, consider that it is not necessary for us to defend the medical men.

The member for Skeena said that the medical men were brave. Certainly they were brave, but they were no braver or no less brave than the other Canadians and Britishers who went to the front, from the Tommies to the Brigadier-Generals. Practically everybody who went out there was brave; there was no cowardice at the front so far as I was able to see. I may mention in passing that one of the first Victoria Crosses won at the front was won by a Canadian physician of Montreal, Dr. Scrimger; so that the medical men do not feel that they are required to speak very much for themselves.

The member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) was also very kind; indeed all the speakers during the course of this discussion have been kind in their references to the medical profession. But the member for Victoria

made some remarks with regard to the women of the Voluntary Aid Detachment at the front, referring to hand-holding and brow-rubbing and so on. So long as human nature is human nature, a certain amount of that will go on, but outside of the ordinary amount of that which goes on in all spheres of life, I believe that there was no more of it among the women of the Voluntary Aid Detachment than there was among any other class of women. I saw their work out there in the base hospitals, and I believe that the vast majority of the V.A.D.'s deserve the gratitude of the whole civilized world for the work they did at the front. I do not think, therefore, I should be doing my duty if I did not say a word on their behalf, even if at the same time I have to take exception to some of the statements of the member for Victoria, for whom I have a very deep personal affection. But, like all good guns, he sometimes goes off at half-cock.

I repeat, in closing, that to my mind it is the administrative end of the medical profession at the front that has been attacked here to-day. For that reason, and because the Government have defended it, I do not feel that it is necessary for any medical man in the House to take up the cudgels on its behalf.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If I understood the hon. member aright, he stated that I found fault with the V.A.D's. I have never found fault with the V.A.D.'s. I have found fault with the system. And is he not aware that after the Bruce report, instead of the V.A.D.'s having little cubby-holes here and there throughout the country, they were all amalgamated with the large hospitals?

Mr. MANION: The hon. member is probably right. There were many things changed after the Bruce report. I admit that very frankly, and the Acting Prime Minister admitted that very frankly this evening. But I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman very badly if I did not understand him to refer jokingly to the brow-rubbing and hand-holding V.A.D.'s. I took that as a slight reflection on the women who composed that detachment. If I am wrong I withdraw my remarks.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were not the hon. member himself and every other medical man in England laughing at the system of the V.A.D.'s as it was at the beginning until it was reformed after the Bruce report?

Mr. MANION: I was not speaking of the system; I was speaking entirely of the V.A.D. work at the front, and according to my experience the Voluntary Aid Detachments, both Canadian and British, did wonderfully good work at the front and deserve the gratitude of all Anglo-Saxon people at least.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the charges that have been levelled here this afternoon by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the whole medical administration in connection with the war through which we have passed must cause some of us to ask ourselves how long our feelings are going to be harrowed in this House and out of it by charges of this nature. It is only a short time ago in this House that we were told frankly and fairly by one who, at least we presumed should know, that our boys had been forced into positions that meant practically nothing more nor less than deliberate and wilful murder in order that some officers in the Canadian corps might cover themselves with personal glory. This afternoon we heard it stated that a similar condition prevailed in connection with the Canadian and British hospitals in which our boys were put when they were wounded at the front. We heard it stated by the hon. member for Maisonneuve that this country is going to be saddled with a burden of tens of millions of dollars in pensions due to the maltreatment criminally administered to our Canadian boys in the hospitals in England.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With my hon. friend's permission, he does not, I am sure, wish to put in my mouth any statement which I did not make. What I said this afternoon was based on speeches delivered by three officers. These statements do not come from me; they come from General Smart, Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price.

Mr. BUREAU: Quotations.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am a new parliamentarian, a new member of this House. The hon. member, I believe, stated in this House in my hearing, that he was the dean of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: One of them.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Are we to understand that the hon. member will stand up in this House and put upon Hansard statements made outside of the House, and not accept responsibility for those statements?

If General Smart, Colonel Price and Colonel Pratt made outside of this House or in some other assembly, statements that were unfounded, and the hon. member for Maisonneuve repeats them in order that they may be scattered broadcast throughout this country, who then is responsible? Is it General Smart, Colonel Pratt and Colonel Price; or is it the hon. member for Maisonneuve?

Mr. LEMIEUX: They can be court-martialed if those statements are not true.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I question whether they can or not. They are made not by Generals or Colonels, but by civilians.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They can be summoned for libel, can they not?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Can a man be taken up for libel who makes a statement in the privileged sanctuary of the Legislature of Quebec or in this House, or not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: They have made it in the press over their own signatures.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Be that as it may, the statement was made here this afternoon that this country is going to be saddled with a burden of millions of dollars due to the maltreatment of Canadian soldiers in the hospitals of France and in England, and right there is where I disagree with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), much as I should like to agree with him, in relation to the aspect of the charges that have been made. If our men have been criminally maltreated as has been stated, in the hospitals in Great Britain and France, who was it that maltreated them? Was it those in charge of Argyll House, or was it the doctors and nurses who were treating them? I do not believe the statements that have been made would bear investigation for a single minute. If we are going to have this wide-open investigation that is asked for, then the men who are making these charges should be the first ones to be investigated. The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) said that it was not chivalrous—I think that is the word he used—to refer in any derogatory way to General Smart, Colonel Pratt, and Colonel Price who have served overseas as they have done.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, no.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Was it chivalrous for them to make the charges they did against the comrades who served with them? What about that aspect of the case? I have on file in my home five hundred letters from boys who served in England and France, more than two hundred of those letters being written in hospitals in France and in England, and every one of those two hundred boys speaking in the highest terms of the treatment they received in those hospitals. My own boy spent five months in a hospital in England, and writing to his mother he said: "For heroism, and devotion to duty, no man who ever went over the top in France has done more in this war than the doctors, and nurses who are looking after the wounded men when they come back from the front." And the whole trend of the charges that have been made this afternoon, say what you will or clothe it in as nice language as you may, comes back to nothing else but this, that the doctors and nurses did not do their duty. And as a friend of some of those who I know have been doing their duty over there and have been making sacrifices in doing it, I say in this House that the men who made those charges should be compelled to prove them.

Mr. BUREAU: So say we all.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Just one or two words with regard to the riots at Rhyl Camp. In some of the charges referred to by my hon. friend this afternoon, and made by Colonel Pratt, and Colonel Price, it was stated that the riots at Ryhl Camp were due to maladministration on the part of "armchair officers." I happen accidentally to know the officer that was in charge of Ryhl Camp previously to and during those riots. The information came to me in an indirect manner. Major M. C. McLean, who won the Distinguished Service Order for taking his company across the canal, and practically taking the city of Valenciennes, who went over with the McLean Highlanders, and came back with that decoration and stayed with the fight until the Canadians went into Mons—he is the man who is held up as the "armchair officer," the "safety-first" man who led the Canadians at Rhyl to riot.

There is one other point in connection with demobilization. It has been stated to this House and to the country that the Government are criminally responsible for these riots, because they did not bring the men home fast enough. I have not heard the Government make the statement, but I am ready to say here and now that the men were brought back to Canada as rapidly as it was reasonably possible to handle them at the Atlantic ports as they came in. We are handling 30,000 men a month, and in March 42,000 were handled. For every thousand men that come into Halifax, forty passenger cars are required

to take them to their destination, and it takes on an average ten days at the very least to get those passenger cars back to Halifax for the next contingent. How many men could be handled with the total equipment of the Canadian railways? Personally, I think it is a marvel what has been accomplished, when we consider all the difficulties surrounding the transport of Canadian troops after landing in this country. It is quite true that two million men have been brought back to England, but they had only the Channel to cross, which takes only two or three hours or at the most half a day. But transporting the Canadian troops is a different proposition. They have to be transported 2,500 or 3,000 miles across the Atlantic, and then by rail, one-half of them at least, to Winnipeg and points West, making a further distance of from two to four thousand miles, and the equipment has to be back at Halifax in time for the next contingent. Yet hon. members will say, because our troops have not been brought back in larger numbers, the Government is criminally responsible for the Rhyl riots. If we are going to fight this whole war over again, and if the fathers and mothers who have suffered as a result of this war are to be forced to continue to listen to these charges made by disgruntled officers—because that is what they are pure and simple, when it comes down to the ground—then Heaven help the Canadian people! If we have not passed through enough without listening to this kind of stuff, then I do not know what is going to become of us. A great deal has been said about the dissatisfaction among Canadian soldiers. Where are they getting their leadership in this dissatisfaction? Right here in this House, and from men who ought to know better.

Mr. BUREAU: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is accusing hon. members of this House of being leaders of rebellion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member will retract any such statement that he may have made. I did not exactly understand it in that sense myself, but I am sure that if he imputed that any hon. member of this House was the leader or head of a rebellion, he will be glad to take it back.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that men in this House were leaders in rebellion.

Mr. BUREAU: You insinuated it. Have the manhood to say it if you think it.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I will repeat what I did say. I say that there is unrest throughout this country and dissatisfaction in the minds of a good many of our soldiers. Where are they getting their leadership? Right here in the Canadian House of Commons. Statements are made and sent broadcast throughout the country charging the Government, as was done this afternoon, with criminal negligence in the treatment of our soldiers. I am ready to admit that there may have been mistakes, and there still will be mistakes. Would any hon. member say that 400,000 men could be transported from Great Britain to their homes in Canada in the period in which we have to demobilize this army without a mistake being made? There is only one man that I know of in these days that assumed to be infallible, but even he found that he had made a mistake, and that was the Kaiser. We have all made mistakes. Our men at the front have made mistakes.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I thought he had in mind the Pope.

Mr. NICHOLSON: You cannot put any words of that kind into my mouth. Don't make any mistake. I say that the man who put himself up, not next to, but above, God and claimed infallibility was the Kaiser, but he found he had made a mistake—and some of our Canadian boys who were traduced here this afternoon and are being traduced in this country were instrumental in convincing him that he had made a mistake. But with all our mistakes, we have won this war. I believe that there is not a single man connected with the administration of the affairs of this country during the war, or with the administration overseas or in the fighting forces, who has not been giving the very best that was in him. If he has made a mistake it was a mistake of his head; his heart was right in any case. I repeat, it is absolutely unfair that these sweeping charges should be made. I do not know General Smart, or Colonel Pratt, or Colonel Price, but I venture to say that inside of twelve months they will all acknowledge that they made a mistake in coming back here and making the charges they did against the men who have given the very best that was in them and who have made great sacrifices in order that Canada could do her part in winning this war.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): It has been repeated several times by hon. members on the other

side of the House that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has made charges against the overseas administration in connection with this war. The hon. member has made no such charges. He has discharged his duty, as I understand it, in bringing to the notice of this House a very important matter bearing upon the life of our soldiers beyond the seas. That duty he owed to those men who have risked their lives in the defence of this country. It does not require a great deal of courage on the part of any member of this House to sit tight and say nothing about anything that may be put in circulation as to the administration of public affairs. It is the man who is anxious for a clean administration, that the affairs of this country shall be properly conducted, who takes upon himself to bring questions of this kind to the notice of the House. If questions of this sort are not to be brought to the attention of this Parliament, this high tribunal, where shall we go with them? What are we here for, if it is not to safeguard the interests of the country?—for this is the only federal Parliament we have. I submit, therefore, that no apology is required for the action of the hon. member for Maisonneuve. I am not going to say whether the charges are right or wrong. All I would say to the Acting Prime Minister, if he were in his seat, is that he has taken the course he usually takes in matters of this kind, of putting up a straw man and then knocking him down. He spoke of things that had nothing whatever to do with the question before the House. There was no mention in those charges, as I understood them, of the Bruce or the Babtie report.

The Bruce report dated in August or September of 1916, and the Babtie report is dated September 22, 1916. When we inquire about things that took place after 1916—1917, 1918 down the years to the present day—is it any answer for the Government to say: "Oh, why, there was a report on September 22, 1916. What are you talking about? That report settled the whole thing then, and of course settled everything down to the present day." Nobody would say that, and I am sure that it is only fair, if there is anything to investigate, at all events from September 22, 1916, to the present day, that it should be investigated. I was brought up to believe—and I would impress this view on every hon. member—that an officer wearing His Majesty's uniform was in every sense of the term a gentleman, beyond reproach, that his word was his bond, and that what he said was absolutely the truth, should the heavens fall. I have always believed that we should accept without question the word of a general, a colonel, a captain, or any other officer of His Majesty. And, Mr. Speaker, it is highly necessary that this should be so. The fathers and mothers of this country who allow their sons to be placed under the control of these men should have implicit confidence in their integrity; and I hope that there is not a member in the House who would countenance any man bearing the title of general, or brigadier general, or colonel, or any of these high-sounding names, which mean so much, if, in the ordinary vulgar Anglo-Saxon term he were a liar. Those men who made the speeches in the legislatures of Ontario and Quebec are officers, and we have a right to believe that they have made statements that are absolutely true as far as they know. If the statements are not true, and they do not believe them to be true and consistent with the facts, they have no right to the titles they bear, nor to wear His Majesty's uniform. They should not be in the army of either Canada or the Mother Country and should be stripped of their honours and driven out of positions of responsibility. If there is no other investigation than to find out whether or not those men are telling the truth, it is well to ascertain that fact. If they are not telling the truth an example should be made of them, so that officers now, hereafter, and for all time, will understand that the Canadian people expect of them truth, integrity and honour, and a dignity that will be above reproach. I make no accusations against anybody. I appreciate the responsibilities of the men in office, and until I know to the contrary I believe they are doing the best they can. But I insist that men who hold important offices of this kind, in whose care the lives of the young men and women of the country are placed, should be gentlemen above all else, true to the traditions which we have always cherished in the British army and in our militia as well. I trust that those who are in authority over these men—I care not whether they are in office or out of office; so long as they bear the titles and wear the uniform they are under the control of the Government—will see that they tell the truth, and that if they do not, they shall suffer the consequence and be stripped of any honour they now possess. If, on the other hand, these men are telling the truth, we should know it. The people have the right to expect that this or any Government that may be in power will not tolerate irregularities or abuse of our men and

women who serve the country faithfully and well, as has been done in this war.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I noticed that the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) said that if these statements are not really true the men who make them should be stripped of their honours. I heard the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) read one charge which I think every hon. member in the House will conclude, if he gives it any consideration at all, is untrue on the face of it. I know one of the three gentlemen mentioned, and it is he that made the statement in question. Colonel Pratt is a very close neighbour of mine, and a gentleman I have known for some years, and I am sorry to disagree with him in regard to anything he may say. But I want to call the attention of the hon. member for Maisonneuve to a statement which he read and which, apparently, he took as gospel. Colonel Pratt makes the statement that he knew of a train containing 1,200 or 1,500 soldiers who were held up by some Canadian ticket agents and had £2 apiece extracted from them. I would ask the hon. member himself, does he believe that statement?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I leave the responsibility to Colonel Pratt.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, my hon. friend, I have no doubt, knows about trains, if he does not know about Colonel Pratt, and he knows that no train during this war has ever carried 1,200 or 1,500 men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Suppose there were only 100 men, what would you say?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend supposes 100, but the statement multiplies it by twelve or fifteen. On the face of it, the charge could not be correct, and I think the hon. Minister of Militia will say that 500 men is a very full train-load. Here we have a statement that there were 1,200 or 1,500 men on one train—I am not positive about the exact number, but the hon. member for Maisonneuve has the figures—and about three thousand pounds was obtained from them. Now, is it likely that these men had each spare £2 to hand over to two or three ticket agents? A band of men coming back from the front, who could not be held up by fifteen hundred Germans of the best type, would not likely be made to shell out, as the saying is, £2 apiece for a bill they did not owe. On the face of it, the statement is not true. I know the gentleman that makes it, and he is guilty of great exaggeration on many occasions; and if the rest of his charges have no more at the back of them than this one, such charges must be received only for what they are worth. I believe that it will be found out that these three officers have personal grievances and if they were summoned to the bar of the House, not one of them would dare to make the statements contained in these charges; and I do not believe they can prove them before a committee of this House or anywhere else. It appears to me that the hon. member for Maisonneuve made a serious mistake in bringing to the House charges reflecting on the whole overseas service. It reflects on the whole department overseas and states that Canadian soldiers there were not well cared for and that a great many were improperly treated. I had two boys over there for four years. They were in several hospitals from wounds and other causes. They have not one word of complaint as to what was done for the soldiers overseas. Coming from a constituency which had between 4,000 and 5,000 troops overseas, I can say that I have not had one man come into my office and say that he did not receive in the hospitals overseas the best of treatment. If that is the case, there must be something wrong about the broadcast statements which have been sent out that our hospital service was inferior and that these men had not been well treated. My information is quite to the contrary. There never was a war in the history of the world with so many serious casualties and such a large percentage of men restored to physical well-being. That is my information; it may be wrong, but I believe it is true. I only know one of these three gentlemen who are making these charges. They have cast aspersions upon the various departments of government which I do not believe they can sustain before any tribunal whatever. I fear they are actuated by other motives than the good of our forces overseas or of any Canadian Government that is endeavouring to carry on to the best of its ability in the face of a difficult situation.

Mr. POWER: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the cars in which troops are moved in France are built to contain eight horses or forty men. That would make a total of 1,200 men on a train of thirty cars.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend knows that no train ever hauls thirty cars. This was not in France, but it was on the way to the boat in Great Britain. My hon. friend knows it is not possible and he never

saw a train carrying thirty cars with forty men each. Why try to make that complaint at all when it is not possible?

Mr. POWER: It is quite possible.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Department of Militia and Defence.—	
Salaries, including Deputy Minister, at $6,000	$214,150
Contingencies	19,500
	$233,650

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are there any increases?

Major-General MEWBURN: There are no increases except the statutory increases of $1,650.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That includes $1,000 to the deputy minister?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you increase the deputy minister $1,000?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: How many employees are there in the Militia Department in Ottawa?

Major-General MEWBURN: I couldn't give you that information offhand; when we are on the general Estimates I can.

Mr. POWER: Are these only civilian employees?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, these are only statutory increases to civilian employees.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 43 for the relief of John Edwin Scott.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 44 for the relief of Claudius Henry Sherk.—Mr. Ross.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 67 for the relief of Gladys Agnes Wilson Hawkins.—Mr. Jacobs.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

Wednesday, April 16, 1919.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 72, to incorporate the Athabasca and Grand Prairie Railway Company.—Mr. Tweedie.

Bill No. 73, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada. — Mr. Hocken.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

NAVAL AIR BASES.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Did the Canadian Government either direct, or through the British authorities, request the presence of the Naval Forces of the United States of America in patrolling the East Coast of Canada in 1918?

2. Did the Canadian Government at any time during the war erect any Naval Air Stations in Canada which were to be used by the United States Naval Air Force?

3. If so, where were these stations erected?

4. What was the total expense to Canada for these bases?

5. How many naval bases did the United States Government have in Canada on November 11, 1918?

6. Where were these bases situated?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. See reply to inquiry of Mr. Mayrand, Debates House of Commons of 24th March, 1919, page 780.

2 and 3. The Canadian Government erected for the Royal Canadian Naval Air Service two bases, one at Dartmouth and one at Sydney, N.S. These stations were temporarily manned by United States air force officers and men.

4. The total amount expended was: Dartmouth, $335,798.94; Sydney, $238,643.45.

5. One.

6. At Shelburne, N.S.

FUEL CONTROL.

Mr. KAY:

1. What was the total expenditure of every kind made by or on behalf of the Fuel Control Board of Canada, from its inception to the end of 1918?

2. How many employees are at present in the employ of the said board?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to abolish this board?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. From 6th November, 1917, to December 31, 1918, $144,848.66.

2. General Office, 6; Audit Branch, 2; Statistical Branch, 2; total 10.

3. Yes. At the end of the current coal year, on March 31.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH WEST INDIES.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Is the Government giving any attention at the present moment to the suggested conclusion of a commercial union between Canada and the West Indies, as advocated by the Canadian West Indian League?

2. Is there official information showing that it would be of advantage to Canada to hold, commercially, a strip of tropical country which it might call its own?

3. Have commercial relations been improved with those countries since the granting of the present preferential tariff?

4. If so, what action has been taken lately?

5. As a result of the war and the grouping of nations and territories, has the Government taken any action to induce Newfoundland to enter the Confederation, or does it intend doing so?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The Government of Canada has not been officially approached by any of the West Indian Islands with a view of forming a commercial union, and it is not deemed expedient to give official recognition to any movement in that direction by the Canadian West Indian League.

2. This is a matter of opinion and the Government does not deem it desirable to express an opinion thereon.

3 and 4. It is difficult to express an opinion as to what improvement has taken place in the commercial relations between Canada and the British West Indies since the treaty was entered into, by reason of the fact that the treaty came into effect on June 2, 1913, that is to say in the Canadian fiscal year 1913-14, the trade statistics of which would be the first that could be affected by the results of the agreement; and as the war was declared in the ensuing year and all shipping arrangements were upset, no normal complete fiscal year has since occurred. The trade shows a large increase, but owing to the interruption of traffic between the British West Indies and Europe much of the West Indian trade was turned into Canadian and United States channels.

The following statement shows the imports and exports between Canada and the British West Indies and British Guiana for the past 11 fiscal years:

British West Indies.

Fiscal year ended Mar. 31.	Imports for consumption.	Exports of Canada Produce.
1908.	$ 7,211,801	$2,449,640
1909.	7,387,056	2,513,695
1910.	5,448,199	3,055,574
1911.	6,469,382	3,991,490
1912.	5,545,861	3,967,748
1913.	5,982,406	3,915,172
1914.	$4,347,310	$4,460,329
1915.	6,163,296	4,333,095
1916.	6,257,963	4,115,872
1917.	14,239,005	5,163,278
1918.	10,550,550	6,838,563

British Guiana.

1908.	2,082,003	601,395
1909.	1,601,540	502,072
1910.	3,556,222	584,631
1911.	3,793,201	614,070
1912.	5,004,630	576,365
1913.	3,550,765	627,244
1914.	3,179,112	649,675
1915.	2,993,534	675,660
1916.	5,636,630	1,207,134
1917.	7,192,893	1,631,395
1918.	6,716,647	1,978,323

5. The Government of Canada have taken no steps since the beginning of the war to induce Newfoundland to enter Confederation. The Government has not decided to approach Newfoundland in the matter.

SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS ENTERED AT QUEBEC.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What quantity of spirituous and malt liquor has entered the city of Quebec each month during the year 1917-1918?

2. What quantity and value of malt liquor?

3. What quantity and value of spirituous liquor?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1, 2 and 3. The quantity and value of malt and spirituous liquors entered for consumption through Customs in the city of Quebec during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918, were as follows, by months:

	Spirituous liquors.		Ale, Beer and porter.	
	Gals.	Value.	Gals.	Value.
April..	6,836	$12,334	...	$...
May..	5,747	10,444	220	219
June..	6,614	12,885	62	29
July..	7,528	14,174	750	544
August.	6,844	12,862	166	191
Sept...	8,501	17,466	128	146
Oct...	9,524	19,920	...	...
Nov...	5,266	12,496	126	165
Dec...	6,311	14,929	...	...
Jan...	9,375	25,911	...	...
Feb...	2,282	5,602	...	...
March.	2,959	8,607	...	...

1. Quantity of spirits is only that received in bond. The department has no record of duty paid on spirits received, as this is purely a commercial transaction. No bonded malt liquor.

2. No information on malt liquor respecting quantity and value as duty is collected on malt used for production thereof.

3. The department is not aware of value of spirits received.

The duty on spirits received in bond is as follows:

	Galls.	Duty.
April, 1917..	29,805.71	$ 71,614.54
May, 1917.	32,850.49	79,014.48
June, 1917..	22,322.85	53,611.90
July, 1917..	51,628.66	123,965.90
August, 1917	30,672,.14	73,720.29
Sept., 1917..	36,096.23	86,719.99
Oct., 1917..	16,995.80	40,908.81
Nov., 1917..	60,959.88	146,343.61
Dec., 1917..	36,098.03	86,751.50
Jan., 1918..	42,145.28	101,210.61
Feb., 1918..	14,988.86	35,986.68
March, 1918..	11,367.89	27,286.47

CHIEF INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, B.C.

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. On whose representations, and at whose request was the office of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries for British Columbia removed from New Westminster to Vancouver?
2. How long has the said office been located in New Westminster previous to such removal?
3. Were any of the British Columbia Members of Parliament consulted in regard thereto previous to such removal, and, if so, what are their names?
4. What rent is being paid by the Government for the office at Vancouver?
5. For what period has the office at Vancouver been rented?
6. What rent was paid at New Westminster?
7. Have any Members of Parliament for British Columbia requested or recommended the return of the said office to New Westminster? If so, what are their names?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. The Department of the Naval Service.
2. Nearly eight years.
3. No.
4. The rent is $2,400, lessor to pay taxes and water rates and provide heating, janitor and electric service.
5. Two years.
6. The Government owned the building that was occupied at New Westminster. It is still used by the Inspector of Fisheries for District No. 1.
7. The following members of Parliament have endorsed a request by the member for New Westminster for the return of the office to New Westminster: R. F. Green, S. F. Tolmie, H. S. Clements, S. Bonnell, J. C. McIntosh, F. B. Stacey, F. J. Fulton, R. C. Cooper, C. W. Peck.

H.M.C.S. CANADA.

Mr. DELISLE:

For what purpose was H.M.C.S. "Canada" sent to a point off Glace Bay in 1914?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: Upon advice from the British Government that an attack on Glace Bay Wireless Station might be expected, H.M.C.S. Canada was despatched to a point off that place as a measure of defence.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

PURCHASE OF DESTROYERS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. During the year 1914 or 1915 did Commander J. K. L. Ross interview Admiral Kingsmill in regard to the Government purchasing five or more modern destroyers?
2. If so, did Commander J. K. L. Ross offer to purchase one destroyer and present it to the Government providing the Government would purchase four or five additional destroyers?
3. Did Admiral Kingsmill convey this information to his superior officer?
4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Answered by Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

H.M.C.S. TUNA.

Mr. DUFF:

1. In connection with the sale H.M.C.S. Tuna did the Government call for tenders?
2. If not, why?
3. If so in what papers was the advertisement inserted?
4. What are the names of the persons so tendering?
5. How much did each firm offer?
6. What has been done with the machinery and fittings?
7. Where are they at present?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. The Herald, Halifax; The Evening Mail, Halifax; The Chronicle, Halifax; The Echo, Halifax. Three insertions in each paper.

4 and 5. Charles Brexter & Son, the only tenderer, offered $800 for Tuna hull.

6 and 7. Machinery and fittings of value to the department were removed before sale. Machinery and fittings are at present distributed as follows: 1 H.P. turbine, 1 L.P. turbine, 1 condenser, and 1 capstain engine, forwarded to Esquimalt, B.C., for use in the Royal Naval College. The balance is at Halifax dockyard or on board H. M. C. S. Niobe.

CANADIAN NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What are the names of the Canadians who have presided or attended as members of the courts-martial of the Canadian Naval Service?
2. Where was each officer born who so presided or officially attended?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: 1 and 2. Officers of the Royal Canadian Navy who presided at or attended as members courts-martial of the Canadian Naval Service and their place of birth: Captain Walter Hose, high seas; Captain F. C. C. Pasco, no record, left the

service; Captain Eldrige, Ireland; Commander H. E. Holme, England; Commander B. F. Jones, England; Commander J. T. Shenton, England; Commander E. A. E. Nixon, Ireland; Commander D. Tatton Brown, Canada; Commander P. F. Newcombe, no record, left the service; Commander A. F. L. Atwood, England; Lieut.-Commander W. T. Walker, no record, left the service; Lieut.-Commander Allan Baddeley, no record, left the service; Lieut.-Commander Henry W. Webb, no record, left the service; Lieut.-Commander John H. Knight, no record, left the service.

POPULATIONS OF CITIES AND PROVINCES

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

According to the latest available figures, what is the population of each of the following cities and provinces: Montreal, Toronto, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

City.	Year.	Population.
Montreal	1911	470,480
Toronto	1911	376,538
Provinces.		
Ontario	1911	2,523,274
Quebec	1911	2,003,232
New Brunswick	1911	351,889
Nova Scotia	1911	492,338
Prince Edward Island	1911	93,728

LABOUR DISPUTES BOARD.

* Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who is the Chairman of the Labour Disputes Board?
2. When was the appointment of said chairman made?
3. What is the salary attached to said position?
4. What amounts have been paid to said chairman since his appointment?
5. What amounts are now due, if any, to said chairman?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The Hon. Mr. Justice F. S. MacLennan.
2. 16th September, 1918.
3. Allowance $20 per day while engaged upon the work of the board and actual travelling expenses.
4. $370.43, representing fees and expenses.
5. Account not yet received for services and expenses in connection with the appeal from the award of the Board of Conciliation established in connection with the dispute between the Canadian Express Company and its employees.

TOWNSITE OF HANNA.

Mr. PROULX:

Who owns the townsite of Hanna, in the province of Alberta?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has no information.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION TO SIBERIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. What is the personnel of the Economic Commission which has been sent to Siberia?
2. How many economic commissions have the Government despatched to foreign countries?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Col. J. S. Dennis, Chairman; Liaison Officer the Canadian Siberian Expedition. C. F. Just, Chief Canadian Trade Commissioner in Russia; L. D. Wilgress, Canadian Trade Commissioner at Vladivostok; Ross Owen, Transportation Officer in Russia of the Canadian Pacific Railway; A. D. Braithwaite, late of the Bank of Montreal.
2. Two, since the outbreak of the war.

B.C. SALMON AND HALIBUT FISHERIES.

Mr. PECK:

1. What was the catch and value of fish, in Number 2, Fishing District of British Columbia, last year, as to (a) salmon, (b) halibut and (c) other fish?
2. What was the catch and value of the same fish in Districts 1 and 3, respectively, during the same period?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. (a) Approximately 707,439 cwts. $3,542,048. (b) Approximately (Canadian and American vessels) 154,412 cwts. $2,155,353. (c) Approximate value $132,208.

2. District No. 1:—

(a) Approximately 280,279 cwts. $2,915,544. (b) Approximately (Canadian and American vessels) 28,750 cwts. $433,287. (c) Approximate value $685,730.

District No. 3.

(a) Approximately 453,923 cwts. $3,185.960. (b) Approximately 2,848 cwts. $42,510. (c) Approximate value, $1,141,759. Complete annual returns are not yet available.

CUSTODIAN OF ALIEN ENEMY PROPERTY.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Has the Government appointed a custodian of alien enemies' property?
2. If so, who is this officer, when was he appointed and what is his salary?
3. Can the Government give an estimate of the value of alien enemies' property in Canada? If so, what is the estimated value?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The Minister of Finance and Receiver-General was appointed Custodian of alien enemy property under the provisions of the Consolidated Orders respecting Trading with the Enemy, 1916.

2. There is no salary attached to the duties of the office.

3. Estimated value of property reported to Custodian and Department of Secretary of State, $38,000,000.,

APPOINTMENT OF RURAL POSTMASTERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

Does the appointment of Postmasters in rural districts rest with the local inspector of post offices or with the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: With the Civil Service Commission.

PURCHASE OF FARM TRACTORS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Were any farm tractors purchased by the Government or on their behalf, or on behalf of any department thereof, in 1917 or 1918?
2. If so, by what department?
3. How many tractors were purchased?
4. At what price?
5. If these tractors were purchased in the United States, what duty was paid on same?
6. What was the retail price to farmers?
7. Have the tractors all been disposed of?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Yes, in 1918.

2. Department of Agriculture, Canada Food Board.

3. 1,135.

4. $750.00 f.o.b. Dearborn, Mich.

5. None.

6. Price to farmers in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, $750, f.o.b. Dearborn, Mich. Price to farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $795, f.o.b. point of delivery.

7. Yes.

INLAND REVENUE VIOLATIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Is H. P. Duchemin, of Sydney, N.S., conducting prosecutions in Nova Scotia for violation of the Inland Revenue regulations?
2. If so, how many prosecutions has he brought?
3. What was the gross amount of the fines imposed?
4. What are the terms of his employment?
5. Do his activities extend over the whole of Nova Scotia? If not, in what counties?
6. Who recommended his appointment?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Duchemin has not been instructed to conduct prosecutions in Nova Scotia for violation of Inland Revenue regulations.

2. Nil.

3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 2.

[Mr. Rowell.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. How many pounds of oleomargarine have been imported into Canada in each month since October, 1917?
2. How many pounds have been exported to each of the said months?
3. How many factories or plants are manufacturing oleomargarine in Canada, what are their respective names, locations, and the amount of this product manufactured since the passing of the Order in Council, dated October 23, 1917, permitting manufacture in Canada?
4. What quantity of butter has been used in the manufacture of oleomargarine since the passing of the Order in Council referred to?
5. What was the total quantity in cold storage on the last date for which this information is available or on any previous dates during the past year?
6. Is it the intention of the Government to prohibit the use of butter in the manufacture of oleomargarine?
7. Is it the intention of the Government to repeal the Order in Council permitting the manufacture or importation into Canada of this product?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the value of, rate of duty on, and customs duty collected on, agricultural implements imported into Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914, and during the last fiscal year for which the figures are available, respectively?
2. What is the rate of duty on, amount of duty collected on, and number and value of, each of the following agricultural implements imported into Canada during each of the above periods: reapers, mowers, binders, thrashing machines, separators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, seed drills, farm tractors, fanning mills, internal combustion engines other than tractors, wagons, buggies, cutters, sleighs, cream separators and wind mills?
3. What proportion of the above were imported through ports of entry in the four western provinces, and what was the duty paid thereon?
4. What was the number and value of such articles exported from Canada during the said two years respectively?
5. What is the number and value of automobiles imported into the four western provinces in the fiscal years ending March 31, 1914 to 1918, respectively, inclusive, and the duty paid thereon?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How much was paid by the Government to the Canadian Press Association during the calendar year 1918?
2. Was the advertising for the last Victory Loan distributed to the newspapers directly by the Department of Finance, or through advertising agencies?
3. If through advertising agencies, how much was paid in commissions to the advertising agents?
4. What was the total cost of advertising the last Victory Loan?

MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

Mr. Lemieux—For a return showing in detail the number of officers and men belonging to the Canadian army, their full name, rank and pay, now stationed at Argyll House, London, England.

Mr. Lemieux—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents in connection with the application of the Shell Transport and Trading Company for the grant of certain oil lands.

Mr. Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough)—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, requests and other papers in the possession of the Department of Militia and Defence, both in Canada and overseas, relating to the employment, services, duties and retirement from the service, of Major Reverend C. W. Gordon, of Winnipeg. Also, a copy of all cheques issued and paid to him for salary or otherwise, including travelling and living expenses during the period of his enlistment in the service.

MOTIONS DROPPED.

Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska)—That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to make certain amendments to the Rules of this House, and that a committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon said Rules.

Mr. Boyer—That, in the opinion of this House, a more rigorous inspection of maple products is essential to their proper manufacture, in order to prevent such conditions as are reported in Government Bulletins Nos. 409 and 415 showing adulteration in quantities of maple syrup, and also in 68 out of 137 samples of maple sugar, taken during April and May last, from Montreal and Toronto merchants who had been indulging in such practices prior to 1915, when the law regulating maple products was passed.

Mr. Lemieux—For a copy of all correspondence concerning the advisability of establishing and developing plants for the utilization of fish waste and waste fish.

Mr. Lemieux—For a copy of all correspondence and petitions concerning the Order in Council of November 7, 1918, granting a bonus to the Civil Service.

Mr. Lemieux—For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and other papers concerning the proposed highway belt line connecting Bonaventure, Gaspé and Matane counties, Quebec.

Sir Sam Hughes—That, in the opinion of this House, it would be an advantage to the community at large as well as to the non-commissioned officers and men residing in Canada, who are honourably discharged from His Majesty's forces, whether Canadian or other, were a corps of Commissionairs composed of these men to be formed in Canada on the basis of the similar corps in Great Britain.

Mr. Casgrain—That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and necessary to establish, at once, an experimental farm in the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency, in order to promote the interests of agriculture in general and the farmers of that country.

Mr. Mowat—That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to dispense with a standing army after the demobilization of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and that Canada should rely for a defensive force, for service in Canada, upon a citizen army based on universal training of young men from eighteen to twenty-five years of age, for such periods in the year as will not appreciably detach them from civilian and industrial occupations; and that Canadian democracy can best be maintained by equal, and not volunteer or casual service.

Mr. Casgrain—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, telegrams, documents, letters and Orders in Council, relating to the paper inquiry conducted by Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C., since the beginning of said inquiry to date, together with all decisions and orders emanating from or given by said Commissioner Pringle.

Mr. Myers—That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that some immediate action be taken by the Dominion Government in order to in some manner control the price of wheat grown in Canada in 1919, both in the interests of the producer and the consumer, and further, make immediate provisions for the establishment of the necessary credits and transportation facilities to insure that our farm products be marketed to the best possible advantage.

Mr. Bureau—That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the salaries of the officers of the House of Commons should be revised and altered in order that these Civil Servants be remunerated on the basis of duties, responsibilities and experience required, and with a view of making these salaries conform with the classification of the staff made by resolution of this House passed on the 5th of June, 1913.

FIBRE FLAX PRODUCTION IN CANADA.

Mr. SAMUEL FRANCIS GLASS (Middlesex, East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the impetus given to the extension and development of fibre flax production in Canada has achieved results which justify further serious consideration, co-operation and encouragement by the Government, and to this end it is desirable:—

First: That a modern experimental and demonstrative station should be established at the most convenient and central point within the area where flax for fibre is being produced so that growers may be advised and educated in the most modern and improved methods of retting, scutching and generally preparing their fibre for the market.

Second: That improved mechanical appliances and equipment being necessary for the economic harvesting of the crop, as well as for the preparation of fibre, constant watchfulness should be exercised by the Government to insure that Canadian growers may be supplied with most modern machinery for harvesting and scutching and instructed in the newest and best method of retting.

Third: That in order to secure full economic value to the grower, it is desirable that the Government should establish a system of grading and standards consistent and consonant (in so far as possible) with continental standards so that the world's best markets may be available for our exportable surplus.

Fourth: That Canadian farmers, urged by the stress of war and the Empire's insistent needs

for increased production, have increased their fibre flax acreage more than eighteen fold, at a time when the world's markets were at their highest figures, and have thus developed a source of natural resource which has materially added to the value of our agricultural wealth, not only so, but have demonstrated in the world's markets that Canadian flax fibre is equal in quality to best continental standards and superior to any produced in Russia, which hitherto produced 75 per cent of the world's supply; therefore, in view of these results attained, the Government should jealously guard the interests of growers and lend such co-operation as may be necessary to increase production and to encourage by every means possible the full development of its manufacture from the field to the loom, so as to obtain the full economic value of the production to the country.

He said: Mr. Speaker, having regard to the important part that the flax industry has played and must play in the economic wealth and development of this country, I feel that I do not owe any apology to the House for again directing the attention of hon. gentlemen to this matter. I desire to express my appreciation of the very valuable assistance lent to this industry through the encouragement given by the Department of Agriculture—encouragement which has resulted to some extent from the discussion which we had in the House in 1916 and 1918.

In 1915 the flax industry in Canada was but a small and struggling one of very little significance; the total acreage of flax fibre under production—I am speaking of the fibre end particularly—was only about 1,400 acres. Due to the necessities of the war and the very urgent demand of the Empire for an increased supply of flax fibre—a demand resulting from the need for linen cloth to be used in the manufacture of aeroplane wings—earnest efforts were made in this country to increase the production of fibre flax to meet the national need. In 1916 Lloyd George, urging the agriculturists of the Empire to increase their production of cereal and foodstuffs, said that this matter was of so much importance that the man who was doing his honest duty in endeavouring to increase the production of foodstuffs and cereals was serving in the second line of defence and doing as important work for the Allies as those who were serving in the front line. Lloyd George said at that time:

> The line which the British Empire holds against the Germans is held by those who work on the land as well as by those who fight on land and sea. If it breaks at any point it breaks everywhere. In the face of the enemy the seamen of our Royal naval mercantile marine and the soldiers gathered from every part of our Empire hold our line firstly. You workers on land must hold your part of our line as strongly. Every full day's labour you do helps to shorten the struggle and brings us nearer victory. Every idle day, all loitering, lengthens the struggle and makes defeat more possible. Therefore, in the nation's honour, heed! Acquit yourselves like men, and as workers on land do your duty with all your strength.

In the early part of last year the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries in Great Britain, who were in charge of the matter of flax production, sent out a circular letter urging an increased production of flax for fibre. The circular letter said:

> The Board of Agriculture and Fisheries have decided that any flax grown for the Government in your district shall rank of as equal importance to cereals and your War Agriculture Committee has been informed accordingly.

A message came over the seas to Canada in this matter because it was found that we could produce fibre of a sufficiently high quality for use in the manufacture of aeroplane wings. The necessity of speeding up production in Canada, therefore, was evident, and the Experimental Farm Branch of the Dominion Department of Agriculture early in that year issued a circular to the flax growers of Canada, from which I quote the following:

> The Canadian Farmers' opportunity to save the lives of many of our men and aid directly in our victory. Aeroplane wings must be covered with linen. The supply of flax for this purpose is alarmingly short and most sources of supply are cut off. Canada is expected to do her utmost to make up the deficiency.
>
> The mastery of the air is proving a great, perhaps the determining factor, in the struggle now going on. Aeroplanes are being built in vast numbers as rapidly as possible. As a covering for the wings of these, linen is the only material found satisfactory. Large quantities are also needed for machine-gun webbing, ambulance and truck covers, thread for sewing uniforms, and a number of other uses. Were the supply of fibre flax for these purposes to fall short, as is threatened it would directly and profoundly affect the success of the Allied forces.
>
> So serious is the situation that the British Government has commandeered all flax products entering the United Kingdom, and Ireland has taken extraordinary steps to increase the 1918 flax acreage in the British Isles. It has to this end imported large quantities of flax seed from Western Canada, although but little is known of the possibilities of the prairie-grown seed for fibre production.

The Resources Committee of Ontario, also active in stimulating production by facilitating matters affecting the gathering of the harvest and the securing of the necessary labour, issued a circular and did splendid work in developing the flax resources last year. They asked the people of Ontario to grow flax this year, pointing out that each additional acre of flax provided wings for another aviator; that one-

third of all the aviators in the British Air Service had been supplied by Canada, and that these brave boys must have further help from Canada—in order that they may fly; we must give them wings. In concluding their circular they said:

If you cannot fly yourself, help others to fly by growing flax.

During the early part of the year this matter was taken up among the farmers, and, stimulated by a sense of patriotic duty and by a desire to increase the economic wealth and production of the country as urged by the Government, Ontario put to fibre seed some eighteen thousand acres. In Quebec, in the district which the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) represents, fibre of a quality superior to anything grown elsewhere in Canada has been produced under experimental tests. In Ontario, fibre is being grown superior to any quality of fibre produced in Russia and quite equal to the highest continental standard. It would seem, therefore, as if there were great possibilities for the production of fibre in Quebec and Ontario. In Ontario last year, under the stimulus of greater production and patriotic duty, we seeded 18,000 acres and produced over 3,000 tons of flax. What might this country do, not only in meeting our national needs, but in increasing our economic wealth, if the same earnestness in flax production were developed in all parts of Canada in which it is possible to grow this fibre? This is not an industry peculiar to Ontario, or to any particular part of that province, because at the present time, the number of flax mills is increasing and they are springing up all through eastern Ontario and throughout Quebec. In such parts of the country as cereals can be cultivated, a very high quality of flax can be grown. Years ago it was demonstrated that in Nova Scotia a very high quality of flax could be produced, and in British Columbia, and in certain districts of the provinces of the Northwest flax for fibre can be successfully grown. It would, therefore, seem as if there were plenty of opportunity for the development of flax growing in this country at the present time.

Before the war, Russia produced about 80 per cent of the total world production of flax, namely, about 400,000 tons, about 200,000 tons of which were exported from that country and used in other countries in which flax fibre spinning was developed to its highest degree. We are led to believe at times that France and Belgium are the countries which have hitherto produced the high qualities of fibre, and that if we are to develop this industry in Canada in the future, our fibre must measure up in quality to that produced in those countries. Notwithstanding the fact that Belgium and France have in the past produced a high quality of fibre, the quantity they produce is really an insignificant portion of the total world production. Before the war, the fibre production of Belgium was about 10,000 tons, and that of France about 30,000 tons, or a total of 40,000 tons, which is small as against a total world production of 500,000 tons.

We have, in the face of difficulties, increased and improved the production of flax in Canada. I am not going to go over the ground that I covered last year as regards the prejudice that exists amongst farmers as to the effect of flax on the soil, but I desire to refer to a matter I overlooked last year, namely, that while this prejudice may be founded, it is founded on causes which are now controlled. Mr. Clark, Seed Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture, in a report for the year 1916, referring to the examination of seeds, says:

Most of the so-called cleaned grain contained large numbers of very small weed seeds as well as small, light kernels and inert matter, clearly indicating poor results from the attempt at cleaning. With flax, this is shown by the presence of such small seeds as tumbling mustard, cinquefoil, wormwood, lamb's quarters, worm seed mustard, and also grain, black bindweed and other large seeds in samples that had been through fanning-mills. One sample reported as cleaned with a common fanning-mill contained seventeen species of weed seeds, including over 2,500 tumbling mustard—

This was a seed cleaned and ready for the market.

—over 1,000 lamb's quarters, 803 black bindweed, and 140 wild oats per pound, besides wheat, oats and barley. Some of the grain samples furnish equally striking examples of failure to remove even small weed seeds by the fanning-mill.

It would not be surprising that seed of that kind sent out to the farmers and seeded would produce disastrous results and disappointment to the farmers. Mr. Clark says further:

Nearly all the samples of flax would have been much improved by the use of a woven wire riddle 3 x 16-inch size (three spaces to the inch one way and sixteen the other), to carry the large foreign seeds over the back of the mill, and a zinc sieve below, with 1-12-inch perforations, to let through the small seeds with practically no loss of flax.

I desire to bring to the attention of the minister and of the Department of Agri-

culture the very great importance, if we are to develop this industry on a broad and successful basis, of the closest care and jealous scrutiny and protection of our standards of seeds. We must also have the confidence of our farmers, and we must disabuse their minds of the prejudice that still exists that flax seed is dirty for the land, that it takes away from the soil essential properties. These prejudices are easily removed by an examination of the reports of agricultural farms in this country, in the United States and in England, and there would seem to be no reason why these prejudices should continue to exist.

Another reason why there are great possibilities for the development of this industry in Canada is this: While flax is the most ancient of all textile industries, it is the one that has made less progress and lagged further behind than any of the others. The ancient methods of harvesting, of retting, of producing the fibre, that have been in existence for the last 5,000 years, have continued until the last two or three years. Before the war we were confronted with this condition, that our production was insignificant because, while we could grow a good quality of flax, we could not compete with the markets of Russia on account of cheap labour in that country and cheap labour in France and Belgium. Those conditions have, however, been materially changed because, owing to the demand for greater production, man has set his ingenuity to solve those problems which, for years, have apparently more or less baffled humanity. In Great Britain and Ireland, in the last three years, more progress has been made in inventing and improving mechanical appliances to manufacture fibre from flax straw than has been made in centuries gone by.

Very great progress has been made in the process of retting. Flax, I might explain, is a cereal that will grow where wheat or any other cereal will grow, but the product of fibre from the straw is obtained only after a very expensive process of retting, which entails much labour. The old method was to spread the straw out in the field and let the dews and rains of heaven, by a gradual process of fermentation and decay, rot the outer bark of the straw, and then after it had been properly dried through an operation known as scutching, the straw was easily separated from the fibre. The production of fibre by that process was a gamble more or less, because when a man had his straw out in the field it depended on the elements whether the retting would be a success. Too much rain would have the effect of discolouring or weakening the fibre. To obtain the best results the flax had to be gathered and dried at the psychological moment, and it was not always possible, owing to the elements, to lift the straw at the proper time.

Some development, however, has been made of a new process called tank retting, which is very largely followed in Ireland, has been used in Belgium for some time, and is making some slow progress in Canada. The possibility of reducing the labour costs by tank retting was considered early in the war by the Department of Agriculture here, and an experimental station was established at the Central Farm, where the process has been carried on with satisfactory results. In the county of Lambton, in the village of Forest, Mr. H. Fraleigh, one of the most prominent flax men on this continent, and admittedly its greatest authority on flax, has developed on his own responsibility a tank retting system which has achieved a marked measure of success. He told me last year that tank retting had yielded him $400 more per ton than the dew retting in the open field. The tank retting process, while an advance on the old process, and ensuring the curing of the straw at the proper time, is a slow process, taking some days. The Government have had brought to their attention another interesting process of retting. The Société Française de Rouissage Industriel reports as follows, under date of July 22, 1916:

> Professor Giacomo Rossi M. D., Director of Laboratory of Agricultural Bacteriology, and Professor of the Superior School of Agriculture of Portici near Naples, some years ago succeeded in isolating a specific aerobic bacterium, the "Bacillus Comensii" which produces the fermentation of pectic matter, or that is to say, of the gums which hold together the fibres of flax and of other textiles plants.
>
> By the action of this fermentation, this pectic matter is dissolved and the textile fibres are liberated.
>
> The fermentation produced is one absolutely specific for the pectines so that the fibers (cellulose) can never be attacked. The best proof of this is given by the fact that the process of retting can be continued indefinitely without ever attacking the cellulose or fibre.
>
> We wish to emphasize this point, and attract especial attention to it for it holds a very important place in the question of economy of the system. It makes it possible to utilize the entire quantity of textile fibre that is contained in the flax straw. There is absolutely no waste.
>
> It is quite different with the retting processes used up to the present either in water or in the fields (dew retting). In these processes the fermentation produced varies extremely, either because of difference in the water used, or in the temperature, and it varies even according to the depth in the same water. Thus in the

River Lys, where the best flax fibre known is produced, the retting process is repeated twice and even three times and each time the position of the bundles is changed. The roots being all at one end, one time they are at the bottom and the next time at the surface. The fermentations which are produced in the rivers and on the fields attack the cellulose (fibre) as well as the pectic matter (gum), and sometimes it even happens that the fibre is completely lost. Without arriving, except in rare cases at this extremity, it is an absolute fact that a certain per cent of fibre is always lost and that one hundred per cent of what exists before retting is never obtained.

On the contrary, in the specific fermentation, produced by pure cultures of "Bacillus Comensii" it is certain and has been proved, industrially as well as scientifically that there is no danger possible for the fibre.

In fact, the mass in fermentation sown with a pure culture of the pectic aerobic bacterium "Bacillus Comensii", under the influence of a temperature of 86 to 93 fahr., and of the circulation of air in the mass, attains in a few hours, a very intense degree of fermentation. At its maximum point the bacteria attains the number of 80,000,000 per cent cubic centimeter (1,200,000,000 per cubic inches) in other words, that work is done to all intents and purposes in a pure culture, and the fermentation obtained is solely pectic without its being necessary to take any special precautions to obtain it.

In the industrial application of this method, the large per cent of fibre obtained suffices alone to cover the cost of retting. The following must also be taken into account.

In speaking of the retting carried on in water or on the fields, it has already been stated, and moreover it is a fact well known to all those in this industry, that a part of the cellulose is attacked by this process of fermentation, and is damaged not only in quantity, for it loses a part of its resistance and its spinning value. In the application of the Rossi Method where fermentation of the cellulose is impossible, besides the conservation of the quantity of fibre, there is also the absolute certitude that the quality of robustness has not been attacked. The pure cultures which we receive always contain small bits of flax or hemp, which have often been in the presence of bacteria during several months.

The fibres are completely freed separated into their elementary fibrils, but they remain unaltered.

Application of the Rossi Method.

In order to undertake an operation that shall be regular and systematic every day, an installation of four vats in reinforced cement is necessary.

The complete operation of retting takes from 60 hours up (70 hours for the finer and more retted qualities) so that the output of one vat per day is obtained.

With vats of 100 cubic meters (325 cubic ft.) 12 to 14 ton of flax straw can be retted per day. This quantity corresponds to the crop of 8 to 10 acres, in France.

If in Canada, as it seems probable, the flax crop will be cut, the quantity of 12 to 14 tons will perhaps be commensurate with 10 to 12 acres, because of the loss of the roots.

The installation requires also a boiler to maintain constantly in the vats the temperature of 86 to 93 fahr., and a small air compressor kept working constantly by an electric motor of 4 or 5 HP.

It is not necessary to have a specialist for the preparation of the ferments. An ordinary workman can prepare them in a few hours daily after having seen them prepared one or twice.

Once the retting is accomplished the flax is treated, in the drying, as in the other process, exactly as usual, that is to say it is dried in the open air in the fields and it is scutched with the Flemish mills as is done ordinarily in Belgium, France, Holland and Ireland.

We wish to call attention to a machine for breaking and scutching, which has just been put on the market and which renders the work of scutching very rapid and really industrial. It has been invented by a specialist in the flax question and it is destined to render great service, above all in countries where labour is scarce and dear.

We have had the occasion to read the following considerations that Mr. James A. McCracken Secy, of the Canadian Flax Growers has published in the Canadian Textile Journal.

"We must set for our goal, now that times are good, the production of the best flaxes in the world, so that spinners with special demands may come to us for their supplies of fibre, because they can get what they want nowhere else—like millers send here for the finest wheat.

"And if we don't achieve first place as a flax fibre nation our high striving ought surely to land us somewhere very near it. Even that much would mean permanence for our flax industry. Can we get beyond the Russian fibre? It means more than that most of us will get 2 or 3 cents a pound more than the average Russian producer. It means that altogether and every year we must produce an essential Canadian flax true to standards so unerringly that in the world's market we will come to be known and recognized. We are not recognized nor mentioned at all in the world's markets today. In bulk we cannot claim much attention in any case, but quality, irrespective of quantity, is the paramount consideration in flax as it is in diamonds."

We do not know how to emphasize sufficiently what a just vision Mr. McCracken has in this question.

Since we have begun to ret flax at our plant at Bonetable we have found that it is absolutely possible by means of a perfectly regulated method of retting to produce entirely uniform types of fibre.

It is a well-known fact that a year may produce an excellent flax crop but that the resulting fibre may be very mediocre, if the season has been poor for retting, while another year may be bad for the flax crop, but the conditions of the retting season being good, the fibre produced may be excellent relatively to the flax straw.

In any exploitation, and having at disposal a method of retting, always sure and absolutely controllable from every point of view, by the will of man, each year the straw harvested can be divided into three classifications, in order to obtain three well defined categories of product.

1. The average straw of the year's crop, average in quality and length. This average straw can be called the "Standard type of the Year."

2. The inferior straw, inferior in quality and in length, and

3. Extra quality, carefully chosen and worked to give a superior product.

At this moment we have at our disposition the crops of 1914 and 1915.

The crop of 1914 is very superior and we have obtained two qualities of fibre—average and superior—(about 50% of each). From the crop of 1915 which was very mediocre, we have inferior and average quality.

France planted in 1913 30,000 hectares.
Belgium " " " 23,000
Holland " " " 14,000

In the same year Canada planted 628,000 hectares in flax.

These figures indicate clearly that the Dominion of Canada is capable of organizing a very powerful linen industry.

With 30,000 hectares, France obtained 25,000,000 francs of seed, that is 1,000 francs worth per hectare.

In Canada 628 000 hectares produced 450,000 tons of seed valued at 90,000,000 francs, that is about 150 francs per hectare.

Russia planted 1,448,000 hectares and her exportation in fibre in 1913 reached 250,000,000 francs as against 50,000,000 francs of seed.

The conclusion is that flax culture is very interesting from the point of view of the fibre, but very little remunerative for the seed, and it seems certain that cultivators will be quickly and easily persuaded to sell their flax straw, and to regulate their flax culture according to the conditions necessary to obtain good straw for fibre.

I should also like to refer to a report that reached me only a day or two ago from New York. I cannot say anything as to its reliability, but it appeared in the March number of Cotton, a textile trade journal published in the United States. It draws attention to the possibility of the production of linen from flax fibre at a price to compete favourably with cotton. Referring to the flax and linen industry in the United States, the March number of Cotton says:

Whether the stimulus afforded by the necessity of war will prove of lasting benefit is still to be demonstrated, but from the report from William J. Robinson, Chairman of the Division of Flax, Fibre and Linen Manufacturers, U.S. War Industries Board, hope of this result is given.

If it comes true, the United States will in one more direction be free from that dependence upon foreign nations which was such a handicap in 1915 and 1916, though happily it has turned out to be a blessing in stirring American initiative.

According to Mr. Robinson, the cotton belt will have to look to its laurels. At any rate, he says that "recent discoveries in the treatment of flax make it possible for America not only to grow flax successfully and profitably, in every state of the union, but to produce flax fibre with an average yield of two-third of a bale to the acre more cheaply than cotton can be produced, and with more profit to the farmer. Synthetically prepared American flax has been converted into linen commercially for the first time in America, in a mill in Wisconsin.

Following are some parts of the report made by Mr. Robinson:

"After long and painstaking research a new synthetic process has been discovered, which is one of the most important discoveries to the entire field of commercial industry. The process dissolves the gum from the flax straw in less than an hour, without any injury to the fibre, and produces a strong, clean, beautiful fibre, ready for the spinner when dried and prepared. The process can be operated in either summer or winter, and has no disagreeable features, costs 70 per cent less in labour, time and expense than either of the other processes, and makes bleaching, except to secure extremely white linen, absolutely unnecessary.

In a test of the comparative strength of water-retted fibre—

This is a very important part of the report, because the objections to the process of chemical retting and any other process except the old one of dew retting, has been that it weakens the tensile strength of the fibre. Mr. Robinson says:

In a test of the comparative strength of water-retted fibre and the retted fibre by the United States Bureau of Standards, October 15, 1918—water retted flax broke at a strain of 115—while retted fibre by this new process stood a strain of 183. Flax by this new method can be produced more cheaply than cotton.

I do not affirm or accept the statement as accurate, but coming from such an authority as the chairman of the Division of Flax, Fibre and Linen Manufacturers, United States War Industries Board, and in view of the tests made by the United States Bureau of Standards, we should at least give some attention and weight to the report presented.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the flax produced in Canada manufactured into linen anywhere in Canada?

Mr. GLASS: Yes, I am coming to that feature of it; it is being done now. I said, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1914 we were producing a small acreage of 1,400 acres only of fibre flax in Canada. We had nine mills in operation and they were scattered over a very small area of southwestern Ontario, not because the weather conditions there were more favourable than elsewhere, but simply because these few mills were the only remaining ones of a large number that had gradually, from time to time, gone out of operation owing to the competition of the Russian fibre and the cheap labour in European production. Now, however, the industry is extending well over the province of Ontario and at the present time 47 mills are reported to the Department of Agriculture with a total flax area last year of 18,000 acres, and an area rented for the purposes of next year's production of 25,000 acres. I have here a list of mills distributed as follows:

Nicholson & Hodgins, Crediton; McMurchy & Anderson, Ripley; Amerlin Flax Co., Petrolia;

Wm. Forrester, Mitchell; O. Geiger, Hensall; Doon Twines Ltd., Floradale; Tipling & Mills, Wingham; T. A. G. Gordon, Sarnia; Jas. McColl & Co., Alvinston; H. W. Ebel, Conestogo; McDonald Burns Ltd., Dresden; H. A. Griffin, Arthur; Barbour Flax Co., Moorefield, Alma; Ontario Flax Co., Parkhill, Ailsa Craig, Shipka, Exeter and Tilbury; Wm. Ward, Lucan; A. Heiderman & Son, Zurich; V. Stock, Tavistock; H. Fraleigh, Forest; Dashwood Flax Co., Dashwood; F. Kalbfleisch, Zurich; Sebringville Flax Co., Sebringville; R. J. Nicholson & Son, Merner and Seaforth; Blyth Flax Co., Blyth; Netherlands Flax Co., Winnipeg.

The Netherlands Flax Co. of Winnipeg, a new company, have 700 acres under contract for next year, and this is evidence of the confidence they have that flax fibre can be grown in the province of Manitoba.

Canadian Flax Mills, Drayton, Arthur, Seaforth, Wallaceburg, Essex and St. Catharines; A. L. McCredie, St. Marys; Stratford Flax Co., Stratford; Flax Spinners Ltd., Guelph and Listowel; Wm. Weir, St. Marys; Edward Weiler, Bowmanville; Canadian Flax & Seed, Oshawa; J. Flock, Windsor; James Rose, Pickering; J. B. Hudson, Millbank.

I point out this distribution to show that the cultivation of flax is spreading out into new areas which for some years have not made any progress. The fact that we have to such a large extent developed this industry under the stimulus that has been pressing us, and the fact that we have increased our production considerably is not, to my mind, the most important thing that we have discovered. We knew that we could produce a good fibre. Our fibre previous to 1915 found its market entirely in the United States, in the mills of Massachusetts and New Jersey, where it was spun into yarns for shoemakers' and harnessmakers' purposes, and for twines for fishing nets, as well as for coarser purposes; but that we were able behind it all to produce a quality of fibre fine enough to make the fine linens that were being made, seemed absolutely unknown to us. I have pointed out that the Ontario Flax Mills Company have five different mills in that province, and it is interesting to tell the House who the Ontario Flax Mills Company are. They are an organization directly representing in Canada the Belfast Spinning Mills of Belfast, Ireland, the largest linen mills in the world. Knowing that a good fibre must be produced and that they could not count on the fibre of Russia as regards its quality, and realizing that the supply from Belgium must be shut off, and as there were limitations to the amount that could be grown in Ireland, the Belfast mills four years ago sent Mr. F. J. Lockhart, a most capable man who understands the flax business from A to Z, to Parkhill in the county of Middlesex to try out our Canadian flax. They obtained a small acreage of four or five hundred acres altogether and seeded flax in that district with the Dutch child seed. The crop was so satisfactory that every pound of it was scutched and sent over to their mills in Ireland, and the next year they put in 1,000 acres, increasing the acreage in 1917. Last year they had over 1,800 acres, and according to the statement I have, they have under contract 2,500 acres for fibre for the Belfast linen mills for next year. Why should men of their experience go to the expense of establishing industries here, if it be not because they know that they can obtain in Canada the raw material necessary to keep their mills in operation and cannot get it so satisfactorily elsewhere? That is their reason for being here; and may we not hope that, as this large industry in Ireland, the largest in the world, sees the possibilities of producing raw material here, the time will soon come when under the stimulus and encouragement of the bounty now being given for the spinning of yarns in Canada they will transfer from Ireland some of their large spinning plants? May we not hope that the time will quickly come when this industry, which was of such insignificant importance here a year ago but which is gradually blossoming out, will be an important factor in the economic and industrial develoment of this country? Last year in discussing this subject I urged on my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and the Government to connect up the fibre industry with the weaving industry by giving encouragement to the spinning of yarns. This was the position we occupied and have occupied: We have had a linen mill in the city of Guelph representing an investment of $750,000, a mill that can weave as fine cloths as those produced in any part of the world. This mill had to bring its yarns from Ireland to weave cloths. We were producing the raw material; were the "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the other fellows, doing the hard, laborious and difficult work which gave the least value in money

3 p.m.

We sent this material over to Ireland and Ireland spun it into yarn. Our mills bought back the yarn as their raw material, and this is what they are weaving in the city of Guelph. I am told this is the only linen weaving mill on the continent of America. Whether that is right or wrong I cannot say, but I do know it is the only one in the Dominion of Canada.

The Government did not take action in the early part of last year in the direction I suggested, that of giving a bonus or a bounty on the spinning of yarns in Canada from Canadian fibre. But in September last the demand for aeroplane cloths and linen products was so insistent that the British War Board represented to the War Trade Board of Canada the urgency of the situation. The War Trade Board of Canada made their representations to the Government and as a result a bounty was given for the spinning of yarn varying according to the fineness of the yarn. These yarns are known by the word "lea" which defines their fineness. On 20 lea, which is a comparatively coarse yarn, the Government allowed a bounty of three cents a pound; on yarn over 20 and under 40 lea, they allowed six cents a pound and on all yarn over 40 lea of fineness nine cents per pound was allowed. What happened? The ink had scarcely dried upon the paper putting that Order in Council into force when contracts were negotiated for the establishment of a big spinning mill. That only happened last September and notwithstanding the difficulties of procuring machinery and establishing such industries, in the city of Guelph, a spinning mill has been established representing an investment of some $300,000 and instead of sending our fibre out of the country to Ireland, the Canadian Spinneries Limited in Guelph are spinning our fibre into yarn which is a step in the right direction. But the Canadian Spinneries Limited at Guelph, operating to their full capacity, could not spin one-eighth of the fibre that was produced in Canada last year and it will be largely increased for the coming year. That is not all. I desire to tell the House that a very large corporation interested in the linen trade and which has been doing much to develop the linen industry in this country, have their buyers to-day in England buying the necessary machinery to establish a mill in Canada for the production of linen in all its departments. Their slogan is: "Flax from the field to the mill." They are going to grow, ret, scutch, heckle, spin and weave the flax. They are going to carry on the whole operation. This concern is going to establish a very large industry. It is expected that $2,000,000 will be invested and its plant will be up to date in every respect. It seems to me that there has been sufficient justification for the Government in carrying out the recommendations that were made to it at that time.

In the Canadian Textile Journal, published at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, a series of articles has appeared under the name of Alfred S. Moore, a very prominent trained flax man in Ireland. He is giving considerable attention to the development of flax in this country. I noticed that in the number of February 4, speaking of Canada and the possibilities of the flax industry, he points out the achievements of Canada in the development of flax fibre. But there is one feature which I desire particularly to call the attention of the House to and that is the high standing we have achieved in the British market for our product. He says:—

> Despite the high price and scarcity of Canadian labour it is at present the most promising country for flax and seed supplies. There is an active Canadian Flax Growers' Association in existence and the Dominion Government in its Experimental Farm at Ottawa, has also shown itself most energetic. Nor should one forget the stimulus given to the industry by the "Canadian Textile Journal" and the "Monetary Times" . . . The great Belfast York Street Flax Spinning Company—the world's largest linen mills—and also several other Belfast firms have proved the excellent quality of Canadian flax, and, as a result, large tracts of flax lands are now being cultivated in the Dominion.
>
> It is a matter for congratulation, however, that a step has been taken in the right direction, and it is hoped that Canadian flax will soon take the place of that grown in Russia in providing the flax for the world's linen trade, and it is to the benefit of the Dominion and ourselves to develop the promising field.
>
> It is due to Canadian seed that the extended flax acreage in Ireland this season has been possible. Most of the Canadian flax is exported to the United States, and what is most needed in Canada is the development of a good flax pulling machine. In the Canadian Northwest also two million acres are annually planted with flax—not grown for the fibre, as the climate of the West is not considered the best for fibre production. To the linen trade of Ireland it is tantalizing that thousands of tons of flax fibre should be annually burnt up in Canada.

What I desire to especially draw to the attention of the House is that tests have been made under Government direction in England and Ireland in their experimental farms in regard to the production of flax, and they have demonstrated that Canadian seed, side by side with the world's established standards, Dutch (White Flowering), Yorkshire, French, Irish, Russian (Perneau Crown), and American (Minnesota), ranks amongst the very first. At present Great Britain is controlling all the seed that will be sown for fibre in Great Britain next year. Great Britain controls the price at which the seed shall be sold and the profit that wholesalers shall receive for the sale of it. In the list of prices issued to the trade only in March last, which appeared in the Linen Circular, a linen journal in

Ireland, Canadian standard fibre is the very highest priced seed offered to the growers of Great Britain of all the world's standard varieties. It seems to me that it is very important that we have been able to attain so high a reputation in the production of our seed. Great Britain this year will be dependent largely on the seed grown in this country for her crop of 1919.

To this end, in September or October last, the British Government asked the Canadian Government to commandeer all the available export flax fibre seed in this country for use next year. The Canadian Government did so, and the price obtained by the growers amounting to something like $8.30 a bushel, or thereabouts. Some one hundred and ten thousand bushels of this seed were commandeered, and after doing that sufficient supply was left to seed the crop of 1919. The British Government, I am sorry to say, instead of using this seed for the purposes for which it was commandeered has directed a certain amount of it to the West to produce seed for their supplies next year. However, the reputation we have made in the world's best market must be jealously guarded, and carefully maintained. I know personally that the Minister of Agriculture has given very serious consideration to this feature, and that he will throw about it such safeguards as are necessary to maintain that reputation.

It is said that in the West a large amount of flax is grown for seed only, and the question has been asked by members from the West: Why cannot we grow fibre out there? I say to our friends from the West: If we attempt to grow flax in this country as you grow it out there we would not produce fibre either. There are two methods of growing flax, one for seed, and one for fibre. Where flax is grown for seed, about half a bushel of seed to the acre is used. It produces a short stubby stalk which throws out very large seed bolls, which are grown for seed for manufacturing oil and certain by-products. Where seed is sown for fibre, a bushel and a half to two bushels to the acre is used and produces a thicker and longer straw with only a few seed bolls in the top. The lands of the West, I understand, have produced as high as twenty-eight bushels to the acre of flax seed. That, no doubt, is a very large production, a great deal larger than the average. From lands where flax is seeded for fibre the maximum average production of seed is about eight bushels to the acre. In the United States and in Canada considerable effort has been devoted to research in the hope of ultimately using the waste straw of the Western provinces. I have a report here in which a Mr. George Harrison claims to have made considerable progress in discovering a method for using the western straw for gas purposes. This gentleman says:

> Plain loose threshed straw is placed in an air-tight retort, and when roasted, not burned, for half an hour in three hundred degrees of heat, the gas leaves by the only means of escape, through a pipe into a scrubber or refiner. At this point a by-product in the form of jet black tar is taken from the gas, and the purified product passes into the gasometer, or large storage tank. From there it is piped to the various cooking or heating appliances and operated in the same manner as by city users of gas. The bluish flame is similar to coal gas, though claimed to be of a much higher grade and having greater heating propensities.

Without going into this report very fully, I may say this man claims to have discovered a means of manufacturing gas from this straw whereby a ton of straw, which is of small value compared to a ton of coal, will develop more gas than a ton and a quarter of coal. I have no doubt this matter is being looked into by the Government, and by the Research Department, and, if it has any merit, that full advantage will be taken of this process. The United States Government are making extensive investigations along the same line, and they also hope to find some use for this straw.

A few years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtained the services of Arthur D. Little & Co., the most prominent research chemists, I presume, in the United States. They established a branch in Canada and were directed by the Canadian Pacific authorities to devote their energies primarily to the solution of the problem of the utilization of western straw in industry. Dr. Howe, who had charge of their research bureau in Montreal, spent some considerable time in the work, and I was disappointed that it had not been prosecuted to a point where some definite proposal for the utilization of this straw could have been presented. It appears, however, that they had been making their investigations in Canada up to 1918, and about this time the Canadian Government established its research bureau. The Canadian Pacific thereupon feared they would be treading on ground that properly belonged to the Federal Government, and withdrew before completing their experiments. I hold in my hand a sample of linen paper produced from our western prairie straw—and Dr. Howe says that this paper is of a quality suitable to the highest requirements that

the Government would demand for bank notes. He also says that it is commercially possible to manufacture pulp from the straw in small mills in the western provinces, and then ship it to the paper-mills where it can be converted into an industrial product. This paper, Sir, looks to be a most extraordinary sample in point of quality, and I am sure would prove very interesting to any member of the House who cared to examine it. It was sent to me by Dr. Howe, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Research Department, as a product of paper manufactured from western flax straw.

In connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn quite recently to the possibility of the utilization of this straw in the spinning of yarns. I have had some very interesting correspondence with a gentleman in New York, in which he expresses absolute confidence in the merit of his process for treating this western straw and manufacturing it into fibre. In a letter written to me on March 15, this gentleman says:

> I thank you for your favour of 13th, and appreciate your courtesy in keeping me informed as to the progress of your work on flax in Canada. Shall be very glad to receive a copy of the discussion in the House when you can send it.
>
> I wonder if I made it quite clear that the process of handling flax straw to which I referred can be successfully used on oil seed flax straw so largely burned and wasted in the great Northwest? The inventor has produced some splendid goods, comparing favourably with the best Irish linen, both as towelling and table cloth fabrics. He uses standardized textile machinery, and claims to be able to produce the spinning fibre and yarn at a small fraction of the cost for the same kind of product by the ordinary process.
>
> There are a number of American inventors who seem to be producing a yarn from this oil seed flax straw suitable for crash towelling, etc., but this man is the first one I have discovered who shows anything in fabrics even approximating the best Irish linen goods. For your information, I am sending a small sample of a table cloth which this man says was produced by this method. I did not see the goods made, but have confidence that the inventor's statement is true as I have known the man for over thirty years and know that he has a large experience in textile work. At present he is without resources and is looking for financial backing to start a factory to turn out linen goods. He has suffered greatly at the hands of apparently unscrupulous promoters who tried to tie him up, hand and foot, but failed to supply the requisite capital. He is now free from this entangling alliance and no doubt can be arranged with on a reasonable basis to take charge of a factory which should use his process.

Consultations were held with the Minister of Agriculture and Dr. Macallum of the Research Bureau, and it was considered that enough material had been presented in his letters to suggest that there might be some merit in the process that he claimed to have discovered. As a simple means of getting information concerning it, I suggested that it would be desirable to have this man come here and present his process and his plans to experts. Dr. Van Bruyssell of Montreal, who is on the Flax Research Committee, Dr. Grisdale of the Experimental Farm, Dr. Shutt, and the head of the Fibre Department, Mr. Hutchinson, and others. If there be merit in his process, it is a matter of vital importance to the whole of Western Canada that this material which represents such a large waste year by year should be used in economic industries. With reference to my suggestion, he said:

> My friend would be glad to accept the Government's invitation for a visit and conference. He is a man of attainments, a gentleman and a scholar, a trained engineer, graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a textile expert in every sense of the word, with an actual mill experience of some twenty years. I am confident that if given the opportunity, he can convince Dr. Macallum and his associates, theoretically, at first, that he has solved the problem, and that the Government would be warranted in equipping a plant under his direction, which can produce from seed flax fibre all kinds of linen goods, equal to those now produced by the so-called long line method.
>
> As I have previously written you, I think, I do not know of my own personal knowledge that my friend has already done this. He tells me he has and I believe him. To my mind there is only one practical question to be settled: Can he do it on a commercial basis, that is, at a cost to compete with normal cost of long line linen production? On this point I am so far affirmatively convinced that if I had the means, I certainly should equip a mill and give him a chance to prove out his claims. I have spent months investigating the matter, have met many experts who said it cannot be done, have seen the wreckage following several failures to do this thing, and believe thoroughly that my friend has solved the entire problem. I think he has taken advantage of all the good points of other processes, so far as he can legitimately use them and not infringe existing patents; has eliminated a lot of useless steps, has avoided some pitfalls present in other processes, and by skilfully combining and utilizing standardized textile and other machinery, has a process that is simple, economical and practical.

I submit that the representations this man makes justify at least an investigation of his claims.

If Canadian flax fibre is to maintain the reputation it has gained through the stress of necessity and through the exigencies of war, we should take advantage of this opportunity to guard jealously the position that we have attained. While Russia and other European countries where cheap labour prevailed were able to manufacture a fibre at a price that prevented our competing

with them successfully, the advantages they have had have been largely overcome by the invention and utilization of mechanical appliances for harvesting the crop and scutching it, and by scientific research in the matter of a simpler and cheaper process of retting. If the Government establishes a Department of Research as is suggested by the resolution of the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) on the Order Paper, there would be a wide field of usefulness in connection with zymo-technology, the study of fermentation, which has played an important part in industry. It is admitted that the process of retting in flax production is a bacteriological, micro-biological process. Professor Rossi seems to have separated and segregated the bacilli necessary for this process, and they are successfully carrying on the work by the use of these bacteria. If we solve the problem of cheaper retting, and the cost be reduced by seventy per cent, as is stated here, if we solve the problem of mechanical appliances for harvesting machinery—and we believe we have done that—having demonstrated that we can produce a better quality of fibre than Russia can, there is nothing under heaven to keep us behind the producers of Europe. If it be true, as stated by Mr. Robinson, of the American War Board, that the process of separating the gum and retting the flax can be completed in an hour; that the tensile strength of the fibre produced stands in a ratio of 183 to 115, and that we can produce in various parts of Canada a flax fibre that will compete with cotton, who can estimate the possibilities of accomplishment in this line? Here is opened a field for thought and investigation that should commend itself to the very best consideration of the Government.

It so happens that fibre is being produced at the present time in a comparatively small area consisting of seven or eight counties, the production being largely in Western Ontario. These producers are groping in the dark and working by the methods of years ago. If we are to help these men to solve the problem of retting, improved scutching, and reduction of the cost of labour in handling, Government experimental mills along the line of the Experimental Farm station in Ottawa, although possibly on a larger scale, should be established in central parts of the flax growing areas. If we are to make a success of the production of flax fibre, we have to put it within the power of the farmer to get the full economic value of all the straw that he produces, not to sell his straw to the flax mill, and thus get the small end of the deal, but to do as he would with his wool, to produce his own fibre from the straw and then to sell his fibre in the market.

We ask also that the Government take into consideration the matter of establishing standards. We know that in the past few years a marked advance has been made in the value of his wool to the farmer on account of the higher price obtained by grading. There is just as great possibility of increasing the value of his flax to the farmer by proper grading and standardizing as there was in the wool, and the Flax Growers Association, at a meeting held in March last, passed a resolution endorsing the resolution I have moved as embodying those principles which most essentially would benefit the flax men of this country. Therefore in this way the Government may be able to lend further encouragement to this industry, and to develop it, not only in Western Ontario, but in other parts of Canada by similar processes by which it may be originated and developed.

The matter of standards for flax fibre is very important, and no less important is the desirability of having a Government cleaning station where the seed, after it is cleaned, and set to a standard, may have its pedigree, character, and reputation standardized and maintained in the markets of the world. I need only to refer to the deplorable report from the Seed Commissioner as to the results of his investigation of samples of flax seed which were handed to him as being properly cleaned. He found them so foul and full of weeds that they would befoul the land of any farmer who attempted to use them. Suitable machinery has been invented for properly cleaning flax seed, and we have it on the authority of the Linen Circular published in Great Britain and Ireland that Canadian fibre is recognized in the world's biggest and best markets in Great Britain as being the highest standard that is sown and as commanding the highest price. We have built up that reputation during the past few years, and it is most important that that reputation should be maintained.

While I am on that question, I purpose reading a report made by Mr. Moore, a cultured gentleman in Ireland, who has written several articles on this subject to the Canadian Textile Journal: He says—

> The most important deductions to be drawn from this table of seed productivity, is that of the several varieties tested, Dutch (White Flowering), Yorkshire and Canadian gave better, and French and Irish slightly poorer results than Russian (Pernau Crown), and

Dutch seed, American Minnesota was relatively a failure. These results further confirm, says Mr. Moore, those obtained in the trials of the previous year—in fact further tests since bear them out also and demonstrate that seed suitable for fibre production might be procured from Canada.

Now that we are able to produce a seed for the growing of flax fibre, a pedigreed seed, a seed of character and quality superior to almost all others and practically excelled by none—and I may say further equal to and on a par with the best known continental standards—it will be our duty to jealously guard this reputation and to take any means necessary to prevent the frauds that are being attempted to blast this reputation, by trying to grow our fibre seed in western provinces of this country, where experience has repeatedly shown that fibre seed loses its quality and character under the climatic conditions prevalent there, and trying to sell this product as Canadian fibre seed against the seed of established reputation grown in Ontario. If Canada is to maintain the enviable position she has attained, I am of opinion that the Government must lend a hand, establish proper standards and provide for rigid inspection of our fibre seed. Cleaning stations should be provided, and no seed allowed to be sold for fibre, unless it shall have the brand and stamp duly approved by the Department of Agriculture, which should be a guarantee of its quality and pedigree. So much for our seed. Of equal importance, however, is the result of our experience in the production of fibre—not so much that we have been able to so largely extend our acreage, and thus more adequately meet national needs, but that we have been able to improve the quality of our fibre, so that in the world's best markets Canadian flax fibre is classed as amongst the best of the world's supplies. To-day our fibre stands side by side with best continental standards. This is a great achievement, but we must not rest satisfied, we must aim higher. May we not, therefore, look forward to greater achievements, may we not hope that by patience, perseverance, and close application to the study of this great industry to make our product stand in a class by itself recognized throughout the world as superior in quality, dependable in grading on approved standards, so that buyers in the world's markets will be assured that when a purchase of Canadian fibre is made, they will know it will be true to standard and quality.

Let us make quality our aim, a higher and better quality than has been hitherto produced. The name "Canada" stands for quality throughout the world, firmly established by the efficiency, courage and fighting quality of our fighting men in the late war. Their record stands out as a beacon light, directing us to greater energy that we may to the fullness of our powers embrace the opportunities that surround us, and press forward to greater endeavour. We have proven to the world that we can produce manufactured goods as well as raw materials, and our ambition must have a higher aim than that of remaining a raw material producing country.

If these higher aims are to be realized, I am of opinion that close co-operation and encouragement will be required of the Government not only in guarding that which we have, but in the development of the industry generally. We can congratulate the Government on its forward policy so far. As a result of the bounty they placed on yarns spun from Canadian flax fibre already a large spinning mill has been established at Guelph, and Canadian linens are now being woven from Canadian yarns manufactured from Canadian flax fibre. That should be our slogan—flax from the field to the loom. We need a dozen mills, yea, even twenty such mills as that at Guelph if we spin our product of fibre into yarns. And why should we not export these yarns rather than the fibre? A large mill is now under organization behind which it is understood over two million dollars of capital is placed, for the purpose of establishing an industry in western Ontario which will embrace the whole field of manufacture from the growing of fibre to the weaving of the finished cloth.

We must encourage scientific research in the industry, so that newer methods, improved methods will be found for retting of flax, and in this I would suggest that the Government in connection with its research work might establish a department of zymotechnics, with a view to the study of this subject in its relation to retting of flax.

Professor Giacomo Rossi, M.D., Director of Laboratory of Agricultural Bacteriology in the superior School of Agriculture in Portici, Italy, has, it is said, made very valuable discoveries in research work, and has practically solved the problem of improved retting process. It is claimed that by this process it is possible to utilize the entire quantity of textile fibre that is contained in the straw. The straw is retted in tanks of varying size even to a capacity of ten or fifteen tons. It is claimed that by his process the large per cent of fibre obtained suffices alone to cover the cost of retting. Full report of this process was

obtained by the Canadian commercial delegation to France in the year 1916 from the Société Française, de Rouissage Industriel, and this has been sent to the Honorary Advisory Council of Research. It would seem to be well worthy of investigating.

Improved harvesting machinery has now been perfected and the matter of labour in harvesting will have been solved, the efficiency of which will be proved by the Nitro Products Co. of St. Dennis, Ontario, who have undertaken to have their machines in operation during the coming season. Improved scutching machines have also made much headway, and this will likewise aid in reducing the labour costs in the production of fibre. All advantages which in the past, as regards labour, were held by European countries will have been overcome by improved machinery devices, so that with these and the application of research work as I have suggested, there is no reason why this country should not attain a place in the linen industry, successfully competing in the trade with the world's largest linen centres. Opportunity is knocking at our door, how shall we use it? I am convinced that the Government of Canada is alive to the importance of the industry, and our people may count on their co-operation and encouragement in all that pertains to the fullest development of it in this country.

In conclusion, I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a matter which, though it has not been discussed, is of considerable importance. We have shown in this country that we are capable of producing just as high a quality of hemp as of flax. Hemp seed is a commercial article brought into this country chiefly for the purpose of bird seed. It is a product of China which has been acclimatized in the United States and grown with varying success in the state of Wisconsin. Our flax fibre men in Western Ontario have experimented in growing hemp. In the year 1916, on the farm of Mr. Howard Fraleigh, at Forest, in the county of Lambton, I saw a field of five acres of hemp which stood on an average twelve feet high, and some of it was fifteen feet high. It was a beautiful crop. We have an ideal climate and an ideal soil for the growing of hemp, and the industry should be encouraged. It is a very expensive seed under present conditions, because after being imported from China into the United States, it has to be acclimatized there for two or three years before it is ready for distribution in this country. I believe that the Fibre Department, which I know has given some attention to this matter, should recommend the taking of the necessary means to encourage to the fullest extent the development of hemp growing in this country. The industry has wonderful possibilities, if we go into it properly. The hemp has to undergo a treatment of retting somewhat similar to that undergone by flax, and if tank retting and other progressive methods work out satisfactorily we shall take a step in advance of European countries in the growing of hemp. I think hemp seed should be admitted into Canada on the same footing as grains brought in for seed purposes; it should come in absolutely free of duty. I respectfully submit to the minister that there is a possibility of growing hemp in this country over a very wide area, and that with proper encouragement a very large and remunerative industry could be built up.

I wish to express again my appreciation and that of the members of the Canadian Flax Growers' Association for the valuable aid given by the minister in the development of the fibre industry. We have made splendid advances, and the possibilities are beyond the power of the mind to calculate. Let us have for our slogan: "What we have we'll hold," and then we will not only sustain the reputation we already have, but will aim at a higher and better quality of fibre than we have produced in the past.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): I shall say only a few words on this subject, as the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) has covered the ground very fully, and I am sure we have all appreciated what he has said. I want to congratulate the Government on the assistance they have given to this great industry. I am sure the Government is willing to make every effort to make flax growing one of the successful industries of the country.

I rose merely for the purpose of urging upon the minister the need of standardizing and classifying the seeds and the fibre. It is absolutely necessary that the growers of flax in Canada should take advantage of the market that is offering in Ireland and elsewhere, but unless our seed and fibre is properly classified we cannot expect to receive the returns we otherwise would. The day is not far distant when we shall have a Government-owned elevator in the province of Ontario, and I hope when that day comes the elevator will be used, to some extent at least, for the purpose of cleaning not only the seed grains and other seeds that are largely used in the province, but also the flax that is sent out of the country

stamped by the Government as Canadian-grown flax. I know that the minister fully appreciates the fact that this flax and flax seed that we export to Ireland compares favourably with the very best flax seed and fibre imported into Ireland from any other country. I would respectfully urge the minister to give consideration to these few points, and particularly to seeing if it is not possible to classify the seed and the fibre.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): The subject that is covered by the resolution which has been discussed so ably by the hon. member who has introduced it this afternoon (Mr. Glass) is one of growing importance in the agricultural field of our endeavours in Canada. My study—my limited study, I should say—of the development of the fibre flax industry in Canada has taught me that some forty or fifty years ago the flax fibre industry in the older provinces of Canada was one of considerable dimensions. The flax produced at that time was spun and handled mainly by the growers themselves. Owing, however, to the difficulty of getting cheap labour and the consequent inability to compete with the flax fibre products of countries like Russia, Belgium, and Holland, where labour has been very cheap, the industry declined in Canada, and very little attention was paid to it until a few years ago. The revival of the industry in Ontario has been quite marked within the last few years. That revival has been due primarily to the impetus given to the industry by war conditions. In 1912 there were approximately 2,000 acres of flax planted for fibre purposes in the province of Ontario. Next year, I am informed, there will be 25,000 acres, which, taking all the circumstances into consideration, is a very remarkable development indeed.

When we were producing flax in Canada quite a number of years ago, I am informed, the growers were able to get for the flax fibre between ten and twelve cents a pound. During the last year or two, owing to war conditions, the price has ranged from seventy-five cents to one dollar a pound.

As the hon. member has stated, the quality of the fibre produced in Canada is fully equal if not superior to the best produced in any of the European countries, and this fact itself affords a very substantial foundation for the building of a permanent and secure industry. It seems to me—and I referred to this aspect of the subject in the few remarks I made when it was under discussion at the last session—that the future of the industry in Canada depends almost altogether on the development of labour-saving devices for harvesting the crop and for manufacturing it into the finished fibre after it is harvested.

I would like to give a brief outline of the work that is being carried on in the Experimental Farms branch in this connection. In the carrying on of this industry I find that there are several stages, the first, of course, being the planting of the seed, followed by the pulling of the plant when it is ready for harvesting. In Western Canada where we have been accustomed to produce flax for seed purposes, or rather for the production of oil, the crops are harvested in the ordinary way, but when the plant is used for fibre purposes it requires to be pulled from the ground in order that the slender threads running through the stem will not be broken or cut. Consequently the first part of the operation is the pulling. After the flax is pulled it has to be deseeded, and then the retting or rotting process takes place. After that process is over the plant has to be passed through what is known as a breaking machine where the woody part that is already rotten from the process of retting is broken up. After that comes the scutching, when the woody part is all stripped from the plant and the rough fibres are left. The next process is heckling, whereby the fibres are passed through another machine and stripped of any remnants of woody matter. The completion of this process leaves the fibre in the fine silky condition necessary for spinning. It was quite clear to the officials of the department, when this matter was first undertaken by them, that there were several of these processes that would have to be closely examined into. In Russia, Holland, and Belgium, where this plant is produced for fibre purposes and where labour is cheap, it was a comparatively easy matter to get the necessary labourers to pull the plants from the ground and attend to the processes of retting and scutching. In Canada, however, where our labour is much more expensive we would obviously be at a very serious advantage as compared with our competitors in Europe, and consequently the attention of the department was directed at first to discovering a machine if possible that would supersede hand labour in the pulling process. The officials of the department were fortunate after some enquiries in meeting a gentleman, who had been carrying on considerable

experimental work in this respect. The name of this gentleman was Vessat. I believe he had the distinction at one time of being a preacher of the gospel, and had in his spare time turned his attention to the invention of a machine that would do this work. This machine was tested out and found to be defective in some respects, but with some financial assistance given by the department, and with the aid of experienced officials in the department, he continued his work until it was finally in a completed form. Last fall the machine was given its first test and the results were very satisfactory indeed. It was demonstrated beyond any question of doubt that the machine would pull from
4 p.m. four to six acres of flax a day, and would thus do the work that under ordinary conditions twenty men would be required to do. It therefore appears that as a result of the assistance we have given in this matter we have in Canada a machine that can attend to this part of the work, which is really the most laborious and expensive of all the processes.

There was also the question of retting. A few years ago there was established at the Experimental Farm a building for the purpose of carrying on experiments in this direction, and experiments were conducted with a view to determining the best process of water-retting. The ordinary method of retting that prevailed in the olden days was to take the plant after it had been pulled and spread it out on the ground so that it might get the rains from heaven and the dews of night until it had been sufficiently retted. That process, of course, was subject to the vicissitudes of the weather. The energies of the officials of the department were directed to discover if possible a water-retting process that would apply to our conditions in Canada. These experiments have achieved quite satisfactory results but they are not by any means completed. These things usually have to run for a series of years in order to fairly test every method to ascertain which is actually the best. The next process is the scutching, and until very recently no machine has been discovered to take the place of hand scutching. I have seen the process in operation and it is a rather difficult one to explain, but I might state that every particle of flax straw that is scutched has to be handled by the hands of the operator. About two months ago the head of our flax development work in Canada was sent to Ireland to investigate the development of modern machines for this purpose, and we received from him a few days ago a cable to the effect that he had discovered a mechanical scutcher which, in his judgment, produced excellent results. He cabled for authority to purchase this machine and that authority was given him a short time ago. The machine will cost, I believe, some $4,000, and it is the intention of the department to place it, along with other equipment we have, on the Experimental Farm and test out the various classes of fibre that come before us to see to what degree of perfection the machine will do its work. I do not need to go over the ground that the hon. member has so ably covered in respect to the market of our product in Canada. Up to the present, I might say, our market has been chiefly in the United States; but if we can provide—and I emphasize this point again, because in my judgment it is the important matter in our successful development of the industry—if we can provide labour-saving machinery that will handle these various processes, I am reasonably sure that we in Canada can occupy a position in this industry that will not be surpassed by any other country in the world. Until we can do that, we must continue our experiments in that direction.

Mr. McKENZIE: Comparing the yield from an acre of ground, sown to flax, with a similar area sown to oats, for instance, how many crops of flax, without manuring, would an acre of ground in Western Ontario yield? Would it yield the same amount without manuring, or would it yield less?

Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry, I cannot give the hon. gentleman definite information as far as fibre production is concerned. I know that when it is produced for seed only one crop can be taken off without a rotation of crop. There is a question whether or not successive crops of fibre flax can be produced from the same land without rotation. I am not sure that it can be.

Mr. McKENZIE: The idea is that it exhausts the soil very much?

Mr. CRERAR: Undoubtedly it exhausts the soil. I am of the opinion that it has to be rotated with other crops and probably a great deal of manure supplied. I would like to deal now briefly with a few of the points in the resolution. The resolution calls for the establishment of an experimental and demonstrative station:

> —at the most convenient and central point within the area where flax for fibre is being produced so that growers may be advised and educated in the most modern and improved methods of retting, scutching and generally preparing their fibre for the market.

For the present I think we had better confine our efforts to the plant we have already established at the Experimental Farm. The establishment of another plant would largely mean the duplication of the one we already have. I would not say, however, that later, when we have carried our experiments and investigations farther, the establishment of an experimental station in Western Ontario, or in some other part of Canada where this industry is being developed, would not be justified. At the present time I am inclined rather to the view that we should proceed for another year with the experimental work we are conducting before we consider incurring the expenditure which will be necessary to establish a new experimental station.

There is this advantage in connection with the plant we have at Ottawa, that we are able to conduct these experiments with flax gathered from all parts of Canada. As the hon. gentleman has stated, the best results in actual fibre content have been produced from flax taken from the Gaspé peninsula in Quebec. Excellent results have also been obtained from flax produced in British Columbia. The second point is this:

That improved mechanical appliances and equipment being necessary for the economic harvesting of the crop, as well as for the preparation of fibre, constant watchfulness should be exercised by the Government to insure that Canadian growers may be supplied with most modern machinery for harvesting and scutching and instructed in the newest and best method of retting.

I have already referred to what has been accomplished with the flax pulling machine. I have also mentioned that we are now securing additional machinery from Europe to assist in the scutching process. I can assure the House that it is the intention of the department to follow up every avenue of information that is available with respect to the development of modern machinery that may be useful in this work. The retting process does not require machinery. This is really a matter of fermentation, and of experiment as to the length of time the fibre shall be under treatment. The third point is:

That in order to secure full economic value to the grower, it is desirable that the Government should establish a system of grading and standards consistent and constant (in so far as possible) with continental standards so that the world's best markets may be available for our exportable surplus.

I heartily agree with the observations of the hon. member who introduced this resolution with regard to the importance of this part of the industry. I think it quite possible that a great improvement could be made in standardizing our seed, in cleaning it, and in putting it in proper shape for the market. The proper cleaning of the seed and raising it to a proper standard, gives it a reputation that will, if we live up to it, ensure it a prominent place in those countries in Europe that have to import their seed every year. With reference to the other point that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) alluded to, the standardizing of the fibre itself, a greater difficulty is presented. The quality of the fibre depends, as I am informed, on the conditions of retting, conditions of weather, the condition of the plant when it is grown, and many other things, and you will find variations in quality of the fibre as between plants grown in the same field or in the same district. As far as my information goes, it has always been a difficult matter in the countries of Europe where this industry has been long established to secure absolute standards of quality in the fibre. Even to this day the fibre product is purchased almost entirely on the eyetest. The representative of a mill who is purchasing the commodity wants to see and examine it before he fixes the price for it. Every encouragement and assistance possible should be given to instructing and educating our growers and mills in the proper methods of preparing and treating the flax in order to get the best possible fibre product. That matter is receiving the attention of the department and will continue to do so.

These are the main points that have been referred to by the hon. member. We have in the experimental work we are conducting, the assistance of an Irish and a Belgian expert, and their knowledge is of very great value because, this industry being a comparatively new one in Canada, we have a great deal to learn in respect to it.

There is another point I would like to mention, and that is the possible use that may be made of the flax straw that is threshed in Western Canada. There we have not produced the flax for fibre purposes, but a good deal of consideration has been given to the fact that annually in those localities hundreds of thousands of tons of straw, containing a certain amount of valuable fibre, are burned and destroyed in cleaning up of the fields. A few years ago some experiments were conducted by private parties with a view to ascertaining whether or not there could be produced from this threshed flax straw fibre that could be converted into twine suitable for

binding our Canadian crops. As hon. gentlemen know, the raw material that enters into the production of our binder twine comes from foreign countries.

A large proportion of this raw material is very closely controlled and we are altogether dependent on outside sources of supply. The experiments that were carried on by the gentlemen to whom I have referred indicate conclusively that a twine could be prepared from this straw. The factor that had to be determined was the cost at which it could be produced; and I might state for the information of the House that last fall the Department of Agriculture took this question up with the view of getting reliable information upon it. We arranged to secure several carloads of the straw in Western Canada and have it treated. We intend to take that straw to Ontario this summer, have it spun into twine, and keep correct data as to the cost of production, in order, if possible, to arrive approximately at an idea of what the cost of producing this twine would be. I see no reason why, with the development of modern science and its application to an industry of this kind, we cannot produce from the vast quantities of this material that is now destroyed every year, the twines that are necessary for all our crops in Canada. It may take a few years to work out the experiments, but I am confident that will eventually be done, and to that extent we will make ourselves independent of the sources of supply for these necessary twines that are now, as I have already said, very closely controlled in other parts of the world.

The information given to the House this afternoon in respect to the possibility of utilizing the fibre produced from this Western flax straw for the manufacture of linens and cloths was indeed very interesting. and served to show that we are only on the threshold of the development of what is possible in utilizing this material. I had not been aware that experimental work had been carried on in this respect.

I do not know that there is anything further that I can contribute to this discussion beyond saying that the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman in his address this afternoon will be taken into serious consideration. I think the flax industry of Canada owes a considerable debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Middlesex East (Mr. Glass) because of the able and continuous manner in which he has studied this problem and brought it to the attention of the House and the Canadian people. The flax growers of Canada have been well represented in this House in that respect. Let me say that the industry is a growing one in Canada, and I believe it contains great possibilities. It should receive, and will receive, the most careful consideration and assistance that can be given in the way of conducting experimental work and ascertaining the best processes of treating the product and the most economical methods of handling it. It is rather a difficult matter for a private person to expend large sums of money in testing out different classes of machines, and I think that is work which can be properly undertaken by the Government. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the House that the department is thoroughly alive to the importance of this subject, and is gathering all the latest and best information with respect to it that is available. Under the circumstances I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he either allow his resolution to stand or withdraw it, the object which he had in mind in introducing it having doubtless been served by the discussion which has taken place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is my duty, before the hon. gentleman exercises his undoubted right of closing the debate, to remind hon. gentlemen that the debate is about to terminate, in case there are any other members who would like to speak upon this subject.

Mr. GLASS: I shall detain the House but a moment or two in answering what has been said with respect to the possibility of soil exhaustion by growing flax. I did not refer to that point to-day to any extent because it was fully covered in my address to the House last year. This subject has not only been dealt with in Dominion Experimental Farm reports, but has been treated by Professor Zavitz, of the Ontario Agricultural College, Professor Doidge, of the Bureau of Agriculture, Washington, and Dr. A. W. Thornton, of Bellingham, Washington, a recognized authority who has done much research work and study for the Washington Government. These authorities have all expressed views entirely opposed to the theory that the growing of flax exhausts the soil; in fact, expert agriculturists are commonly agreed that the growing of flax, when used in rotation with other crops, does not cause any more exhaustion than other cereals, and not quite as much as oats. One cereal may take certain chemical properties out of the soil—for instance, flax takes considerably more nitrogen than wheat or oats—but that is easily replaced by rotation where clover is grown. The adoption of scientific agricultural methods can easily overcome the

temporary loss of such chemical constituents, and therefore I say that the growing of flax does not result in any greater injury in the way of exhaustion of the soil than any other crop when it is used in proper rotation. I appreciate very much what the Minister of Agriculture has said on this subject. I brought this matter to the attention of the House in order to further the development of this industry throughout Canada, and having achieved my purpose, I now beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion agreed to and resolution withdrawn.

EFFICIENCY IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Motion by Mr. Steele for inquiry by a committee of the House.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, a special committee should be appointed during the present session to inquire into and report wherein the Inside Civil Service staffs in the various departments can be reduced and re-arranged with a view to securing the greatest efficiency in the service with the minimum number of employees, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

He said: At the outset I wish to state that owing to the very brief time now remaining for private members, this being the last day at their disposal, I propose to abbreviate the remarks I should otherwise have made, so as to allow other members to have an opportunity of bringing forward the resolutions standing in their names.

I am sure that I need not apologize to the House or to the country for moving this resolution. The Civil Service is the great working force of the country, and the country gets just such administration as the character of the Civil Service permits. A vast interest is being taken in the Civil Service throughout the country to-day, which is due to several reasons. One is that, largely owing to the war, there is a demand for efficiency in every line of industry and every occupation. Efficiency is being advocated in everything, and the country is demanding efficiency in the Civil Service. The abolition of patronage brought clearly before the minds of the people the fact that a great change had come in the method of appointments to the Civil Service. The new Act takes the matter of appointments out of the hands of members of Parliament, which in itself is a great revolution; and on that account the interest of the people has been awakened to the importance of the Civil Service. Another thing that has interested the country in the Civil Service is the fact that last fall the Civil Service made certain demands upon the Government which they followed up by threatening to go on strike and paralyse the work of the country. People began to wonder whether it was possible that in a time of war, when every one was putting forward his very best efforts to serve the country in one sphere or another, the five thousand civil servants in Ottawa would go on strike. That, perhaps, more than anything else led the people to realize that it was time that they took an interest in the Civil Service. It may be said, then, that a deep and widespread interest is being taken in the Civil Service by the electors, the taxpayers, the business men of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

It has long been believed that the conditions in the Civil Service are not satisfactory. I need not argue that in this House; that is a question on which members on both sides agree. In 1911 the Conservative party in the House of Commons apparently strongly believed—and I have no doubt did believe—that the Civil Service was in a bad condition; and since 1911 members of the Opposition have apparently believed even more strongly that the conditions are bad. Indeed, many of us who came into the House in 1911 were convinced by the arguments put forward by the Opposition in the last Parliament in regard to conditions in the Civil Service.

In 1907 the Courtney Commission was appointed to investigate conditions, and their report led us to believe that conditions existed at that time which should be remedied. The evils prevailing then were chiefly over-manning, incapacity and inefficiency; and to correct those evils the Civil Service Commission was appointed in 1909. But the Civil Service Commission could control only the flow of new members to the service, they could see that only efficient appointments were made; but at that time the commission could not correct the abuses inherent in the service. So that some evils which existed then still remain in the service, and many of us believe that they have not been lessened since 1909. If we want evidence of that, we have only to look at the report on the Printing Bureau made a few weeks ago. The committee appointed to investigate conditions in the Printing Bureau found that the inefficiency in that department of the Government service was shocking. They found certain the labour inefficient. They found certain

staffs over-manned. They found the conditions in one department pitiable. In another department three men were employed where two could do the work. They found conditions in another department preposterous, and they found still another department a dumping ground for those who could not otherwise be placed. That is the condition that was found to exist in the Printing Bureau, and many of us believe that similar conditions, though perhaps not in the same degree, exist in many other departments. If an investigation were made by qualified men they would probably get information that would substantiate that assertion.

As long as political patronage existed the members of this House—at least those supporting the Government—were held responsible for these conditions. It is time that members should be relieved of that odium. We have no longer any responsibility for any of the appointments; that responsibility should be placed where it belongs. In future the responsibility for conditions in the Inside Service will rest upon the deputy heads of the departments. Section 47 of the Civil Service Act passed last year says:

> The deputy head of a department shall, subject to the directions of the head of the department, oversee and direct the officers, clerks, and employees of the department, and shall have general control of the business thereof, and shall perform such other duties as are assigned to him by the Governor in Council.

The deputy minister is the business head of his department. It is only reasonable that members of the House who long have been accused of making improper appointments and being responsible for conditions in the Civil Service should be relieved of any responsibility in that regard, and that we should now turn around and see that the men at present responsible shall clean up the Service and put it on a business basis.

I rather regret that the Government proposes to increase the salaries of deputy ministers to $6,000. The deputy who can manage his department efficiently and as any good business department should be managed is worth more than $6,000 a year to this country. But during this year I think we should have put the deputies on trial with a view to seeing whether they are qualified to clean up the Civil Service, and those deputies who proved themselves equal to the occasion might well have had their salaries increased next year to a figure commensurate with the work they are doing.

There is a good deal of over-manning in the Civil Service. May I point to one or two facts which I think will satisfy the House, that there is over-manning? We have in the Civil Service to-day 220 people who are of the age of 65 years or over, and 403 people over sixty years of age. While I would be the last to say one word of disparagement of the old man or woman in the Civil Service who has given good service in the past—and there are many of them—we are not so much concerned with that as with the efficiency of the service as a whole, and I think any person will admit that, where there is such a large percentage —about 8 per cent—of the civil servants over sixty years of age, that is a condition which does not tend to the greatest efficiency. The question is: What should be done with these men? That is for the House to deal with at a later date. A few days ago the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) stated in this House that there were in his department 24 men who were of an age that made them of very little use in the service; that he believed a similar condition existed in the Outside Service, and that the services of a very considerable number of men employed in his department might be dispensed with. We find that condition running throughout the whole Civil Service. We know efforts are being made at the present time to reform the service; but even if the plans proposed are carried out, that is not going to give us the reform which Parliament and the country desire in connection with the matter. We want to know what the condition is; we want to know whether there are too many men in the service or not, and if there are too many, this House is going to demand that the staffs be reduced and that the service be put on a business basis.

We have not only the old men who—especially those who have been efficient in their younger days—have the sympathy of every hon. member, but the inefficient class, the incapable class, and the idlers. Those men or women, because there are some women who come under one or another of those heads, deserve little or no sympathy. The man who is incapable to-day should not be in the service of the country. The man who is idling ought to be dismissed at once. The man who is inefficient ought to be either put in a position to become efficient or asked to retire from the service. Then we have another class which I think deserves the attention of the House as it is receiving the attention of the Government to-day. I refer to agi-

tators in the Civil Service, men who are drawing salaries from the country for work which they are not doing, but whose time is being spent in agitating, agitating, agitating, stirring up strife in the service amongst other employees who are willing to give this country efficient service, disorganizing to a large extent the whole Civil Service, so that we are not getting the service and the work to which the country is entitled. We want to know the relations of those men to the Civil Service and to the country, and when we know that, this Parliament will be in a proper mood to deal with them. This is not a matter any longer for the Government or entirely for Parliament. It is a matter for the country, and let me emphasise that the country is demanding of its representatives in this Parliament that something shall be done, that the Civil Service shall be cleaned up and put on a business basis. I believe, if I correctly understand the spirit of this Parliament, that Parliament is going to demand from the Government that this be done, and we hope and believe that the Government, with this demand behind them, will have the courage to do this.

I am not one of those who feel disposed to offer lengthy criticism of the Civil Service Commission. I do not think they have yet had an opportunity of showing what they can do. I am not introducing this resolution to-day to excite any controversy or anything of that kind, and as far as I know, we have, as chairman of the Civil Service Commission, a man who is eminently qualified for the position and for performing the duties which he has undertaken to perform. I believe, in the course of a year or two, when the preliminary reorganization work of the Commission is completed, the country will be very well satisfied with the work the Commission has done.

I am not going to say anything further than simply to suggest to the Government that such a committee as I ask for in my resolution can be of vast service to the country and to Parliament at this time. I believe we can get information which cannot be got in any other way; and when we have that information, we shall be in a position to discuss intelligently the whole question of what shall be done with the Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend taking up much of the time of the House in respect of the motion moved by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). He proposes that a committee be appointed to investigate whether the Inside Civil Service might not profitably be reduced and rearranged with a view to securing greater efficiency. The purpose of the resolution is quite a laudable one, and the Government have no desire whatever to object to the motion; in fact it will accept the same and consent to the appointment of a committee, which will be named after the Easter recess.

I am not, however, disposed to agree with the general statement that the Inside Service is to-day very greatly overmanned; but that is a question of fact and is well worthy of investigation by this committee and when the evidence is presented we shall know definitely whether the assertion that the Civil Service is overmanned is correct or not. Under our political system it would not be surprising if I were compelled to admit that there might be found an overmanning of the service in some departments, and more in some departments than in others. This is unavoidable, but nevertheless we should make every possible effort to keep the number in the service to the lowest possible minimum.

The hon. member, in speaking to the resolution, referred to the fact that there was in the service to-day a large number of people who were 65 years of age and over, and that there was further a large number who were over 60 years of age. The hon. gentlemen suggested that such members of the service had seen their best days and should, in some way or another, be retired. This question presents a very great difficulty, and I think the hon. gentleman himself admitted that difficulty, as, I am sure, will every hon. member. Prior to 1907, we had a Civil Service Superannuation Act, and it is very regrettable that that Act was ever repealed. I think I may say so, because the repeal was made by a Liberal Government which I was then supporting and of which the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), who is now in the House, was a very prominent member. I have reason to believe that, since the repeal of the Superannuation Act, most of the members of the ministry of that day regret the step then taken. I hope that at a very early date the Government will take into consideration the question of the restoration of a superannuation system for the Civil Service. I do not know how popular that view is in the House or in the country, and I do not care very much, because I say, as a matter of principle, we should have such a superannuation system.

That statement is true not only of the Civil Service, but of all the great employing industries of this country. All these industries must adopt some form of superannuation. It is a fact that many of our leading industries to-day are adopting some scheme of insurance or superannuation for their employees; for instance, the banks and insurance companies. There is no reason in the world why any industry in Canada employing men in large numbers should not provide out of its income some system of superannuation and I hope the day will soon come when some form of insurance or superannuation will be open to every man who has followed the same employment for a certain number of years. Therefore, I should like, when the opportunity presents itself, to have an expression of the views of this House on a superannuation scheme for the Civil Service. As I have already intimated, within two or three weeks the Civil Service Commission's new system of classification will be presented to Parliament for consideration—I hope early in May. I think when presented it will be found to contain many improvements which will be readily accepted by the House, and I trust that the proposals will ultimately prove of great advantage to the public service and to the country.

When the Civil Service Act amendments and the classification resolutions are presented, ample opportunity will be afforded to hon. members to discuss the very matter which my hon. friend brings up in his resolution. The Government accepts the motion, and immediately after the Easter recess a committee will be named by the Government.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): I am in full sympathy with the object of this motion, and should like to point out another method of achieving the economy and retrenchment at which the motion aims. I have reference to the work of the Select Committee on National Expenditure in Great Britain, and especially to their seventh and ninth reports, which propose an examination of the Estimates by committee. The Select Committee gathered a great deal of valuable information and performed a great public service, and perhaps one of their greatest services was their recommendation with regard to a committee on Estimates.

It is not proposed to interfere with the present method of preparing the Estimates, but rather to suggest three reforms: first, and greatest in its scope, a committee of members of the House upon the Estimates; second, a change in the form of the Estimates so that they shall be more indicative of the purpose of the expenditure, and enable comparison to be made; third, that a motion to reduce a money vote be not treated as a want of confidence motion, the object, of course, being to ensure that the vote shall be regarded purely as an economic, and not as a political measure. A government's followers will not wreck a government for a small economy, at the sacrifice of large matters of policy.

A committee on Estimates was formed in Great Britain in 1912, and 1913, but it was found that the committee could not cover the whole field in a reasonable time. To go over all the Estimates would have taken them anywhere from ten to twenty years. The committee, not having any say as to policy, which, of course, in any responsible system of government must be settled by the Cabinet, found itself more or less stalled in its work. The main proposal of the Select Committee on National Expenditure was that there should be an Examiner of Estimates with a permanent clerical staff. They proposed two committees, or one committee with two sub-committees. One of these subcommittees was to consider expenditures on works that had already been launched, and the other to consider expenditures on new ventures—such as, in our case, the Health Department. In the meantime, the clerical staff of the Examiner of Estimates could be instructed to gather certain information, which could be laid before the committee at its next session. The committee would also have the power to examine witnesses and papers and to direct inquiries. That, of course, would mean an entire change in the method of considering the Estimates, and it would be going very much further than the mover of this resolution had in mind, because he is only looking to the Civil Service.

As a new member last year, the way in which the Estimates were considered seemed to me almost futile. Hours would be spent criticising the expenditure of a few hundred dollars, only the fringe of some subjects would be touched, and subsequently millions of dollars would be passed with little or no consideration. As a new member, I had no idea whether the proposed expenditure was commensurate with the service, and that is necessarily the position when the House cannot go into the facts, cannot call witnesses and go to the departments and look at the books and accounts. We have not the material before us on which to form an opinion. The Committee on Estimates would have the proposed expenditures under review and make

their report. I do not propose to discuss other features of that report now, but I certainly should like to bring to the attention of the House and of the Government that means of securing retrenchment and economy in the whole public service, not merely in that part of the service called the Civil Service—the wage list—but in all expenditures.

Mr. ROBERT H. BUTTS (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I am not always as keen an economist, Mr. Speaker, as some hon. gentlemen who sit around me, but while this resolution is before the House I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister an important fact. There is a large number of men who are servants of this Government performing various duties, for instance, at that door and at the other door, and in other occupations around the gallery and the House, and who are looked upon as merely sessional servants. I have talked, or rather half a dozen of them have talked with me lately, and have informed me that during the last decade or so the wages of the different other civil servants have gone up year after year and year after year, while there is one class—so I am told—that for twelve or fifteen years have been working for the same wages. I think that is absolutely unfair, and I would ask the minister, feeling that he will take cognizance of my appeal, to see that ample justice is done these men. They tell me that fifteen years ago they were receiving the very same wages they are working for to-day. There is an old and respected gentleman at that door who told me the other day that when the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier died there passed away the last man who was in this House when he came here. Yet his wages are still the same, with the difference that in former years he came up to this House from Pictou county on a half railway fare, whereas to-day he has to pay the full fare. I can mention other cases, but I am only speaking for my own province. I have other cases; one from Inverness county, and I am speaking because my hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm) is absent; and I am speaking because I think my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McGregor) is absent. I am speaking for the absentees, and I am going to ask the hon. minister if it is not advisable, or if at least it would not be praiseworthy that these men should be accorded an equal consideration with all other working men or all other servants of the country.

[Mr. Davis.]

Mr. HERBERT M. MOWAT (Parkdale): I will support this resolution for the one chief reason that it asserts the principle that this House has not given up control of the Civil Service. I am heartily in favour of the efforts that are being made to improve the Civil Service; but I am inclined to believe from what I have heard that there are quite a number of senior officers in the Civil Service who since the passing of the Civil Service Act have not been playing the game as they should in supporting it. They have asserted themselves in many little ways to show that the whole matter of appointments on recommendation is with them. That should be so, but their actions should also be on the principles on which the Bill is founded. Here is a resolution for the appointment of a committee —I am glad to find that the minister says it is assented to by the Government, and that, indeed, might be made a permanent committee—which indicates that the Civil Service is yet to be under the control of Parliament. While it is a very important desideratum that the appointments should be made as they are, yet if in the administration of the Act the deputies and principal officers, superintendents and inspectors should exceed the powers which have been given them and appoint or recommend friends and on personal grounds, as has occurred in a few instances, this resolution serves notice upon them that Parliament has not given up control of the Civil Service, and unless they are prepared to carry out the Bill in its spirit Parliament will inevitably interfere again.

5 p.m.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): It is not my intention to take up more than two or three minutes on this matter, but owing to the fact that the hon. minister said he would like to know the feeling of the House on the question of superannuation, I would like—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman will be in order in speaking on that subject at the present time. I understood the minister to say that the subject could be brought up when the amendments to the Civil Service Act would be under consideration. At the present time the resolution before the House relates entirely to the constitution of a special committee to examine into the Inside Service, and as this is the last day upon which resolutions introduced by private members can be discussed, I think the House will agree with the Speaker that the subject

matter of this resolution should be strictly adhered to.

Mr. BEST: I might say a few words in reference to what one of the previous speakers said about different salaries—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman would not be in order. The speaker to whom he refers was allowed a certain amount of latitude so that he could no longer complain that he was always out of order.

Mr. BEST: I wish to say a word or two about the Committee that will be appointed, and I think I will then be in order. I hope that when the Government appoints that Committee they will wait until it reports before they take any action. We had a Civil Service Commission appointed about a year ago and we are told that that Commission will report in a few weeks. If a Committee is appointed I hope that nothing will be done until it reports, I believe, as the hon. member who introduced the resolution said, that very many departments are over-manned, and that some servants are drawing more than they should while others are not getting enough. I know men myself whom it is a shame to ask to work for what they receive, while I really think that some men get double what they should. I hope a Committee will be appointed that will look carefully into the different departments and make an honest report and that when that report is submitted the Government will have the nerve to act on it and not do as they have been doing in the past, giving men a little and having them come back every forty-eight hours. I support the resolution.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): We have already elaborate machinery for controlling the Civil Service. We have a minister whose, duty it is to deal with that, and a Civil Service Commission with jurisdiction over all appointments throughout the Dominion of Canada, and I am not sure that it would be advisable for a Committee to interfere at the present time until the minister has had an opportunity to look into the matter. I was somewhat surprised when he seemed to express a doubt as to the question of the Inside Service being over-manned. I do not think there is much doubt on that question. It was constantly contended, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, that this service was over-manned. The present Prime Minister was constantly telling us that the service was over-manned, but after a change of Government took place we discovered that in about twelve months some 12,000 men had been dismissed or retired from service chiefly because they exercised the right of free citizens, and that some 25,000 had been put into their places. There has been a constant stream of appointments since that time, and there is no doubt that the service has been over-manned.

We had a report from Sir George Murray on this very question some years ago, and he said that the service was overmanned and that the conditions were confusing. He proposed some very important reforms that have not yet been fully carried out. I trust the present Minister of the Civil Service will undertake to carry them out and not confine himself too much to the question of superannuation. The question that is before the House is that of improving the Civil Service and making it an efficient instrument to do the work of the country. That is what we expect the minister to do. I know it is a big contract but he has a splendid opportunity to make a record. One of his first duties will be to get efficient men to take the places of those who are inefficient. Every man who has dealings with the departments knows how inefficient some of them are. I could show you files of letters in my desk which have accumulated when I was dealing with a little question like a sailor's wages that have been due since last January. A little balance is due him and I have been unable, after a lot of correspondence to secure a settlement. I get a polite answer from one officer, who sends me to another; I go to him and he sends me to another. One man told me that I had got into the wrong place and that I should know that the Minister of Naval Affairs was the man to go to. Notwithstanding all this correspondence I have not been able to get the few dollars that are owing to the sailor. I do not say all the departments are like that. There are some departments of the Government that I have had dealings with where a different condition obtains. If I write them a letter with regard to any matter of business I can get to the end of the transaction at some time, but there are other departments in regard to which I seem never to reach the end of the case with which I am dealing. This is a very important question. What I want to impress upon the minister is that the country is looking to him to give us an efficient Civil Service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not want to have the country looking to me with regard

to matters for which I am really not responsible. There is really no such person as a Minister of the Civil Service.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I think the thanks of the House are due to my hon. friend for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for having introduced this resolution. I have not heard anybody speak in a concrete way of the constitution of the committee that may be appointed. I think this is a most important matter from the standpoint of the efficiency of the committee and the relation that the soldier bears to the Civil Service and the other life of the country. There has been a good deal of pressure brought to bear upon the Government to have a soldier or two appointed to the Civil Service Commission. I think whether this is done or not—I do not speak of that at present—the minister will be well advised to consider the personnel of the committee that is under contemplation by virtue of this resolution. If the Government want efficiency in the public service I believe that owing to the training of the returned soldier, he having been amenable to discipline himself, efficiency will be brought to bear by giving an opportunity to returned soldiers from this House to be appointed on such a committee as is here proposed. The reason I say that is probably, in a general way, obvious to the members of the House. But, I have a personal reason for saying it. In conversation with a civil servant—temporarily connected with a rather important branch of the Service in Ottawa—he suggested that he had noticed a great many abuses within the department administered by himself and that he could not have corrected these abuses in the same way as he had, if he had not been a returned soldier. There are no doubt men in any public or private service who at times do not live up to their duties, are inclined in the performance of them to a laissez faire, don't-care sort of fashion, and if a returned soldier happens to have some authority, being accustomed to discipline himself, he naturally tries to discipline his staff. I think one of the weaknesses of the Civil Service to-day largely arises from overmanning. Whether due to political pressure or pressure of friends having the ear of a minister in the old days, or maybe having the ear of the Civil Service Commission to-day, the Civil Service has become overmanned, and girls and young men are employed in too great numbers. The returned soldier will not stand for very much of that sort of thing because he is not only trained disciplinarily but he is trained to efficiency. If I mistake not, I can see signs that the returned soldier, with the capacity for any walk in life, if employed by this Government, will bring to his service in aid of the State a great deal of strength and efficiency because he has been accustomed to discipline. I therefore think that the country will profit by looking to the returned soldier who has had the experience of war. The man who has gone through the war has gone through the stress and strain in the greatest crisis in the life of any man, and what I have observed in the returned soldier is that if he is anything he is not arrogant, he is absolutely fair. He has a big heart and that brings to his mind the necessity for fair judgment in regard to the services that he is rendering to the State and in the treatment of those who may be under his control. Therefore, I would ask the minister to take note and see that the returned soldier is well represented upon any such committee, so that in that regard, there being a common feeling throughout the country that the returned soldier should get the best the country can give him, the returned soldier who is seeking employment at the hands of his country in this period of reconstruction and development shall have some little consideration paid to him—rather would I say, shall have some great consideration paid to him. I think the minister would be well advised if he considered that carefully when he was appointing this committee because in that way he will get efficiency where probably if it were overlooked we will fall back into the humdrum ways of the past and into the old conditions, and will lose what, to my mind, is the most salient feature in the new public life that is coming in this Canada of ours. I leave that suggestion with the minister in the hope that he may act upon it.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that there is a good deal of merit in the suggestions contained in the resolution and that there are a good many things about the Civil Service that might be put in a better position than they are now in. I have no hope whatever that those remedies or good results will come from the appointment of this Committee. I know this House pretty well, and have known it for a good many years, and if I were asked to-day to select three or five of its members to bring in satisfactory recommendations as a result of conducting inquiries as to the proper operation of various offices in the

Civil Service, I would be at a loss where to begin. I do not think any member of this House, even a returned soldier, or anybody else, is possessed of the necessary training or experience to bring about the needed reforms. I would suggest to the minister, although we have at present a great many administrators, a great many departments, and a great many officials, as a result of my experience in the district from which I come where there are in operation big industries employing a great many men, that if a superintendent of the Civil Service in Canada were appointed—an officer of equal rank, influence and independence with the Auditor General—to act as general supervisor of the Civil Service and the several departments in this country, a big man and possessed of the necessary training for the position, then we might expect to derive some beneficial and permanent results. I do not expect such results will follow from the appointment of a Committee of the House, and I say that without desiring in the slightest to cast any reflection upon such Committee. If we are going to effect reform in the Civil Service, we must have somebody who is thoroughly familiar with the work of that service, who follows every move that takes place, and who is in a position to systematize the whole of its operations. I think the great fault in the Civil Service to-day, just as much as overmanning, is the lack of system. No system prevails in the departments whereby one man if given the opportunity and a proper allotment of work might perform perhaps just as much service as two or three men now render. The present defects are not so much the fault of the men themselves as of the existing system. I therefore venture to make this suggestion to the minister who has spoken on behalf of the Civil Service, and who has so many departments to look after that we scarcely know how to correctly address him.

The mover of the resolution (Mr. Steele) said that the country had its eyes on the Civil Service and was interested not only in the proceedings of this House but in the work which all branches of the Service have to do. There is no doubt about that fact, and that is just as it ought to be. We should strive to cultivate a live public opinion in respect to every matter with which we deal, because such an opinion will have a most wholesome effect upon the members of this House and upon the Civil Service, as well as upon public officers generally. This is the last day that private members will have for the ventilation of matters before the Easter recess, and I had hoped to have an opportunity of saying a word to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) about some things that touch the membership of this House, and the service of the country as a whole. In view of the prevailing conditions the present is a time when above all other times, public matters should receive proper attention. The meeting of wartime conditions, the carrying out of a reconstruction policy, and the development of the country generally, call for the exercice of our very best judgment. Had the acting Prime Minister been here I would have urged upon him although perhaps I should not be quite in order, that the whole of the people should be represented in this Chamber. However, I will tell the other members of the Government who are present and impress upon them the necessity of giving representation in Parliament to large bodies of people all over the country who are now without that representation, and I hope that during the recess they will take the matter under serious consideration.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): In my opinion it is the most opportune time, although possibly a little late in the session, for the principle of such a resolution as this to be approved by the House and to go into effect. I was a little surprised at the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, who might well say that his remarks were out of order, in advocating class representation in Canada. I will not imitate the hon. gentleman's example, except to say that we have representative government in Canada, although at times I have doubted whether the Government rules, and whether the people are the ultimate tribunal, or whether the Civil Service are going to conduct public affairs. When we came here at the beginning of this session we experienced a condition of affairs that, in my opinion, warrants some action being taken. We have seen these people, as a result of the legislation passed by the House a year ago, form an organization which I consider a menace to the country if those concerned endeavour to carry out what they are now attempting to do. We have seen the business of this country held up for days at a time, and the proceedings of the Parliament not being printed, as the result of the attitude of a certain department of the public service. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) referred to the reforms that might take place in the Civil Service through the admission to its ranks of the returned sol-

dier; but unfortunately, out of some thirty thousand appointments made, permanent and temporary, since the enactment of the amended Civil Service Act of last session, only about twelve per cent of the number have been made from the ranks of the returned soldiers. I do not know whether that is the danger they foresee or not. Meetings are being held in this city from time to time that are having a tremendous influence on the legislation of this country as regards the whole of the people. Under the circumstances I am surprised to find the leader of the Opposition getting up in this House and advocating class representation in this Parliament.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the hon. member misunderstood me. Upon what remarks of mine does he found the statement he has made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. gentleman regretted that various bodies were not represented in Parliament, and hoped that in the future they would be.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have reference to counties such as Glengarry and North Ontario, that are at present without representation in this House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. gentleman was by inference leaving the impression that the agitation which is now abroad in this country should be recognized.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly not: I had no such intention. What I said was that the counties that are now without members should be given representation in the House as speedily as possible.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am very glad to hear the hon. member make that statement. I rose to take part in this debate only because I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman was advocating something entirely different.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: You can scarcely go into a passenger coach on any railway in this country without hearing something of that kind advocated, and I may have been a little too ready to associate the hon. gentleman's remarks with what we hear so much of these days. However, if there is a lack of system in a body which exerts such a tremendous influence as the Civil Service does, in a body where the most thorough system should be employed, then we should have such a committee as is suggested by this resolution to inquire into this matter. Such a thing as happened during the early part of this session should not be permissible. It should not be possible for these people to hold up the business of the country as it was held up; some regulation or some means should be provided to ensure that such a thing shall not again occur. I heartily approve of the resolution.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF OWNERSHIP, ETC., OF NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, all newspapers, magazines, trade journals and other periodicals publishing articles designed to influence public opinion shall be compelled from time to time to publish sworn statements setting forth the names of the owners, managers, editors, stockholders, bondholders and of any other person having an interest in such newspaper, magazine, trade journal or other periodical.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this motion is self-evident and the principle which it embodies will, I am sure, be adopted by the House. I had intended to bring this motion up earlier in the session, but unfortunately it has not been reached on the Order Paper until to-day.

I look upon the press as a torch, but as a torch which must at times be held in the hands of the people; thus the torch may be shaken so that it may burn brighter. It is said that a stream will not rise higher than its fountain; the St. Lawrence will not run backwards over the Great Lakes. In other words, the press of Canada will be what the representatives of the people choose to make it. The honest and independent press of Canada will I am sure, support this motion, because the honest press stands for light, not for darkness; stands as a beacon, not as a false light. This motion does not mean an abridgment of the liberty of the press. The liberty of the press in the English-speaking world is merely a matter of history. We know that at the beginning the press was under the control of the King, that nothing was published in book or pamphlet form or otherwise that did not bear the stamp of His Majesty. Then, later came the censorship, and finally by a gradual process the liberty of the press was proclaimed. We have in the words of Lord Wynford a statement of the exact status of the press to-day in the English-speaking countries. He said in a very famous case:—

My opinion of the liberty of the press is that every man ought to be permitted to instruct his

fellow subjects; that every man may fearlessly advance any new doctrines, provided he does so with proper respect to the religion and government of the country; that he may point out errors in the measures of the public men, but he must not impute criminal conduct to them. The liberty of the press cannot be carried to this extent without violating another equally sacred right, the right of character. This right can only be attacked in a court of justice, where the party attacked has a fair opportunity of defending himself. Where vituperation begins, the liberty of the press ends.

That is the dictum of Lord Wynford in the famous historical case of Rex vs. Burdett. The press in all liberty-loving countries is an instrument which serves the public; it carries the news and pretends to educate the public. The newspapers to-day circulate in hundreds of thousands, advocating causes, presenting issues, and swaying public opinion. That being the case, the press should not sail under false colours; the greater the freedom of the press the greater should be the protection to the public. I say that the mission of the press is not only to disseminate news, but to educate the public. In the education of our young people there is a very close inspection not only of the pupils, but also of the educators themselves, the professors, the masters. There is a board of supervision, and you cannot clothe that board with too much power in order to protect the rising generation. In the United States they have realized the necessity of protecting the public against the evil influence which the press may exercise through its freedom, and they have passed a law which does exactly what my resolution suggests. In Canada the immense privilege which the press has obtained to circulate almost freely from one end of the country to the other has been accompanied by very little effort on the part of the press to repay the public for that privilege. In 1882 an Act was passed to provide for the free transmission of Canadian newspapers by mail within the Dominion. The proviso establishing the conditions of that power of free transmission was as follows:—

> It must be known and recognized as a newspaper or periodical in the generally received sense of the word, and published regularly at intervals of not more than one month.
>
> The full title, place and date of publication, and the distinguishing number of the issue must be printed at the top of the first page, and also on any paper purporting to be a supplement to it, and sent with it.
>
> It must be addressed to a bona fide subscriber, or to a known newsdealer in Canada.

That was the only condition exacted from the proprietors of newspapers in 1882, when this law was enacted by Parliament. It has not been changed since. In the United States much more progressive legislation has been enacted. I find in the United States:

> That it shall be the duty of the editor, publisher, business manager, or owner of every newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication to supply to the Postmaster General and the postmaster at the office at which said publication is entered, not later than the first day of April and the first day of October of each year, on blanks furnished by the Post Office Department, a sworn statement setting forth the names and post office addresses of the editor and managing editor, publisher, business managers, and owners, and, in addition, the stockholders, if the publication be owned by a corporation; and also the names of known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders; and also, in the case of daily newspapers, there shall be included in such statement the average of the number of copies of each issue of such publication sold or distributed to paid subscribers during the preceding six months.

Then there is a proviso that this does not apply to religious, fraternal, temperance and scientific, or other similar publications. It was further provided:

> That all editorial or other reading matter published in any such newspaper, magazine or periodical for the publication of which money or other valuable consideration is paid, accepted, or promised, shall be plainly marked "advertisement."

This is a very wise legislation, and all that I ask by this resolution is that Canada should adopt similar legislation in order to give to our press the stamp of honesty and respectability. Let me give a case in point. The Montreal Herald, for over a century, was an old and faithful adherent of the Liberal party. It was the old, recognized organ of the Liberal party amongst the English-speaking minority of my province. It had a large clientele. Suddenly, after the election of 1911, Mr. Brierly who had become the proprietor of that paper, mysteriously sold it first to Mr. McGibbon, then to Sir Hugh Graham, who afterwards became Lord Atholstan, both being Tories. But Mr. Brierly was the mask; he was still generally supposed to be the owner. One day Mr. Brierly disappeared. As I said, he first sold the paper to Mr. McGibbon and Mr. McGibbon finally sold it to Lord Atholstan, and during all that time the paper retained the appearance of being a Liberal paper, whilst it was kept in existence by Lord Atholstan, only to prevent a rival from coming into the field against the Montreal Star. This was disclosed in a celebrated case in Montreal, and the respectable English-speaking Liberal people of Montreal were shocked to find that such a game had been played at their expense. From that moment, I decided that I would introduce this resolution in order that the owners,

stockholders and mortgagees of papers should be known, so that a paper preaching morality, respectability, should be known under its true colours. The people are entitled to know who are behind the newspapers, who are their backers, if I may use that sporting expression, and the respectable papers of Canada will favour the United States legislation. There is need for such publicity. We live in an era in which publicity is necessary. I cannot forget that during the past two or three years, the country has been flooded with newspapers and magazines, publishing huge advertisements. By whom were those costly advertisements paid; and how is it that at a given moment the whole of the Liberal press of Canada suddenly passed from the Liberal party to the Tory party? When I read those advertisements, I could not help saying in the House, and I repeat it again to-day, that the press, with few honourable exceptions, had been chloroformed, if not bought. The respectable papers of Canada object to being branded as having been bought, and they will, therefore, support my motion. The other day I was reading one chapter of the American Commonwealth by Viscount Bryce, and I cannot better close my remarks than by quoting what that great English writer says about publicity:

> The genius of universal publicity may have some disagreements, but the wholesome ones are greater and more numerous. Selfishness, injustice, cruelty, tricks, jobs of all sorts shun the light. To expose them is to defeat them. No serious evil, no rankling sore in the body politic, can remain long concealed, and when disclosed, it is half destroyed.

Once more, I say that this is a progressive reform, and I hope the Government will accept it and that a Bill will be introduced along the lines of the American legislation.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I desire to support the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). I am in favour of publicity with regard to ownership of newspapers. The purport of the resolution is, of course, that the Government will afterwards, if they see fit, introduce legislation somewhat similar to that which exists in the United States. It will, I think, be conceded by everybody that anything that will tend to increase the responsibility of newspaper editors and proprietors is a good thing. I have no quarrel with the newspapers, which are doing very good work, and of course, we all recognize the splendid work that many of them did in connection with the war. I am also well aware that they are privately-owned, and that the owners have a right to control their paper and to dictate its policy. I have no objection to that. At the same time, the newspaper moulds public opinion, and it has a good deal to do with the Government of the country, so much so that it has been given the name of "the fourth estate." We are in this country governed by the Governor General representing the Crown, the Senate and the House of Commons. We know who the Governor General is; the senators are well known; the members of this House are public men and well known, at all events, in their own constituencies; but the fourth estate, we do not know anything about; we do not know who they are, and we all recognize that they have a very important place in the government of the country, and they always will be so in the government of a democratic country like ours.

In addition to this the newspapers receive large concessions from the public in this country in connection, for example, with carriage in the mails. If you or I, Sir, wish to mail one issue of a newspaper of 50,000 copies to our constituents, it would cost us a cent apiece, or $500, but under the postal laws of this country a newspaper proprietor is required to pay only a quarter of a cent per pound, and I have been told that on an average, or at all events in a great many cases, it takes five newspapers to weigh a pound. If that is true, the newspaper proprietor would have to pay only about $25 for the service of the mails, while the private individual would have to pay $500, or twenty times as much.

I took occasion a few days ago to ask some questions about the cost of carrying newspapers in the mails, and the Government answered, as follows:

> 1. What was the gross postal revenue derived from newspapers for the year 1918? Answer: $291,539.21.
>
> 2. What is the estimated expenditure for the same year in so far as newspapers are concerned? Answer: The department has no data on which a close estimate of the expenditure involved in handling newspapers can be made, except that newspapers make up about 65 per cent of the bulk of the mails. The total expenditure for the carriage of mails and the cost of mail bags during the fiscal year 1918 was $8,293,515.24.
>
> 3. What is the average daily weight of newspapers carried in the mails? Answer: 239,731 pounds.

Now, 65 per cent of the total cost amounts to $5,390,784, so that we only received from the newspapers $291,539. After crediting what we received, there is a difference of

over $5,000,000 which the people of this country contributed to the cost of delivering newspapers to subscribers. That is a very large sum of money. But that does not exhaust all that we do. As members of this House we vote $50,000 a year to the Press Association, on the principle that it furnishes the people with information. The farmers of the country recognize the great importance of the press. I saw a few days ago that the farmers of the province of Ontario are purchasing a weekly newspaper, with the intention of running it as a daily, as an organ to boost their views before the country. They understand that it is of vast importance to them as a class to have their views put before the public. The Union Government have also resorted to this method of establishing themselves in the country, as witness the publication of that organ of public opinion known as the Canadian Official Record. The people are not deceived as to the object of the Official Record. Sometimes it publishes Orders in Council and official documents, but when it resorted to printing the political speeches of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) and other ministers, it became plain to the public that its real mission was to strengthen the party machine by circulating Union propaganda at the public expense. The Germans understood the importance of controlling the press. In the investigation that took place recently in the United States, it was disclosed that they had purchased newspapers. These men had even invaded the capital and had purchased the Washington Times for something like $375,000. Referring to this, the Montreal Witness said:

> The serious feature of all these German plottings is the faith that the emissaries of evil place in the purchase or manipulation of the press. They at least do not doubt that in buying newspapers they are buying the souls of men. It will soon be necessary for free peoples to make the facts as to the ownership of newspapers, and every money interest that affects them public property.

That is the object of this resolution—to give publicity as to the ownership of newspapers. The question arises, will this not be objected to by the newspapers themselves. I see no reason why the owner of any responsible high-class newspaper should object. There is no better work in which a man can be engaged than in the newspaper business when it is conducted as it should be conducted, and the man who is conducting a respectable high-class journal certainly will not object to having the ownership of the paper disclosed to the public. They did not object in the United States, and I see no reason why they should object in Canada.

Of course, this is a matter for the Government. No private member could hope to succeed in passing a Bill of this kind, especially at this late state of the session, unless it was adopted as a Government measure. It is up to the Government to say whether this shall become law or not. I want to say to the Government that they could not do anything more democratic or anything that would please the public better than to enact legislation along the lines of this resolution. I express no opinion as to what their attitude will be but simply invite the Government to take this matter into consideration, and if possible, to embody the principles of the resolution in a statute before the end of the present session.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: There is very much to commend the principle which is set forth in this resolution, and I regret there is not an opportunity to debate it this afternoon. We should not, of course, express an opinion in an abstract way upon a subject which possibly is not within our jurisdiction, and I have some doubt as to whether the Federal Parliament might have jurisdiction to legislate along the lines suggested by my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Amend the postal laws.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: If this Parliament has jurisdiction, I suppose it would be in the way of exercising control over the postal delivery of papers coming within the scope of this resolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what they have done in the United States.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: I should like to have the opportunity of giving consideration to this matter and of bringing it before my colleagues, and if my hon. friend would bring up the subject again, say on the Post Office Estimates, I should then be in a position to give the view of the Government. In the meantime, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London) moved:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Special Committee be appointed forthwith to consider the matter of the establishment in Canada of a National Research In-

stitute for research work in the various industries of Canada and the co-ordination therewith of the scientific branches of the various departments of the Government, with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Mr. WM. F. NICKLE (Kingston): That resolution, Mr. Speaker, is seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Andrews).

Mr. CRONYN: At this hour, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite impossible to attempt to even outline the reasons and arguments in favour of this resolution, I therefore simply move it.

Mr. NICKLE: I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall).

That all the words after "that" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "In the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Special Committee be appointed forthwith to consider the matter of the development in Canada of Scientific Research, with power to call for persons, papers, and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

The only object of the amendment is to widen the scope of the resolution.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Mr. BUTTS: Before putting the motion, Mr. Speaker, would you permit me——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: Before you adjourn the House, Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the Table the annual report of the Editorial Committee. With the unanimous consent of the House, I should also like to make a reply to a question asked the Government yesterday by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) in respect to a strike in Montreal between——

Mr. BUTTS: You have called me to order two or three times now, Mr. Speaker. Why do you not call the minister to order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BUTTS: I am just asking that question now as one I have a right to ask and a right to expect an answer to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BUTTS: You have called me down, and now you are listening to the minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member who is leading the House has always been accorded the privilege, by unanimous consent, at the moment of adjournment, and also when the Orders of the Day are called, to lay upon the Table certain papers and to answer certain questions of public importance. When I called the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Butts) to order a moment ago it was after a resolution had been disposed of and when no other matter was under consideration.

Mr. BUTTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I sat down then and obeyed your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BUTTS: I wish to say—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACLEAN: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) asked for information regarding a strike difficulty between the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company and its employees. At the moment I was unable to give him the information, but after inquiry I have learned that negotiations are now going on between the employers and employees and an early solution of the difficulty is hoped for.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

Tuesday, April 22, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Volume 4 of the Report of the Auditor-General for the year ended March 31, 1918. —Sir Thomas White.

WAR MEASURES ACT, 1914—EXTENSION OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 71 to extend the operation of the orders and regulations passed by the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act, 1914.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I do not think copies of this Bill have been distributed. I would therefore be obliged if the minister would allow the Bill to stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill is so simple in its composition that there is very little to be gained by its distribution, although, as a matter of fact, it has been distributed in both languages. It simply provides that Orders in Council passed under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, shall, notwithstanding any effect of the termination of the war in the meantime, remain

in operation until the prorogation of this session of Parliament, subject, of course, to the existing right of the Governor in Council to rescind any such order in whole or in part. That is the entire purpose of the Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is most comprehensive I should say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a comprehension of all that is intended of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Is the Order in Council prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquor into one province from another one of the Orders in Council covered by the Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. The effect of the passage of this Bill would simply be to extend the life of the Order in Council for the duration of this session, subject to the power of the Governor in Council to repeal it. That is to say, the Bill prevents all these Orders in Council from being automatically repealed, by the mere fact, of the termination of the war.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): May I join with my leader in asking the minister to postpone the second reading of this Bill? It is very simple, as he says, but it is a contentious measure and I know of many members who desire to speak on it, but who are not present to-day. This is the first meeting of the House after Easter recess, and I hope the minister will grant the postponement of the second reading as desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Although I do not like to resist the appeal to defer the second reading of the Bill, let me point out that we arranged to go on with it this afternoon. There is this consideration to be borne in mind: We have no knowledge as to when the proclamation terminating the war may issue. This Bill must receive its second reading, must go through committee and receive its third reading, then be passed by the Senate, and obtain the Royal assent and all that prior to the issue of a proclamation by His Majesty terminating the war. Consequently it is felt that we cannot afford to delay action in this matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the minister postpone the second reading until to-morrow?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I will agree to that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister considered the advisability of letting these Orders in Council lapse and re-enacting those that are deemed to be of any use?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are considering that every day, but our consideration must be applied to each one individually.

Motion allowed to stand.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT—FOREIGN FRATERNAL SOCIETIES.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved the second reading of Bill No. 54 (from the Senate), to amend the Insurance Act, 1917. He said: I desire to have this Bill referred for consideration to the Banking and Commerce Committee. As it is of a technical character, I think I can best explain its purpose and object to the House by reading a memorandum prepared by the Superintendent of Insurance:

The object of this Bill is to provide additional safeguards for the members of fraternal benefit societies operating in Canada, and to make it necessary for foreign fraternal societies to obtain licenses under the Insurance Act, before transacting business in Canada.

The Insurance Act as passed in 1917, and as it has existed since 1885, exempts from its provisions fraternal benefit societies, and at the present time the only fraternal benefit societies licensed under the Act are those societies which have been incorporated by the Dominion Parliament and whose Charters require them to obtain such licenses. Of these there are at present seven. There is in addition one provincially incorporated society which has voluntarily submitted itself to the provisions of the Act.

In addition to these societies there are operating in Canada sixteen foreign fraternal societies and large number of fraternal societies incorporated by the legislatures of the various provinces.

The Dominion Parliament has jurisdiction to require the foreign societies to obtain licenses before transacting business in Canada and this requirement is imposed by the Bill.

For foreign societies not now transacting business in Canada the Bill provides that they must be actuarially solvent before obtaining licenses.

For the sixteen foreign societies now transacting business in Canada, many of which are actuarially insolvent the Bill provides that they may receive licenses up to 1925, provided they properly secure their new members by deposits in Canada, held for their protection exclusively. After 1925, however, the societies must be entirely solvent if their licenses are to be continued.

Foreign societies now transacting business in Canada which are unable to get a license, may continue business in respect of existing policies without incurring penalty.

Parliament has not the same jurisdiction in respect of the provincial societies, and the provisions of the Bill are that these societies may obtain licenses under the Act if they are actuarially solvent, but they are not compelled to do so.

If such a society applies for a license and is not actuarially solvent, it may obtain a license until 1925 if it either deposits with the minister securities to fully protect new members, or

creates a separate class, whose fund is actuarially solvent, into which new members will be admitted. After 1925 the license will be continued only if the society as a whole is actuarially solvent.

One of the most important provisions of the Bill is that requiring annual valuations by an actuary, and an annual certificate by an actuary that the society is actuarially solvent.

The standing of the actuary is assured by requiring that he shall be a Fellow of the British Institute of Actuaries, or the Faculty of Actuaries of Scotland, or the Actuarial Society of America. It is believed to be essential that the many serious problems facing these societies should be dealt with by actuaries of the highest standing.

The Bill repeals certain sections of the Act respecting Assessment Companies under which the licensed societies have been operating and which have been for some years more or less inapplicable to these societies, and substitutes a new Part IIA applicable solely to fraternal societies.

The Bill also repeals the exemption granted to fraternal societies.

In a word, the object of this Bill is more effectually to protect members of foreign fraternal societies. Before it was introduced in the Senate it had been carefully considered by the Superintendent of Insurance, who took it up with the societies concerned. I believe that the Bill as now drafted meets the desire of all parties interested and effectually protects the public. As the Bill is of a rather complicated and technical character, I suggest that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It has already passed the Senate.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

FERTILIZERS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Fertilizers Act, 1909, chapter 16, and to provide that on and after the 1st day of February, 1920, the phosphoric acid contents in the guaranteed analysis of a fertilizer shall be stated in certain terms; that the registration number and guaranteed value shall be plainly printed upon a tag of prescribed size, shape, and colour, and attached to every package sold, or to the invoice if sold in bulk, and such invoice and tag shall be delivered to the purchaser; that the vendor who sells to the consumer shall affix to every package of fertilizer sold in Canada special stamps, to be provided and sold by the Minister for the purpose, to the value of one cent for every hundred pounds or fractional part of one hundred pounds of fertilizer contained in the package, which the vendor shall cancel upon sale, and which shall not be removed until the package is emptied, and if sold in bulk such stamps shall be affixed to the invoice and cancelled by the vendor; and also that an analysis of a registered fertilizer may be obtained upon application in prescribed form, that certain authorized inspectors may enforce the provisions of the Act; that the results of analysis shall be published, regulations may be made and penalties enforced for violation of the Act.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The amendments proposed by the resolution are not very numerous. The Bill will provide for a definition of the word "analyst"; it had been assumed that the word "analyst" had the same meaning in this Act as it had in the Adulteration Act. Owing to the fact that lime has in recent years very extensively come into use as a fertilizer, the Bill will provide that lime shall be included as a fertilizer. The Bill will also recognize the administration of the Fertilizers Act under the Department of Trade and Commerce instead of under the Department of Inland Revenue. It was intended that the Bill should provide a method of stating the phosphoric acid content in the guaranteed analysis of a fertilizer; I propose, however, when we reach the Bill, to have this section deleted and to cover the matter by regulation. The other amendments proposed are amplifications of the existing sections of the Fertilizers Act, with one exception: it is proposed to make provision—this has not hitherto been the law—for securing a revenue from the inspection of fertilizer. The Bill will provide that the vendor who sells to the consumer shall affix to every package of fertilizer sold in Canada special stamps to be provided and sold by the minister for the purpose, to the value of one cent for every hundred pounds or fractional part of one hundred pounds of fertilizer contained in the package. When the fertilizer is sold in bulk, it is provided that the stamp shall be affixed to the invoice. This is the principal amending feature of the Bill.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the purpose of the stamp?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To secure a revenue to pay for the administration of the Act. This is done in the case of almost everything else which, before sale, is inspected under federal statute.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In some countries a great impetus is given to agriculture by encouraging the production and use of fertilizers. Is this proposed legislation intended to that end, or is the department taking any steps to encourage it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The legislation is not of the nature suggested by my hon. friend. I cannot say that at the present moment any special or practical steps are being taken to encourage the production of fertilizers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Or the use thereof.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I imagine that the Agricultural Department is doing everything it can to encourage the general use of fertilizers. During the past summer investigations were made by a department of the Government into the matter of securing potash as a by-product from cement works. The report of the officer making the investigation has not yet been submitted to the Government, but it will very soon. The other amendments are very trivial and might better be considered after the Bill is introduced.

Mr. CAHILL: About what amount does the minister expect to realize from this stamping provision? It seems to me that this business of tagging one cent on every hundred pounds of fertilizer is very foolish legislation. A man is almost afraid to sell anything now on account of a multiplicity of regulations, and if you are going to regulate this thing to death, it might as well be left out of account.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At present all fertilizer produced in Canada is subject to inspection by federal officers; it is proposed that this charge shall cover the cost of that inspection. The policy may be wise or unwise; I suggest that my hon. friend allow that point to stand till the Bill is printed.

Mr. CAHILL: Is lime to be included as a fertilizer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Is all lime to be subject to this stamping provision?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: All lime that is manufactured and sold for the purpose of fertilization.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has it been found that improper substitutes for fertilizers have been sold?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Just at the moment I could not speak with a knowledge of the facts, but I think it frequently has occurred that fertilizers below the standard required by the statute have been manufactured and sold.

Mr. McCOIG: I do not think any hon. members will question the great importance of fertilizers being used for the encouragement of greater production, but it seems almost ridiculous to have a one-cent stamp placed on every hundred pounds of fertilizer and lime that is sold for fertilizing purposes. This would probably necessitate the appointment of some additional officers to carry out these regulations.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. McCOIG: At the present time, manufacturers of fertilizer have to state on the package the different ingredients of the contents. Is the Minister of Agriculture or is his department recommending this change which might have a greater importance than we may at present be aware of?

Mr. POWER: People interested in the fertilizing industry in Quebec have asked me to oppose this resolution on the ground that for some years past they have made very strenuous efforts to induce the farmers of that province to make a greater use of fertilizer and that, in their opinion, the imposition of such a tax will set their strenuous efforts at naught. They consider that this is not the time to impose such a tax when farmers are just beginning to realize the importance of fertilizers and the benefit that can be derived from them.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When we come to consider the Bill I should be glad to hear the representations of my hon. friend. If he can then satisfy me that those provisions of the Bill are against the public interest, I shall be glad to meet what are the interests of the public.

Mr. EULER: I would not raise any particular objection to the imposition of a tax on this commodity, but has the minister seriously considered whether this is the best method of collecting such a tax? In this case, as in the case of the tax on patent medicines, stamps have to be affixed to the packages, and this is a most awkward and inconvenient method of collecting these taxes. The druggists are raising a great deal of objection to this method of imposing taxes on drugs, and this is simply an extension of the same idea. Will the minister consider very seriously whether, if it is necessary to obtain this revenue, it could not be obtained much more readily and with much less inconvenience to the public by having the stamp affixed to the package by the manufacturer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the principle in this Bill. This Bill will hardly be comparable with the tax on drugs to which

my hon. friend refers, because in that instance it was found impossible to impose a tax on the wholesaler or manufacturer, and, therefore, it is in some measure a very objectionable tax to the public because the stamp has to be affixed to the article when it is sold in the retail drug store.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why should it be impossible to have the stamp affixed in the wholesale drug store? Four or five good, decent druggists in my constituency were fined fifty dollars each because they sold a patent medicine box without a stamp on it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should not say it was impossible to impose the patent medicine tax upon the manufacturer or the wholesaler, but it was very difficult to administer the Act otherwise than it is now being administered. I remember that the tax when first introduced provided that it be paid by the manufacturer and wholesaler, but during the same session the Act had to be amended to its present form. There are, of course, very few manufacturers of fertilizers in Canada, and it is the intention that the tax be paid by the manufacturer, so that the retailer will not be troubled. At least that is my understanding of the matter at present.

Mr. EULER: What is the idea of the provision to attach the stamp to each package containing 100 or a fractional part of 100 pounds? Does not that indicate that the stamp must be affixed by the retailer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That will be done as the package leaves the factory.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Maclean thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 74, to amend the Fertilizers Act, 1909.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIVE STOCK AND LIVE STOCK PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House in Committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, chapter thirty-two of the statutes of 1917, and to provide for the preservation of rights of farmers, drovers, and other persons to sell and buy at stockyards, for regulations regarding inspection, for the size of packages of wool, for compliance with the requirements regarding inspection, branding and marketing before shipment, for the issue of inspectors' certificates, and for the increase of the penalty for violating the Act.—Hon. Mr. Crerar—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister please explain the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. CRERAR: The purport of these amendments is to strengthen in some particulars the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act which was passed by this Parliament two years ago. The resolution provides for establishing more clearly the rights of farmers and drovers in dealing on live stock exchanges. It provides also for the inspection of certain live stock products, for the grading, handling and marketing of which provision had been made under the Act as it stood. It goes further and gives the Governor in Council power to establish regulations governing the marking and branding of certain of these products when imported into Canada, that are subject to regulation when produced in Canada. It also provides for the passing of regulations for the closer control and inspection of shipments in Canada, and for the enforcement of any regulations that may be passed under the Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: I presume the word "wool" refers to Canadian wool. It has been brought to my notice that there are some difficulties in the use of Canadian wool by our woollen manufacturers. I am told that our woollen manufacturers for the most part import their wool;—that may or may not be the case, I have no knowledge of the matter myself. I have also been told that large quantities of our Canadian wool are bought and taken across to the United States and there treated by American woollen manufacturers. It has also been intimated that this slight difficulty in connection with our wool is overcome by a certain process used by American manufacturer. If this be true, I think it is advisable that the Government should encourage our own manufacturers to make use of that process, so that Canadian wool may be used by our own manufacturers of woollen goods. This will, of course, have a tendency to cheapen the price of woollen goods.

Mr. CRERAR: I believe that the chief wool markets in North America are in the United States. As to the treatment and preparation of wool for manufacturing purposes, I cannot speak with any definite knowledge of the facilities in Canada. One of the objects of these amendments is to establish more clearly the grades and packages, so that both the purchaser and the seller will know more definitely on what basis they are working.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The resolution provides: "for the preservation of rights of farmers, drovers, and other persons to sell and buy at stockyards." Does that mean that to-day a farmer or drover cannot dispose of his live stock at the stockyard except through a broker? I understand the business has changed considerably in the last five or six years. Then, a drover could ship a carload of stock to the yards and dispose of the stock as he saw fit; but to-day, I understand that the selling has to be done through a broker, and that entails a commission.

Mr. CRERAR: Clause 2 of section 3 of The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, 1917, provides as follows:

> Nothing in this Act, or in any regulation made hereunder, shall take away, or in any manner limit, the right of any farmer or drover to sell his live stock at any stockyard.

We are proposing an amendment to make more clear the right of a farmer or drover to buy live stock in any stock yard, which right is not clearly defined in the present Act. For the information of the House, I may say that the existing Act empowers the Governor in Council to formulate regulations governing in a general way the conduct of stock yards, the manner in which live stock shall be handled, guarantees of good faith on the part of commission agents, and other matters of that character. These regulations have been under the consideration of the department for some time.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not have them approved by Parliament, which comprises a great many farmers who have just as much knowledge of these matters as the officers of the department?

Mr. CRERAR: The Act as it at present stands empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations prescribing the manner in which the stockyards are to be constructed and operated.

Sir SAM HUGHES: More Orders in Council.

Mr. CRERAR: That may be. The present Act was passed two years ago, and these regulations have been under consideration for a considerable time. The producers, the farmers, and the Live Stock Associations have been consulted and the regulations, which are now practically completed, are the result of our joint collaboration.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where are these stockyards located? I do not think there are any such institutions in my part of the country. Are they all under the control of the department?

Mr. CRERAR: The chief stockyards in Eastern Canada are in Montreal and Toronto, and in Western Canada at Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton. There is also a stockyard at Moosejaw, and another at Prince Albert. Some of them are private enterprises, and others are under the control of the railways. In Winnipeg, for instance, the railway companies have formed a stockyards company. The purpose of the Act of 1917, and I think the purpose was entirely commendable, was to provide for a closer supervision of these yards, so that those who were handling live stock would have proper facilities for the carrying on of their work.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are these stockyards anything in the nature of an exhibition?

Mr. CRERAR: No, they are purely for market purposes.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: I understand that the amendments will more clearly define the right of a farmer or drover to purchase and sell stock at a stockyard.

Mr. CRERAR: The farmer has now a right to sell. We are going to make it clear that he has a right to buy.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: What supervision has the department over by-products imported from the United States. Chicago, for instance, ships in many tons of canned meats, which are used very extensively in the hot weather. Does the department provide for a standard weight and quality of these meats?

Mr. CRERAR: The control of canned meats comes under the Meat and Canned Foods Act. They have to come up to certain standards.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The minister speaks about giving to the farmer the right to buy as well as to sell. What does that mean? Who has had the authority hitherto to deny the farmer the right to buy in the market, and who controls these stockyards? Is it under Dominion, or provincial, or private charter?

Mr. CRERAR: The stockyards are I understand all incorporated under provincial Acts, and I presume the purpose of the amendment when it was introduced into this Act two years ago was to make it absolutely clear that no company privately chartered and conducting the business of a stock-

yard could deny the individual farmer or drover the right to go in and sell his stock.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We could not override a provincial statute.

Mr. CRERAR: We have the power to pass regulations governing these stockyards, the same as we have to regulate the handling of grain through elevators.

Mr. McCOIG: From what source does the request come for this change in legislation? I understand that in Toronto the farmers can buy all the stock they wish without interference. The resolution has some reference to the matter of marketing wool, and I do not see why the two things should be connected,—the purchasing of livestock, and the branding and the marketing of wool. Would it not be better to have them in separate resolutions? What I would particularly like to know, however, is where the request comes from to have this change in legislation.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that any request has been made respecting the right of farmers to buy in these stockyards. That right, as I understand it, has not been interfered with, and the purpose of this resolution is to make it clear beyond any doubt. As regards the grading of wool and the size of packages in which wool has been marketed, the request for the regulation of these matters has come practically from all the wool producers in Canada, who have asked that some definite standard be fixed as a medium of sale in this commodity.

Mr. McCOIG: The greatest compliment I have heard from the farmers in reference to the markets in Toronto is as regard the quotations for the different products that are being sold there, and the way in which they are sent out. A great number of producers have expressed a desire that the Government should control the prices that are paid each day for stocks at different markets and that one quotation should be sent to the press throughout the country. Very often contradictory reports are seen in the press and in some cases you will find a discouraging report in one paper and in the same paper of another date possibly an encouraging report as to different stocks being sold. If the minister is anxious to do something in regard to the markets of the country I think he should see that if there are going to be inspectors at these different places they should have full charge in the matter of quotations that are submitted to the press, and see that these quotations are uniform.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. CRERAR: The suggestion which the hon. member makes is a very radical one, and one which I do not think it would be wise to adopt. Quotations governing the sale of live stock are available in the same way as are quotations on grain or any other article of commerce. If I understand the hon. gentleman's suggestion aright, it is that the Government should establish some means of definitely controlling the prices that would be paid daily to the public. That certainly is not contemplated in the legislation, and I thing it is rather a radical idea.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The farmer can purchase in the market, but must he purchase through the agent? In the privately owned stockyard, as I understand, you are not permitted to dispose of your stock except through an agent, and you have to pay a percentage to him which reduces your profit. Under this amended legislation will one farmer be able to purchase from another independently of the agent?

Mr. CRERAR: I cannot explain that matter more clearly than by referring the hon. member to the provision of the Act:

(2) Nothing in this Act, or in any regulation made hereunder, shall take away, or in any manner limit, the right of any farmer or drover to sell . . . .

We propose to amend that to read, "sell or buy," so that the farmer can have absolute freedom to sell or buy.

Mr. HENDERS: I think it is well that such a law should be provided. We have experienced some difficulty along that line in the West with regard to the handling of live stock. During the last year or two we have been taking out of the stockyards large quantities of cattle for feeding purposes, and the right has been questioned of the individual farmer to go and make his own purchase. The commission men have asserted themselves on that point and have claimed the right to do the purchasing for the farmer, exacting a commission from him. If the Bill intends to cover those two points of selling and buying, I think it is splendid legislation and should go into effect. We should make it clear that the producer has the right to go himself and sell and to go personally and buy and take out his stock. If that is the intention of the Act it should be supported.

Mr. McKENZIE: If I understand the minister to say that these associations are organized under provincial statutes, then it is not good practice that they should be regulated by legislation of this House. While

we have no power to repeal an Act of a local legislature, we can render it inoperative by depriving it of all its effectiveness. But it will stand on the Statute Books of the province which enacts it, and I submit to the minister that if there is any local legislation creating a corporation such as a stockyard, and if there is any ground of complaint from the farmers, the legislature of the province creating that institution should be asked to provide the necessary remedy. That should be done under extreme necessity, and if the legislature of the province should refuse to remedy the matter, then we could regulate any provincial institution by legislation in this House. It is a very clumsy and inconvenient way of doing it, and if the institutions which the minister intends to regulate are creations of provincial statutes, I do not think that this House should pass legislation which would have the effect of annulling those statutes. I think that under a local statute a man should know exactly what his rights are without having to consult any Dominion enactment as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Do the words "for regulations regarding inspection" refer to the inspection of live stock?

Mr. CRERAR: They refer to live stock products such as wool or hides.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Do they not refer to live stock itself?

Mr. CRERAR: It is intended to cover live stock products such as wool, hides and eggs—such live stock products as are not already under the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

Resolution reported, and concurred in

Hon. Mr. Crerar thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 75, to amend the Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, 1917.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—PREVENTION OF FIRE.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), to amend the Criminal Code respecting prevention of fire.

Mr. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a Bill that I asked to be introduced into the Senate for expedition. Its purpose is to prevent fires, and the methods employed are these: (1) It makes it a criminal offence on the part of the owner, occupant or tenant of a building to refuse to obey any law of the country looking to the prevention of fire provided that upon his being prosecuted for the offence the jury find that but for his negligence in so omitting to obey the law the fire would not have occurred.

Sir SAM HUGHES: His criminal negligence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It makes it criminal negligence now. The second clause makes it obligatory upon the owner, or occupier or tenant of a property to carry out any instructions of a provincial officer looking to the prevention of fire, which instructions would be in the nature of the removal of material, the construction of fire-escapes, or making some alterations, providing these instructions are reasonable and are passed upon as reasonable by federal officers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will that entail the creation of a number of agents, officers, etc.?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not think so. I really have not given much consideration to that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is a bad thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that the existing officers in the various provinces can take care of this work. There will be officers of the Government who will be locally situated and who will be competent to perform these duties. At all events, even if that were considered necessary it would be amply justified. The losses from fires in this country in the year 1918 aggregated some $33,000,000 of which 75 per cent are believed to have been absolutely preventable. That is an average of about $4 per head for every man and woman in Canada; a per capita average that is simply appalling. In European countries, where legislation similar to this is in effect and where greater governmental care is taken, as well as care by associations and societies, the rate of loss is trifling compared with what it is in Canada.

4 p.m.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There they have tile roofs and mud floors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very true, but tile roofs and mud floors would be a rather cheap inconvenience if purchased by the saving that might be effected in this country.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that most municipalities have laws regulating this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but this is to give effect to these laws. If the hon. gentleman will read the Act he will see that the law of the municipality is made effective. Wherever there is an enactment which is not obeyed and a fire occurs as a result, which would not have occurred but for the disobedience, then the persons guilty of such disobedience will be guilty of an indictable offence.

Mr. POWER: Most of the municipal enactments are to the effect that such and such structures may not be put up unless with the permission of the municipal authorities. I do not see therefore how this enactment would apply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some of the enactments are of that nature. Other provincial and municipal laws would deal with the distance between buildings, the nature of the material employed and various features like that looking to the safety of the structure when erected and to the safety of the people in it. This Bill says that those laws must be obeyed under penalty of being guilty of an indictable offence provided that the disobedience is found by a jury to be the cause of the fire. As this is a motion for the second reading, I think it would be proper that we should move the House into Committee and let the discussion take place then.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—negligently causing fire which results in loss of life or property:

Mr. SHEARD: I would like to ask the minister if the proposed statute provides that the owners of the building must receive notice of these defects and that a reasonable time be allowed for complying with requirements after the notification has been given?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That question would be applicable to the next section. This section merely refers to disobedience of an enactment by the owner, and everybody else presumably acquainted with the law.

Mr. CAHILL: What effect will this provision have upon the insurance rates, if any, and where would the insurance company come in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The passing of this enactment will not affect any contractual relations at all between the insurer and the insured. It will be just the same as if the Bill had not passed.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. CAHILL: Will it not affect the insurance rates?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope it will. It will not perform the work unless it does. The impression that fire losses are insurance losses only if the buildings are insured is a wholly unsound impression. Losses by fire are national losses whether the buildings are insured or whether they are not, because the increase in the fire loss is reflected year by year in the increase in the insurance rates. Conversely anything that diminishes fire loss must be reflected in the decrease of insurance rates. Consequently, if this enactment has the effect intended of diminishing fire losses it will result in a diminution of insurance rates. Of course this Bill has no power to diminish rates, but it will enable companies to diminish them, and if companies refused to put such reductions into effect then it would give the Provincial Legislatures ground upon which they might act.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think this Committee should consider this measure with extreme care, because the provisions of the Bill are very far-reaching, and the underlying conditions very onerous. For instance, the penalty is made applicable to the person owning, the person occupying, and the person controlling the property. All three classes of persons will be liable to the penalty imposed by this Bill, and yet any one of the three may not have been officially notified of its requirements. The minister's comparison of the fire losses of Canada with those in European countries, I submit, is hardly fair for several reasons. The insured property in the Old Country is not as valuable as the property in this country carrying insurance, neither is the population of Canada as dense as the population there. Therefore, the per capita comparison of the fire loss given by the minister is not fair and is not justified, and does not warrant the stringent provisions proposed here. The fire insurance companies and the Conservation Commission of Canada have been trying to establish, more particularly during the last year or so, that the fire loss per capita in this country is enormous as compared with the fire loss in other countries. I submit that their method of comparison is not at all justified for the reasons which I have already given. Moreover the fact should be borne in mind that during the last few years we have had enormous losses in Canada through fires in munition plants. One great fire occurred in Trenton which

resulted in a loss of $5,000,000. Another great fire resulting in a similar loss occurred elsewhere, and so on. These losses have been included and have swollen the total fire losses of Canada. The comparison therefore is not a fair one because the fires in question were extraordinary in character, and should not be included so as to increase the per capita fire loss of the country. Had I known that this Bill was coming up for consideration I would have studied the matter more carefully, and been in a position to deal with it more satisfactorily, because I have given considerable thought and attention to it. In my opinion the business interests of the country should insist upon delay before enacting a Bill embodying such stringent provisions at the present time.

Mr. POWER: The danger which I see in a clause of this character it this: As we all know, after almost every big fire which occurs in a city or municipality, a large number of new by-laws are introduced; a panic occurs and it is said, "This kind of thing must not happen again." The result is the adoption of various new by-laws, more or less well studied, and after a certain length of time, when the scare has subsided, they are no longer enforced. We have in most of our cities, I should say, a number of antiquated laws and regulations with regard to the character of buildings to be erected, and the provision of fire protection, fire escapes, etc., and these are made applicable more particularly in places where the labouring people congregate. In the city of Quebec we have had a large number of such by-laws, and at one time it was decided to insist upon the use in buildings of cement products, asbestos tiles, and so forth. It was found, however, that these articles were too expensive for the ordinary labouring man's dwelling, and the by-law was thereupon allowed to drop, or the inspector did not perform his duty by enforcing it. Now, should a fire occur in the poorer quarters of the city, and should someone discover that such a law exists, under the present provision the owner, the occupier, and the person controlling the property—possibly the janitor, or even the nightwatchman,—would be responsible, and would be liable to a fine of $1,000. As at present worded the clause is rather too stringent. If there was a possibility of amending it in the direction indicated by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) so as to provide for the giving of notice to the proprietor or occupier that he is not carrying out the law, I think the provision would be a reasonable one. Otherwise I am afraid it will result in a great deal of hardship to the labouring classes and to others against whom such an enactment should not be enforced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not catch the point made by the hon. member for Renfrew, but apparently he is of the view that we should not compare our fire losses with those of European countries, because their population is more dense than ours. It would occur to me that the more dense the population the larger the number of cities having fire losses, and the higher the per capita fire loss, is likely to be. It is a well-known fact that our insurance rates are higher in our cities than in our rural districts, because when the population becomes congested the danger is greater. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman's argument has any force it leads to exactly the opposite conclusion from what he intended. However, I do not know that it has very much force one way or the other. The fire loss in Norway in 1918 was 55 cents per capita and in Belgium, where the regulations would, presumably, be equally strong and enforced with equal care, the loss was $1.02 per capita.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How could the figures for Belgium be got in 1918?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the case of Canada the year given is 1914, and from the statement which I have it would be inferred that 1918 was the year in the other cases. It must have been the year before the war. At all events, Norway has a population of about 2,000,000, spread over a large territory, and Belgium is very thickly populated. The thicker the population the higher the fire loss per capita; consequently, the comparison of the figures for these countries with those for Canada is all the more striking and all the more unfavourable to ourselves, for our loss is $4 per capita. In the Netherlands the fire loss is 11 cents per capita.

Mr. PEDLOW: The figure given by the Conservation Commission of the fire loss in Canada is $2.92 per capita.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Our fire loss was $33,000,000, and, taking the population as something over 8,000,000, the figure would be $4 per head. The loss for January, 1919, is the highest on record.

Mr. PEDLOW: The losses would be specially heavy during the last few years, on account of munition plants and so on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are munition plants in other countries, too. They made munitions in England; the fire loss there was 64 cents per capita.

Mr. PEDLOW: The munition plants were not destroyed by fire there, but they were here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had better have some laws, then, to prevent their burning here. My hon. friend says that business interests should be consulted with regard to this legislation. I know he must have great respect for the Retail Merchants' Association —I hope he is a member of it. That association has written a letter strongly commending the Bill. Representatives of the following associations have been consulted with regard to these amendments—I do not think it can be said that they are not all business institutions: Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Canadian Fire Underwriters' Association, Non-tariff Insurance Companies, the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the United Farmers of Ontario, the United Farmers of Alberta, the Wholesale Grocers' Association, the Canadian Bankers' Association, the Dominion Mortgage and Investment Association, the Fire Chiefs' Association, the Commission of Conservation. So that I do not think we have failed to take into account the views of the community, and while we do not need to act precipitately, there is no very great reason for delay.

Mr. POWER: Could the minister find it possible to get the United Farmers and the Manufacturers' Association to agree on any other subject?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We hope they will.

Mr. ELKIN: All business men, property holders and those interested in protection against fire will agree with the principle of this Bill. But it occurs to me that confusion may arise from the fact that the fire laws in the different municipalities conflict to some extent. I understand that in the next section of the Bill you take care of anything that might be unjust in municipal fire laws by placing further responsibility upon an officer approved by the Governor in Council; is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but a man to be guilty under the first section must be guilty of a breach of a law, not merely of a breech of instructions of a local fire officer. If he is guilty of a breach of the law and his guilt is found by the jury to have been the only cause of the fire, then he is liable. Neither the occupant nor the owner or controller is guilty unless the law of the province fixes the responsibility on him. If the law of the province fixes the responsibility on more than one, then it is for the province to amend its law if necessary.

Mr. POWER: Most provincial and municipal fire laws provide penalties for infractions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true, but very often the people responsible for fires have less to fear from any punishment that the province can impose than from the punishment that follows the breach of the Criminal Code.

Mr. ELKIN: The minister did not quite answer my question. In section 2 the responsibility for recommending to an owner or property holder that certain changes be made within thirty days does not rest alone with the municipal or provincial officer; the recommendation must be approved by an officer authorized by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies to the second clause. The other sanction is only the opinion of a provincial officer. We think there should be a second sanction.

Mr. EULER: When the minister says that there is to be no punishment except for breach of the law, does he include by-laws passed by municipal, town and city councils? Many of these by-laws vary in the different cities and towns. In fact some of them consist of many pages of printed matter and the people in the municipalities may not be acquainted with their contents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A law passed legally by a municipality on the authority of provincial legislation is just as much a law as any other law. It is true that these laws vary among the municipalities; still we may assume that the residents of a municipality know the law of that municipality. If the law is too complicated and too long, it is for the municipality to amend it. Our law is neither complicated nor long.

Mr. PEDLOW: The second paragraph of section (1A) says that a person shall be deemed to have caused a fire through negligence if such a person has failed to obey the requirements of any law intended to prevent fires. But suppose a building is considered to have defective electric wiring and the owner has been notified of the defect; if a fire originates in that building from some other cause and is destroyed, the

owner would be liable to a penalty of two years' imprisonment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the jury must find that his disobedience was the cause.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: While I agree with the principle of the Bill, it seems to me that its drafting requires consideration. The first clause says:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who, by negligence, causes any fire which occasions loss of life or loss of property.

Negligence might consist in a man going out to his stable with a lantern and setting it down on the floor, and then, perhaps, while doing something else, backing up against his lantern and knocking it over and setting fire to his own barn. In such a case he would, under this clause, be liable to two years' imprisonment, while under the Ontario law the insurance company would be bound to pay his loss. A lady in a house might accidentally leave her electric iron with the current turned on; it might burn its way through the board and drop to the floor and set the house on fire. That would certainly be negligence, but under the law of Ontario, the insurance company would have to pay her loss, and yet under this clause she would be liable to two years' imprisonment. Unless the word "negligence" is defined in some better way, there are many cases of negligence which are perfectly innocent and in which there is no wrong intent, and there is no reason in making a criminal of a person who unwittingly acts in a negligent manner. The gist of every crime is the guilty intent, but as far as I can see, under the first clause standing by itself—and the second clause, which says certain things shall be deemed to be negligent, does not limit it—a person guilty of these innocent, though negligent acts, would come within the purview of the Bill and be liable to imprisonment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think my hon. friend's interpretation is right. That is the intent of the law and, I think, a proper intent. There is no definition of negligence here, but negligence in law has been interpreted ten thousand times and one hundred times that again, and will have to stand as so interpreted.

Mr. McKENZIE: How about criminal negligence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This makes what before was negligence that was not criminal, negligence that is criminal. Unless you do that, you do not get to the root of the trouble; you leave things absolutely as they are. Undoubtedly, a man who intentionally does something to cause a fire is liable now, because there is criminal intent, and there is no use in legislating to meet his case, because it was met long years ago. But by this legislation, we are trying to reach the careless person who does not think of fire at all, and it is this kind of negligence that causes over 75 per cent of fires. If we leave this out, we had better not go on with the Bill. The law of the land to-day places criminal responsibility upon persons who have no criminal intent. For example, if the guardian of a ward, by negligence, by insufficient attention, by failure to procure medical attention, and without any guilty intent at all, causes the death of that child, that guardian is guilty of murder. The same thing runs through the law in many respects, and many other instances could be cited. This extends the operation of that law into the field of fire prevention and says to those, who by mere carelessness, taking no thought of what may happen to them or the loss that may happen to others, allow an electric iron with the current turned on to sit upon a table, when any one with common sense would know that if it were not properly insulated it would burn the table and perhaps the house and perhaps even the neighbour's house. You, through your negligence, caused that loss; it is probable you suffered no loss at all, but other innocent people did; your negligence was the primary cause; you are impervious to punishment by fine, but we say to you in advance: You must be more careful afterwards, and if you fail to be more careful, then you must suffer the only punishment that has any effect upon you.

Mr. SHEARD: Would not the owner be liable also under the wording of the clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the provincial law said that the owner shall be responsible for no person in his house doing anything carelessly, then he would be liable, but no provincial law says that.

Mr. DAVIS: Supposing there is a case of defective wiring, which the owner should fix and which the tenant is forbidden to use, but the tenant continues to use it, are they not both liable in case of fire?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS: Whom will you prosecute in such a case; will you prosecute both?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If both are liable. both should be prosecuted.

Mr. DAVIS: The owner may have intended to repair the defective wiring, but in the meantime the tenant continues using it. Is there not some unfairness in making both liable?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is any unfairness in the matter, the unfairness has its root in the provincial law. If the provincial law makes it the duty of both, and both neglect their duty, we cannot help that; both are liable.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The case I was discussing was not one of owner and tenant. If I own a house and pay insurance on it, and I am paying a sufficiently large insurance premium to justify a company paying me for a loss if I should make a mistake in my own house, for instance, if I should leave an electric iron with the current on, or if my wife should do so in her own house, or in my house, under this clause, she is a criminal and liable to two years' imprisonment. It is not an accident; it is due to her negligence in not turning off the electric current, because forgetfulness is negligence. Under those circumstances, while according to the Ontario law, the insurance company would be bound to pay the loss, my wife would be liable to go to prison for two years. If that is the purport of the Bill, I should like the House to know it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is not quite as careful in his statement as he was before. If the provincial law makes it an offence on the part of a wife of an owner, this would not apply at all, because I do not think the hon. member could be the owner and his wife the owner, too, nor could the hon. member and his wife both be said to be occupiers.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend does not get my meaning. I am not speaking about the second paragraph at all. If the word " only " were put in the second paragraph, I would understand that the meaning of the word " negligence " in the first clause was being defined. The second clause says:

> The person owning, occupying, or controlling the premises in which such a fire occurs, or on which such fire originates, shall be deemed to have caused the fire through negligence if such person, etc.—

But that does not define the only persons who are liable, under the preceding clause, because of negligence. The minister should insert the word "only" in the second clause if negligence is confined to the commission of the breaches set out in the second clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is right in that respect. I was thinking about the second paragraph. Where he understated the intent was this: The punishment will, we must presume, be proportionate to the guilt. If the negligence is not gross, if it is of the nature of an accident—and the two merge together very often—then we must presume the magistrate or the judge will take that into account, and it may be a judge if the person so elects under this legislation. The punishment is within the power of the judge to inflict: he cannot go higher than two years, but he can inflict punishment of a day's imprisonment if he wishes. He can inflict suspended sentence, if he wishes. He can invoke section 1035 of the Code, and, instead of imposing punishment by imprisonment, he can impose a fine. All that we create is the statutory offence, placing it within the power of the judge to impose such fine or such imprisonment as may be appropriate. Surely that is not too much when the result of the negligence alone is fire. If we are not prepared to go that far, I do not know what we can do to assist in preventing or reducing this annual waste.

Mr. POWER: Does this apply to forest fires?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; it does not matter what the property is.

Mr. McKENZIE: I thought at one time that this legislation might be amended so as to make it more humane and Christian, but I have come to the conclusion that that is an absolute impossibility. The minister is proposing to go to a length to which we never went before in this country, or any other country, as far as I know. I think the illustrations that have been given are sufficient to bring home to the mind of the minister that this is really dangerous legislation. If a very slight accident is caused in a house, even by a child—I suppose the parent will be responsible for the child—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: Well, then the child is responsible. I think the minister should withdraw this Bill, and wait for another year or so until he hears that anybody wants this legislation. I do not think anybody does want it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quoted quite a few institutions which did.

Mr. McKENZIE: There may be some institutions looking for extraordinary protection, so as to make bigger money out of their insurance; but I am not in sympathy with legislation of that kind, at the expense of making criminals out of people who are absolutely innocent. It has been said a thousand times in this House that it is impossible to have a criminal without a criminal intent, and it is ridiculous to say that some person with the innocent heart and mind of a child and incapable of conceiving a crime, should be sent for two years to the penitentiary on any of these grounds. I cannot see any force in the suggestion that the province may intervene and render this law harmless, because the Act explicitly sets forth that any person guilty of the offence shall suffer such and such a penalty. I do trust that the minister will not find it necessary to put any such legislation as this on the Criminal Statutes of this country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The point that strikes me is this: Suppose I am an insurance agent and an applicant for insurance comes to my office and says: "I want to insure my house." I say: "Yes." He says: "Does this policy cover a fire loss due to leaving on the electric iron, for instance, or to the pipes becoming overheated?" I say: "Yes, you would get your insurance in full. The insurance law so provides." Then when the fire occurs the man is told he is liable to go to jail for these very offences. That is where the inconsistency comes in, to my mind.

Mr. BALL: I quite agree with the minister that the losses from fire in this country are very great, and I think they should be curtailed in some way or other. Not only are they a loss to the country, but all policy holders in mutual companies have to make up for these losses and their rates are consequently much higher. I think anybody who has studied the fire records as given by the insurance companies will agree that Canada's fire losses are very large. Section 1 of this Bill provides:

> The person owning, occupying or controlling the premises in which such a fire occurs, or on which such fire originates, shall be deemed to have caused the fire through negligence, if such person has failed to obey the requirements of any law intended to prevent fires.

His want of knowledge of the law is construed to be negligence. I do not think that is right. If he knew the law and failed to obey it, that would be negligence; but this legislation is convicting him of negligence even though he has not had an opportunity of knowing what the law is. I think this provision should be modified in some way. Let me read it again:

> The person owning, occupying or controlling the premises in which such a fire occurs, or on which such fire originates, shall be deemed to have caused the fire through negligence, if such person has failed to obey the requirements of any law intended to prevent fires or which requires apparatus for the extinguishment of fires.

A man might well be said to be guilty of negligence if, after an insurance or government inspector had visited his premises and advised him that certain conditions must be remedied, he did not remedy them. Many people will come under this law who do not know what the law is in regard to fires. I think that is unfair. Steps should be taken to advise the public of the law, and want of knowledge of the law should not be construed as negligence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really think hon. members are of the view that some principle is being adopted here that is new and of a perilous nature, but such is not the case at all. No law in the world can proceed on any other assumption than that the people know it. We never legislate in this House on any other assumption. If, however, the punishment is made greater, it may be the duty of the federal or provincial authorities to disseminate more widely a knowledge of the law, and when the punishment becomes of a nature differing in certain respects from what it was before, it may well be that the province in enacting a law shall see that the provisions are better known. What I want to impress is this: You cannot legislate on any other hypothesis than that the law is known. If you legislate on any other hypothesis, nobody will make it his business to find out what the law is, because he will not need to care. To-day, the law has the very same defect, if it may be called such, that the hon. member for Grey points out and at which the hon. leader of the Opposition was so horrified this afternoon. The law provides now on this very subject:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who by such negligence as shows him to be reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences—

I would not be a bit surprised if the woman who left a heated iron on the table was considered reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences. In my judgment, she would be liable now under the law.

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who by such negligence as shows him to be reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences, or in viola-

tion of a provincial or municipal law of the locality, sets fire to any forest, tree, manufactured lumber, square timber, logs or floats, boom, dam or slide, on the Crown domain, or on land leased or lawfully held for the purpose of cutting timber, or on private property on any creek or river, or rollway, beach or wharf, so that the same is injured or destroyed.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is not that bad enough without making it worse?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not consider it bad at all. I am trying to show that this law is no innovation. It is the law to-day with respect to a certain class of property. Let me read it again:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment, who, by such negligence as shows him to be reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences, or in violation of a provincial or municipal law of the locality, sets fire to any forest, tree, manufactured lumber, etc.

If a man is to be liable for two years for burning this class of property, booms, dams and slides, etc., why should he not be liable if he burns a block in a city through similar negligence? It is very hard to see why there should be a distinction. I presume that the reason it was confined here was that the party suffering the loss in this regard was the Crown, but the nature of the offence itself is just the same. I think that meets the point raised by the hon. member for Grey, but the great principle I want to impress upon him is that if you are ever going to secure the utmost obedience to law that can be secured, you must impose upon every citizen of the State the obligation to acquaint himself with the law so far as it effects him. I know that every citizen in the State cannot be acquainted with all law; perhaps no citizen can, but you must legislate on the assumption that it is his duty to acquaint himself as it is in his power with such law as affects him. Let me add this again, which I have already tried to impress upon the Committee: That the punishment itself is still left to be regulated by the grossness of the offence, and where the offence is not gross we must presume that the punishment will correspond. As to a little child being liable, every one knows that no court will hold a child criminally responsible. After the child reaches the age of criminal responsibility and has attained a degree of maturity that justifies the court in fixing guilt upon it, there is no reason why it should be absolved if its negligence results in the destruction of a building, or if it carelessly injures or maims a companion. As regards the opinion of the hon. member for Grey that there is an inconsistency in a person being liable to conviction and punishment and at the same time being entitled to receive insurance money, I must say that I cannot see the force of this argument. Is a person to escape the consequences of his act merely because he is able to contract himself out of financial loss? Why, the loss really is not his at all, and he might go on and be guilty of anything. It is true he does not suffer himself, because the law makes the insurance company pay him But the community suffers, since that carelessness of his tends to raise the insurance rate to every citizen of his district. This result of his negligence may not be apparent immediately; it may take several repetitions of his negligence to effect it. But the result is inevitable and inescapable, and it is the community that suffers from his carelessness. Now the community comes to him in this enactment and says, "Though you may still be able to contract yourself out of financial loss, we who are the sufferers, say to you that if by your negligence you cause us loss, then you must answer before the courts of the country in the way the Act sets forth." What is illogical or inconsistent in that? It is true that if a man causes fire in such a way as to place himself outside the terms of his contract with the insurance company —for instance, if he sets fire to a building intentionally—then his insurance policy does not cover that at all. But if his policy did cover it, that would not say that he should be at liberty to indulge in all the carelessness he liked. It is altogether a matter of contract as to whether the insurance covers his loss or not; but it is a matter of his duty to the community as to whether or not he conducts himself so that they shall suffer no loss. It is the community that suffers, and therefore the community has the right to impose the terms.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I have no objection to the second part of the clause, that is, as to where a person has been guilty of a direct breach of the present law, provincial, municipal or otherwise. But apparently the law which is now on the Statute Books is not drastic enough in the opinion of the minister. The law says that a person must be wantonly reckless before he can come within the code. The word "reckless" is a much stronger word than "negligent," and "wantonly reckless" is stronger still, and a man has to be guilty not only of recklessness but of wanton recklessness before he comes within the provisions of the code to-day.

Under the present amendment the first subsection standing by itself says that every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment, who is negligent. That is what it says in effect. Now, I venture to say that in seven cases out of ten the fires that occur in this country would, according to this subsection, be due to negligence. A fire may be caused by electric irons, or by a man not sufficiently looking after his electric installation, and under such circumstances he would be held to be guilty of negligence. Or perhaps a man going into a stable might accidentally back on to his lantern and start a fire, and he might also be guilty of negligence. Do we intend, or are we willing, to go so far as to say that a man shall be liable to two years' imprisonment in such a case, and be held to be negligent although the insurance company admits that his negligence is unavoidable inasmuch as they pay him his insurance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He pays for his insurance.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: He signs a contract which says in effect that although his electric iron may start a fire, or he may knock over his lantern or do all these things which amount to negligence on his part, they will pay him his insurance, notwithstanding the fact that he may be liable, under this law to two years' imprisonment. I do not think it is the intention to go as far as that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The law says "if by negligence that is reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences." I think those are perhaps a little stronger than just the word "negligence." But who is to say that we should not make it an offence against the State for one negligently to cause loss to the State? It is an offence to-day. We use the word "negligence" throughout the Code over and over again. For example, if a man to-day by any manner of negligence causes the death of another, is he not answerable before the courts of the land in criminal law? Undoubtedly he is. If his negligence causes the death of or injury to another he is liable now, because he has offended against the law of the State, and you must impose punishment. Of course, it would not be reasonable to make him liable to the same extent as if his negligence merely resulted in financial loss to the community But it is just as logical to make one an offence against the code as to make the other. The character of the injury is the same although in the one case it is greater in degree than in the other. The community suffers in one case financially through his negligence while the community suffers the loss or maiming of a citizen in the other case. I have given one illustration where negligence resulting in the loss or injury to the State is punishable now under the code. I could give many others. We are simply adding another and we say that for loss to the community by reason of a fire you must answer before the courts. We place it in the power of the judges of the land to say just what measure of punishment should be inflicted upon you. There is nothing new in it at all; it is merely the sound principle that is everywhere found in the code extended to another class of cases.

Mr. PEDLOW: This clause has evidently been built up entirely upon the foundation of negligence. The difficulty that will arise under this enactment will be to prove negligence. There are two sets of electrical wiring inspectors to-day operating in Ontario. There is the inspector of the Hydro-Electric Commission and there is the inspector of the Canadian Underwriters' Association. I know of one instance where one of these inspectors visited a building, condemned the wiring and ordered it reconstructed. That order was carried out to the letter. Subsequently the other inspector came along and condemned the wiring done under the order of the previous inspector and consequently the work had to be done all over again. Supposing that a fire had occurred in the meantime with the wiring carried out under the instruction of the first inspector, who would have been negligent in the case? The owner of the property under this law. The difficulty is to establish negligence. It will be almost impossible, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) says, in seven cases out of ten.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then nobody will suffer.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to have this Bill withdrawn or delayed so that it may receive further consideration. I think that the whole subject of fire insurance should be considered at the same time. A large proportion of the fires that occur in this country are attributable not to negligence on the part of the occupant, owner, or person controlling the property, but largely because insurance agents are trying to effect insurance regardless of the result. All they care for is the commission. With a Bill of this kind you should also couple the responsibility of the insurance agent. He is largely responsible for a large proportion

of the fires that occur. I believe that a large proportion of the insurance agents will take a risk on any property they can get through with their companies because all they are interested in is the commission. I think the minister will be well advised to delay the enactment of this Bill until the whole subject of fire insurance is considered from every standpoint. I do not think that negligence on the part of the property owner is at all responsible for a large proportion of the fires that occur. You talk about negligence. To whom do you attribute negligence in the case of the Great Fire in Chicago? Those of us who remember that fire know that it occurred because a cow kicked over a coal oil lantern. What are you going to do with the cow? That fire destroyed millions and millions of dollars worth of property in Chicago. I think the House will be well advised to delay the passage of this Bill until it has had an opportunity to look into the question from other angles than that which has evidently impressed itself upon whoever drafted the Bill.

5 p.m.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: There is another feature of the Bill that perhaps has not been fully considered. A man may have a fire by any one of the innocent means of which I have spoken and yet it is negligence. He is insured, he goes over the matter with the insurance company and the insurance company say: We will offer you so much and if you do not take that, you have two years' imprisonment ahead of you; your wife may have neglected to turn off the electric iron. The insurance company would be practically the only people who would know the circumstances under which the fire occurred, because they would have investigated them. This Bill puts them in the position of being able to force a settlement to their own advantage.

Mr. MOWAT: I do not see how the draughtsman of this measure could have chosen language better fitted to carry out the intention. Negligence is something to be proved in each case. Hon. members of this House seem to have it in their minds that carelessness or negligence on their own part, or perhaps on the part of their wives, may bring them within the clutches of the criminal law. That is what is intended. It is to make the people of Canada more careful, in order that Canada may take a fresh step forward and occupy a position on all fours with other nations that do not have these enormous fire losses. I am quite sure that if hon. members had followed the proceedings of the Fire Underwriters' Association, the Conservation Commission, the Retail Merchants and other bodies which have been enumerated here by the minister, they could not but realize that something must be done in Canada if we are not going to fall behind the people of other nations. Our losses are enormously out of proportion to what they should be. It is true that our houses are, generally speaking, more inflammable than houses in some other countries, but that should not excuse our people from the consequences of such negligence as has produced this enormous percentage of losses. I quite understand the feeling of hon. members, such as the hon. member for South East Grey (Mr. Ball), who is afraid that hardship will be brought upon people because of their not knowing the law. But this House is not concerned about that, because the enforcement is left to the provincial authorities. All we have to do is to state what the law is and then if the provincial authorities, the magistrates and judges who try these cases, are convinced that the negligence is excusable, they will find some way of instructing the jury, or themselves deciding, that there is no negligence under the law. Thus hardship is avoided. It would be a great pity if in this House we failed to make a declaration upon this matter simply from the apprehension that the law might be carried out harshly by the provincial authorities. Our duty is to do what is right and define and declare the law as we are asked to do by these important bodies who have considered these matters from time to time. I would be very much disappointed if the reasons which have been advanced and the doubts which have been expressed as to the supposed harshness of the law and the hardships that it might create should prevent us from doing what seems to me our manifest duty.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose that all of us, whether we are lawyers or not, could form some idea of the character of a law, particularly criminal law from the class in which it is placed. The Criminal Code makes a great many classifications of different kinds of law; it is divided into certain parts, and each part deals with a certain class of criminal law. The law which the Acting Minister of Justice proposes to put on the statute-book now, goes into the category, or under the sub-division, of Part 8 of the Criminal Code. The legislation which the minister proposes is put into the class which deals with wilful and forbidden acts

in respect of certain property, and the first section under that reads as follows:

Every one who causes any event by an Act which he knew would probably cause it being reckless whether such event happens or not, is deemed for the purposes of this Part to have caused it wilfully.

Now the very first section of that part of the Code starts out by saying that a person cannot be liable under Part 8 unless he does the thing recklessly, whether such an event happens or not, and knowing that probably the mischief would happen. That is, any ordinary man must know that what he was doing would result in mischief. Then the very next section is under the heading of "Mischief." What does any person think of putting such a case as my hon. friend from Grey North (Mr. Middleboro) has described in the part classed "Mischief"? Let us suppose that a woman is ironing in her house and her iron is connected in the proper way with an electric current. She is called out for some purpose, and by the time she returns the house is afire. Is it to be said that because that woman went out when she was called, either to look after a sick child or to do something else that urgently required her presence, was mischievous in her conduct, because she forgot to turn off the current? Yet that is the class of case in which such conduct is put, and it is classed as mischievous. Then again in the same section and under the same category in which my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice puts this offence, is the crime of arson.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not the same section.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is in the same part of the Code, under the same heading, and in the same class of legislation. Now is this woman, whom I have just described, to be pronounced guilty of arson and put in the same class of criminals as a man who commits arson because she neglected to turn off the electric current in her house when she was called out by some urgent summons?

Now there is another heading dealing with setting other fires. The main section, to which my hon. friend expects to add 515A has the same criminal idea running through it, and any lawyer, or any person, who at times acts as a juror although he is not a lawyer, must know that all these sections must be read together, and he must understand the current or thread that runs through them all. Very well, here is what section 515 says:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to two years' imprisonment, who, by such negligence as shows him to be reckless or wantonly regardless of consequences, or in violation of a provincial or municipal law of the locality, sets fire to any forest, tree, manufactured lumber, square timber, logs or floats, boom, dam or slide, on the Crown domain, or on land leased or lawfully held for the purpose of cutting timber, or on private property or any creek or river, or rollway, beach or wharf, so that the same is injured or destroyed.

That is the section to which my hon. friend wishes to add subsection 515A, making it ten times worse, and bringing criminal law into domestic relations in a way in which it was never done before. What are the kind of cases that may come within this law? It applies whether there is any insurance or not, and the minister tells us that it does not make any difference. Suppose a private individual has a little house with a stove pipe running up through the middle of it. If a fire occurs by reason of that stovepipe being defective, that man is just as liable as if the fire occurred in a large house that was insured, and he is liable to go for two years to penitentiary if he happens to neglect something that he was told to do by an officer. We will suppose that an officer is passing and he enters and tells the man, "You should have a flue in this place. You should build a flue from the cellar to the top of your house and connect your stovepipe to that flue. If you do not do that I am afraid you may have a fire some day." The man says, "I am poor, and I cannot afford a flue. I have no bricks, I have no money, and I cannot afford to hire a mason. I will get along just as I am and be as careful as possible." An accident happens and the little house is burned down, the proprietor loses his house and is sent to the penitentiary for two years because he did not build a flue as he was directed to do. Is it well for us to enact legislation of that kind? I am sure my hon. friend will have to admit that the cases which I have described would come within the meaning, force and effect of this Bill. It is a measure of such drastic character, and is so absolutely unnecessary that I have much pleasure, seconded by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) in moving that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the Chairman leave the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the Committee rises may I be permitted to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister would be out of order in so doing. A motion that the Committee rise is non-debatable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be the case.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: Aye.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN: No.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Refeiring to the last complaint of the leader of the Opposition he apparently now suspects the Bill not so much for its contents but for the company it is in, and he quotes other offences, very serious in character, in the same part of the Code that this proposed legislation would be under, to sustain him in his contention.

Mr. McKENZIE: Part 8.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman thinks that in view of that it is a pretty serious matter to adopt this legislation. Well, if my hon. friend will go back just a few pages in the Code to Part 6 he will find common assault made an offence, and defined as follows:

> An assault is the act of intentionally applying force to the person of another, directly or indirectly, or attempting or threatening, by any act or gesture, to apply force.

So that according to that law, if I walked across the floor of the House and held my hand in a threatening attitude over the head of the hon. member, I would be guilty of the offence set out in this section. In the same part of the Code— indeed, on the very same page—I find the offence of so doing defined and, just two pages back, the offences of murder, manslaughter, and rape. All these are in the same portion of the Code as the reference to the offence that I would be guilty of if I walked across the floor and held my fist over the magnificent shining dome of the leader of the Opposition. So that it cannot be argued very powerfully that you can judge of the nature of a newly-made offence by the part of the Code into which you place it.

The hon. gentleman mentioned one or two very trifling offences which, he said, would be made offences under this law and would subject the persons who committed them to two years' imprisonment. That may be true, but no one will suffer two years' imprisonment if his offence is trivial. You cannot legislate on that assumption; otherwise I would be liable to seven years if I went across the floor and did what I have described. No judge in the land, not even the hon. member himself were he on the bench, would impose that punishment on me. The maximum punishment is for the maximum offence; the minimum punishment, or none at all, for the minimum offence. Surely two years' imprisonment is not too great a punishment to impose on a person who by his own gross negligence causes very serious loss to the community. The effect of a punishment not only has its application to the individual; it is a matter of example to the community, and a punishment of two years for a gross offence of this kind would have such an effect on the community in general that its adoption by this Committee is absolutely justified.

Mr. REDMAN: The word "negligence" as used here is entirely too wide. A house might be burned down by what we might call an act of God; it might be burned by the act of some person other than the owner. If a man burns his own house with his mind accompanying the act, he does it wilfully and he is guilty of arson; but I cannot conceive of the house being burned in any other way except through his negligence. If the mind accompanies the act, surely it must be a wilful act; if the mind does not accompany the act, it is simply carelessness or negligence. Negligence as set forth here simply means that any act other than one which is wilful which you commit or which you fail to commit and which results in your house being burned, will make you a criminal. I do not think that is the proper principle to apply. The principle of wanton recklessness, set forth in that part of the present Criminal Code which was read by the minister, is the principle that we ought to apply. That principle is well known among lawyers; it is well known in the civil law. It is one of the ingredients of fraud; it sets forth the difference between misrepresentation and fraud. It is a sort of quasi-criminality, and I think it is the only sort of act other than an act accompanied by criminal intent that we should make criminal. The issue is quite clear between the two sides in this controversy. One side desire to make every act other than a wilful act which results in the burning of a building a crime; the other side think that only such carelessness as is in itself a sort of quasi-criminal act should be made criminal. As I say, the present use of the word "negligence" in the section is going entirely too far and is putting into the list of crimes something that has not a tinge of criminalty about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member, as a lawyer, must know that negligence is to-day a crime in many places in the Code of the very same character exactly. Does he mean to intimate that if a man by his negligence—not intentionally in any way, but simply through carelessness—causes the death of another man, he is not criminally responsible? The only difference is in the result; the word used is the same in one case as in the other. In one case the act causes a person's death; Parliament has legislated that that is crime. In the other case it causes, say, the loss of a million dollars to the community; we make that a crime, but with a far less punishment. I fail to comprehend the apprehension of hon. members in this regard. A man whose mind accompanies his act in such a way that he knows what is going to result from his act, and intends it, commits a crime which is punishable now by a far greater punishment than two years' imprisonment—I think fourteen years, at least. The class of people we want to bring home are those who, by mere carelessness, by not realizing their duty to the community, causes this loss. If the same carelessness now causes loss of life or the maiming of another, the offender is criminally liable. Now we propose to make that same carelessness a crime, but with a fair less punishment, if it causes destruction of property. A man of substance who by his mere carelessness causes a building worth $100,000 to be burned is liable to-day for that $100,000 in the courts of the country. All we say now is that he is also answerable before the criminal courts. Very often these things are done by men who have no financial responsibility; why should they escape? Why should the community be always at the hazard of careless, reckless acts on the part of people who have no financial responsibility? Unless we are prepared to bring home to them some punishment, we are saying: Let things take their course; let the community suffer year in and year out to the extent of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 because we are afraid to make a man responsible and to make him suffer appropriate punishment for his own negligence.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister cited the cases of Norway, Belgium and England. Have they such a law as is now proposed here, and if so, has that been the reason for their smaller fire losses?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they have, but I cannot answer for certain. The United States has now before its Congress a much more drastic law.

Mr. CAHILL: To what does the minister attribute the smaller losses in the other countries? Have they better building restrictions or more effective fire restrictions, or is it because they have some law of this kind?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quote a memorandum furnished to me by the Insurance Department, the language of which very clearly indicates and, I think, necessarily implies, that these laws are in effect in the European countries mentioned:

> The effect of this drastic legislation is seen in the per capita loss in European countries, which averages less than 50 cents, while the average in Canada is approximately $3. In 1908 it was $4.

So this memorandum says in effect that this drastic legislation is in operation in those countries.

Mr. CAHILL: Would it not be well to get the exact laws of the different countries so that we might have some idea as to how they work out? If this legislation, as proposed, is as good as the minister maintains it to be, that is, to reduce the loss from three or four dollars per capita to fifty cents per capita, and if it is not working any great hardship in Norway or Belgium, it may not be so bad. But if such legislation as this is not the cause of the lesser losses in those countries, then why inflict this legislation on the people if it is not going to produce satisfactory results? For instance, the minister stated that 75 per cent of the losses in Canada were preventable, that is, that they were caused by negligence. What is the nature of that negligence because 75 per cent of a loss of $33,000,000 would not occur simply from leaving stove pipes in houses without proper safeguards? The losses are, I presume, in our larger cities and larger buildings, and most of the cities have fire regulations. Are they living up to them and are they living up to their building restrictions, that is, that certain classes of buildings are not allowed to be built in certain areas? Have the people of Norway and Belgium and other countries better building restrictions, thus causing a lesser loss, or is it that they can, by legislation, scare people out of allowing their houses to burn? This question could, perhaps, be handled better by another of the innumerable commissions appointed by the Government to investigate the whole matter and treat it from a business standpoint. If the loss can be

reduced, that would be a direct benefit to the whole of Canada, because it does not matter where the fire is, we pay the loss through the insurance premium. The people of this country desire to reduce our fire losses. If this legislation brings that about, it may be beneficial legislation, but if it does not, we are only incumbering the people with more legislation.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: This legislation appears to be placing a weapon in the hands of insurance agents or insurance companies, it seems to be in the interest of the insurance companies as against the property owners. When the minister makes the comparison of Belgium, Holland, and Canada, I do not think that is fair, because people who have visited those countries know the difference in conditions. In Belgium or Holland the average workingman's house is invariably of solid brick and does not contain a stove or a furnace such as we have, but a little fireplace with a stove in the brickwork which is well protected, and they never put on very strong fires. In the first place, they cannot afford to do so, and in the second place the fireplace is so well protected, there is less danger. In Canada, insurance companies will tell you, or you will see if you look up the records, that fires are not so frequent in summer as in winter. They will tell you, as soon as the people light up their stoves and furnaces in the winter, to be on the lookout for fires. I know of a case myself. In the fall of the year when it was getting cold, a woman put on a fire of wood and coal in her house, leaving the draughts open. There was a baby in the next room. A neighbour called the woman out for some purpose, and she rushed away without checking the draughts and when she came back in about ten minutes, the house was on fire. The fire had worked through the wall of the room in which the baby was, some plaster fell and the baby had a very narrow escape. There was no insurance and the loss was very heavy. That kind of fire and that kind of firing would not occur in Belgium, so that I do not think that it is fair to compare conditions in Belgium and Holland with those in Canada. In Canada, if you do not check the draughts, the house is very liable to be set on fire, unless the pipes are well protected, and we may, therefore, expect greater losses in Canada. This Bill is to drastic and the matter should be looked into further.

Mr. EULER: I would like to refer to a question that I asked of the minister some time ago. I am heartily in sympathy with the object of the Bill, the prevention of fire, but I believe, with many hon. members who have spoken, that it is just a little too broad in its application. The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the committee particularly is this, that it makes every council of every little municipality a criminal law-making body, or at least, a law-making body that can make a law which will constitute men who commit a breach of that law criminals. It seems to me that it is taking away the authority from this Parliament and handing over to any small body of men in any municipality throughout the country, power which, perhaps after all, it was never intended should be given to them. For example, we have heard in this debate a great deal about negligence and what negligence means. It may be rather presumptuous for one who is not a lawyer to attempt to interpret that which is to be a law, but as I read the Bill, it states that a breach of any regulation which may be made by any council, by any municipal body, will in itself constitute negligence, because the clause reads:—

> The person owning, occupying or controlling the premises in which such a fire occurs, ... shall be deemed to have caused the fire through negligence if such person has failed to obey the requirements of any law.

It is quite possible that some of those smaller law-making bodies in some of the smaller municipalities might make regulations, the breach of which would not be negligence in the ordinary accepted sense of the term at all, but by this enactment it will be considered negligence, and if it be negligence it makes the person who commits it liable to criminal prosecution and two years' imprisonment. While the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) said that this law states exactly what it is intended to mean, I say it does not. We are simply handing over the power of this Parliament to any small body of legislators there may be throughout the country, and the breach of whatever regulations they may make, whether right or wrong, shall be considered negligence and the person committing such negligence shall be liable to two years' imprisonment.

Bill reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Acting Minister of Customs) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, to provide for the definition measured content, and use by a chemist or druggist, of chemical stills,; for abatements to be allowed in the computation of duty upon spirits when stored in warehouse in wooden or in ventilated metal tanks, and when stored in warehouse in wooden barrels; and further to provide that the license fee for a bonded manufacturer shall be such sum not exceeding three hundred dollars as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council; that there may be a remission of duty on malt used in the manufacture of vinegar under prescribed conditions; that the department may authorize the preparation of tobacco and cigars in packages of such size, and the issue of stamps to cover the same, as may appear advisable; that the words "Methyl Hydrate—Poison" in letters of certain size be affixed to certain medical preparations; that no less quantity than five thousand cigars shall be entered for warehouse by one entry, and except for export, no less quantity than two thousand cigars shall be ex-warehoused by one entry; that an excise duty be imposed upon acetic acid produced in Canada by the destructive distillation of wood, or any other process or from any other source, of four cents on every gallon of six per centum acid, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength; that section 251 and Part X of the said Act be repealed, and in lieu thereof that provision be made respecting the manufacture in Canada of alcohol without the admixture of any denaturants, and denatured alcohol and specially denatured alcohol, which is intended for use in the arts and industries or for fuel, light or power, or for any mechanical purpose; with restrictions as to place of manufacture, sale, delivery and transport of such alcohol and its use in incorporated hospitals, universities, and research laboratories for scientific purposes only; and providing that no alcohol shall be manufactured or sold under these provisions for beverage purposes; with such other enactments as to the use of recovered alcohol and its redistillation and purification, and for labels on containers of wood alcohol or denatured alcohol, and for penalties for violation of the law, as may be prescribed.

He said: Several amendments are proposed, the first being a change in the computation of the duty. Sub-paragraph (2) of section one hundred and fifty-five of the present Act is repealed. Where spirits are stored for over two years a certain percentage is allowed for shrinkage. The distillers claim that this percentage should be higher, as the loss is very serious now that prohibition is in force.

Mr. McKENZIE: How is the shrinkage determined?

Mr. J. D. REID: The contents are measured going in and coming out of the tank. The shrinkage in no case exceeds the deficiency found in the tank. Another amendment to section 250 reads as follows:

The person in whose favour a license is granted to manufacture in bond for exportation, shall, upon receiving such license pay to the collector such sum not exceeding three hundred dollars as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

That is, instead of a flat rate of $300, the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing a lesser amount. There is also an amendment to section 255 remitting the duty when the alcohol is used in the manufacture of vinegar. Section 282 is amended by adding thereto the following words:

The Department may authorize the preparation of tobacco and cigars in packages of such size, and the issue of stamps in such denominations to cover same, as may appear advisable, but as to the necessity of advisability of issuing such stamps, the department shall be the sole judge.

Section 316 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

1. No less quantity than one hundred pounds of raw leaf tobacco or the contents of one package, five hundred pounds of cavendish or other tobacco, five thousand cigars, or eight thousand cigarettes, shall be entered for warehouse by one entry.

2. Except for export, no less quantity than fifty pounds of raw leaf tobacco, five hundred pounds of cavendish or manufactured tobacco, two thousand cigars, or five thousand cigarettes, shall be ex-warehoused by one entry.

Section 366 is repealed, and the following substituted therefor:

There shall be imposed, levied and collected upon acetic acid produced in Canada by the destructive distillation of wood, or any other process, or from any other source, except as by this Act otherwise provided, the following duty of excise, which shall be paid to the collector, etc., etc.

The only change there is that we are adding the words: " or any other process."

Section 368 is amended, and defines denatured alcohol as follows:

Denatured alcohol means alcohol in suitable admixture with such denaturants as to render it in the judgment of the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue non-potable and to prevent recovery of the ethyl alcohol.

Section 369 is amended to read as follows:

Alcohol without the admixture of any denaturants and denatured alcohol and specially denatured alcohol as defined in section one of this part, which is intended for use in the arts and industries or for fuel, light or power, or for any mechanical purpose may be manufactured in Canada free from any excise duty.

It has been represented to the Government that alcohol can be manufactured to a very large extent by the distilleries for fuel, light and power, and this amendment simply empowers the distilleries to use denatured alcohol for that purpose.

Section 370 will read:

Excepting as provided by this Act, no alcohol shall be manufactured, denatured or recovered

in Canada except in distilleries thereto licensed.

I think hon. members will approve of these amendments when the Bill is before them and they have had an opportunity to study it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why does the minister want to differentiate in the various amounts that he would charge for the licenses? Importunists might tell him they were only going to manufacture a very small amount and should therefore be given the license for a smaller sum, and I think it would be well to fix the license fee in the Act, so that the person getting the license would know how much he had to pay. It would be inadvisable to leave it open to people to come and ask for favours, and it might place patronage to some extent in the hands of the department.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not discussed that point very closely with the officials of the department, but when we come to the Bill I shall have the information and be glad to discuss the matter on its merits.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. J. D. Reid thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 76, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 11, respecting The Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 55 (from the Senate), to change the name of The Canada Accident Assurance Company to The Canada Accident and Fire Assurance Company.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 20, to incorporate Canadian Merchant Service Guild.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Grain Insurance and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Blake.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries including Deputy Minister at $6,000, Chief Engineer at $5,500, Assistant Chief Engineer, Electrical Engineer, and Inspecting Engineer at $4,500 each, Comptroller at $3,900 and R. A. C. Henry at $3,300, $189,300. Contingencies, $28,000.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): There is a decrease in this vote of $13,812.50. The staff in the department coming under the vote for Civil Government for the fiscal year 1918-19 numbered 110. We have reduced it to 96. The increases in salary are all in accordance with the Civil Service Act with the exception of the following: The deputy minister has been increased from $5,000 to $6,000 in line with all the deputy ministers who have been increased by $1,000. We had last year the position of assistant to the minister. That was Mr. Graham Bell's position and the salary was $5,000. We have dropped that position. The salary of the chief engineer, Mr. Bowden, last year was $5,000; we have increased that by $500. The solicitor, Mr. Fairweather, remains at $5,000. The assistant chief engineer, who was at $4,000 last year, is now increased to $4,500; the electrical engineer from $4,000 to $4,500 and the Inspecting Engineer from $4,000 to $4,500. The names of these gentlemen are: Mr. Bell, deputy minister; Mr. Bowden, chief engineer; Mr. Fairweather, solicitor; Mr. Sherwood, assistant chief engineer; Mr. Murphy, electrical engineer; and Mr. Alexander Ferguson, inspecting engineer. The other increases under the heading of Civil Government are simply statutory increases. The staff has been reduced by the transfer of a number of the employees to the Canadian National Railways, Toronto.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am sure the Committee will be very much disappointed if the minister departs from his usual custom of giving at this stage a full statement as to the financial condition of all the railways that the Government is operating. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 2161 of last year's Hansard he will find that he is reported as stating:

> It has been customary for the Minister of Railways and Canals to make a statement in connection with the operation of the Government Railway System from year to year.

The minister is now at the stage to which he referred when he made that statement, and the Government has many more miles of railway under its control now than it had then. I see no reason why some explanation in regard to the financial operations of the Government railways for the year should not be submitted to the Committee now.

Mr. J. D. REID: It must be remembered that there has been a change in the entire organization of the Government Railway system since a year ago, owing to the transfer of those railways to new management. I intend to make a statement later when the Intercolonial Estimates are being considered. I think perhaps that in a week or two I will be in a much better position to present a statement as to the whole railway situation than I am at the present moment. The hon. gentleman knows that a reorganization is proceeding, and that changes are taking place from time to time, and the present is hardly the proper time to give a statement such as he has asked for.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not understand that there is any difference between the estimates of the Intercolonial Railway and the estimates of any other railway that may come up for the committee's consideration. I gather that the whole system of Government-owned railways is now under the one management and responsible to the Minister of Railways, and when that minister comes here with railway estimates we have a right to suppose that he is dealing with the whole Government system. The statement submitted to the House last year dealt with the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental, and the Prince Edward Island Railways, and some small lines in New Brunswick, and the receipts and expenditures were given as for the whole system. Are we now to understand that the minister has been keeping separate accounts for the Intercolonial apart from the other lines, and that there is a different system of management in certain sections of the Government lines, or is the Government system to be dealt with under one head? If the latter is the case I do not very well see how we are to get one statement about the Intercolonial, and a different statement about other portions of the Government Railway system. I find that last year the minister made an estimate as to what the operations of the Government system of railways were to cost for the fiscal year which ended in March last, stated what purchases of rolling stock he was to make, and gave a general outline of the financial operations of the Government system. I think the minister, as in a sense the President of the Government railway system, should, when he asks for more money, give us, as representing the owners of the railway, an exact statement as to how these railways have worked out during the year. The minister told us last year that he anticipated a deficit, and the only question in that regard is whether it is any larger than he thought it would be

Mr. J. D. REID: My intention this evening was first to take up the Canal Estimates, and some smaller items about which there probably would not be much discussion, deferring the railway statement until a later period, because I am not in a position to furnish the necessary information this evening. With reference to the operation of the Government Railways the situation is this: Last year we took a vote for the operation of the Canadian Government railway system. That was for the Intercolonial Railway and its branch lines, and the Transcontinental Railway between Winnipeg and Moncton, which then comprehended the Government railway system. We took a vote until the end of the then fiscal year, the receipts were deposited to the credit of the Receiver General, and the disbursements for operations were made in the same way as for many years past. Three or four months ago the control of the Government Railway operations was transferred from the Railway Department to the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railway System, of which Mr. Hanna is the president, and that board will report to the Government and to Parliament through the Minister of Railways and Canals.

When the Intercolonial Estimates or some of the larger amounts that are in the Estimates in connection with the Government railway systems are before the Committee I shall be pleased to make a statement such as I made last year and to give all the information I can as to the results of the operation of the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the several companies of which the Government has purchased the controlling stock. I had intended simply to have the Civil Government Estimates passed and then to go on to the Canal Estimates.

Mr. McCOIG: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to something that happened last night in Toronto. Before the departure from Toronto for Ottawa of the 10.55 Canadian Northern train, I had wired from Chatham for a berth in the sleeping car, and naturally expected to be able to get one. When I arrived in Toronto, however, I was informed by the conductor of the train that on account of the number of special cars that were on the train containing Government officials, it was impossible to put on any more sleeping cars. I asked the conductor how many private cars were on, and he said that there were three, one carrying the Minister of Finance,

another carrying the Minister of Militia, and a third carrying the Chairman of the Railway Board. He said: "The car of the Chairman of the Railway Commission cannot be pulled because we refuse to take on a fourth one." The conductor said that if we wanted to do so we could go into the day coach and sleep on the seats. I refused to do that, and ran to catch the second section of the Canadian Pacific railway train, on which I got a berth; but many others who wanted to go to Ottawa to transact business had the choice of sleeping in the day coach or smoker or of being unable to travel on that train. Because three special cars occupied by three public men were attached to the train, fifty people were unable to travel from Toronto to Ottawa on that line. The Canadian Northern could not put on any more sleeping cars because these three special cars carrying three or four of the public men of Canada were attached to the train. If the minister thinks he is going to economize in that way he is making a very sad mistake. If ministers want to run private cars for their own special comfort during the holiday season, surely two of them ought to be friendly enough to get into one car and let us poor individuals have the privilege of occupying berths. Providence was against the Government in this particular matter; the train ran off the track before it got to Smith's Falls, evidencing its disgust with the action of the Government in carrying three special cars while other folk slept in the day coaches. Moreover, after the train ran off the track, those who had managed to get berths were deprived of the privilege of having their breakfast until a special dining car was sent from Ottawa; but the gentlemen who occupied the private cars had their breakfasts, while the other people on the train watched them through the windows, with empty stomachs. There is not another railway system in the country which, on the occasion of delay caused by a wreck, does not furnish meals free of charge to the passengers. On this occasion, however, I am credibly informed that every man had to pay for his breakfast in the dining car which came from Ottawa. This matter may seem somewhat of a joke, because the whole thing is so ridiculous. But this treatment of those who were anxious to patronize Government roads was so unkind and so unfair that the minister should take some action in the matter and should see that ministers of the Crown may not in future occupy half a train so that the plain people are unable to get berths in the sleeping cars.

Mr. J. D. REID: I agree that a train should not be loaded down with private cars. It happened last night that several ministers were returning from their Easter holiday and were coming down on that train. The president and directors and Sir Henry Drayton were in one car. Sir Thomas White was in another; he had intended to come to Ottawa the night before, but unfortunately there was a death in his family and he could not come until last evening. General Mewburn could not come either; so they all happened to come together on that train. But a thing of that kind probably would not occur once in a year —probably will not occur again. As to the accident, of course that could not be helped; we believe that a switch was tampered with and that that was the cause of the accident. Fortunately, no lives were lost. As to the people paying for their meals on the dining car, I did not hear anything about that; probably in the excitement that matter was overlooked. I am sure that the management of the Canadian National Railways would do everything they could to make things satisfactory for the passengers, as they have done in the past. I understand that in the case of a wreck, the railways have some such understanding with regard to meals as that mentioned by the hon. member. However, I am glad the hon. gentleman has drawn attention to the matter of the private cars and of the furnishing of meals to the passengers after the accident. It does good to bring these matters before the House; at the same time, it was really accidental that two or three private cars were on last night's train. I do not think the members of the House or the people of the country can complain much about the use of private cars by ministers; they are not used very much. After all, it is almost an absolute necessity that they be used occasionally. Ministers have hardly sufficient time to do their work in Ottawa and when they travel they have to take work with them and do it on the train. I think I can safely say that the use of private cars is less to-day than it ever has been at any time during the last ten or fifteen years.

Mr. POWER: How many private cars—

The CHAIRMAN: I have to call the Committee to order. The item under discussion is that of salaries for Civil Service, Department of Railways and Canals. The matter of private cars certainly comes under the Outside Service.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I did not happen to be present when an Estimate was passed raising the salary of any other deputy minister. I do not want to make any invidious reference to the deputy minister of this department, but I should like to know the grounds upon which the additional $1,000 is being paid to the various deputy ministers of the departments at this particular time and whether there is a comparable advance to the other members of the Civil Service.

Mr. J. D. REID: The members of the Civil Service, as a whole, have received advances during the past year. They have received bonuses and then there are the usual statutory increases each year. The salaries of deputy ministers, however, have not been increased for many years. The cost of living has gone up with them as well as with others, and it was felt, when the matter was brought to the attention of the Government, that they, along with the other civil servants, were entitled to an increase, and all the deputy ministers were given the same increase.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I should like, so as to be thoroughly understood, to say on that point that I suppose the deputy ministers are feeling the increased cost of living with every other inhabitant of Canada. Personally, I think a deputy minister is, in ordinary times, worth quite the salary which he is getting, including the increase; but as the cost of living is the cause of this, I venture, while not opposing the appropriation, to express the hope that the Government are directing their attention to the question of the cost of living. We had in this House a statement of the most funereal description as to the condition of the finances of the country, and we were also told, in so many words, I think, on two different occasions, that we are $100,000,000 in the hole. Under those circumstances, something has to be done, and I hope the Government are not going to be misled by the state of customs returns, which is, I believe, very good for the moment, into thinking that we can go on spending money and increasing salaries without attempting to do something at the other end, that is, to reduce the cost of living. If it goes on mounting in this way the ministers may have to come before the House next year with another proposal to increase salaries, and with this sum of $100,000,000 not yet provided for, one is naturally waiting with anxiety, and, indeed, with some degree of apprehension, for the Budget statement in this connection, and I can see nothing but very great financial disorder. I hope the Government, as a whole, will, in the next few weeks, pay very serious attention to this question of the cost of living and the general financial condition of the country. Unless history is absolutely misleading, we shall, within the next two or three years, have times very different from the present. We are still running the country under war conditions, and our soldiers are not, by any means, all back. We are selling a great deal of material, as other nations who have it to sell are doing, to our Allies to feed the Central European nations. A summer's harvest in these nations will alter that condition, and if we have good crops ourselves, I want to assure ministers that the financial embarrassment and economic disturbance will be such as they do not seem at present to be quite as apprehensive of as they should be. I venture to say these things at this point without any special reference to the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), who, I think, gets his work through this House wonderfully well—and I am the last man to want to obstruct him—and without opposing this particular vote. The general position, however, is one which should commend itself to the consideration of any Government which desires to be credited in the next two years with average foresight, discretion and economy.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no doubt at all what the hon. member says is true. The cost of living in this, as in every other country, is a very serious question. The Government are certainly considering the matter, and when the Budget speech is brought down, we shall have to discuss the whole situation and consider what can be done. When I see the prices that people have to pay for the necessaries of life, such as clothes and so on, I feel that the cost of living has become so high that people must have higher salaries or they cannot live. I believe every member of the House is anxious to consider the situation and to do what he can to improve matters. This is a big question and one that it will tax the ingenuity of the best people in this country to solve. I hope, when the matter comes up on the Budget, some means will be found by which the cost of living may be reduced.

Mr. POWER: With reference to the item regarding the solicitor, does the Department of Justice not look after the legal affairs of the department?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Justice Department looks after the outside legal work of every department, but it has always been necessary, in connection with railway matters, to have a solicitor in the department to prepare the briefs and give opinions as to cases coming before the department. If those cases are not, or cannot be, settled, then, of course, they are sent to the Justice Department which selects lawyers outside of the department altogether who take the cases up and go to the courts with them; that is, if the Deputy Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General does not deal with them. In many cases, the Deputy Minister of Justice, if he has time, or the Solicitor General, appears before the courts.

Mr. POWER: How many solicitors are there altogether?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have one solicitor in the Department of Railways and Canals. Of course, on the railways, there are several solicitors. When the Intercolonial Railway and the Transcontinental Railway were being administered by the Department of Railways, we had at Ottawa one solicitor, Mr. Fairweather, and then we had Mr. Alward at Moncton, who had one assistant. That was the total staff of solicitors on the whole railway system.

Mr. POWER: If I understand the matter aright, each branch of the Canadian National railways, that is to say, the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern, has one or two solicitors. I am at a loss to understand, if each railway refers its legal business to its own solicitor, what the particular solicitor mentioned in this item does. What are his duties?

Mr. J. D. REID: When the Department of Railways administered the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental, we had at Ottawa a solicitor to advise the minister on matters coming before him, and there was also work in connection with the canals, such as leases, agreements and things of that sort that were prepared at Ottawa. There is work for solicitors in matters of that kind.

Of course, with a system of 13,000 miles of railway there is a great deal of legal work to do. We have a solicitor at Moncton, for instance. There are legal matters continually cropping up in connection with the Canadian National Railways which have to be referred to the Government, and the minister must have a solicitor at his call. Mr. Fairweather is very busy with the work he has to do in connection with the department. I do not think it possible for a minister to carry on without a solicitor at his call.

Mr. POWER: Could the work not be done as well by one of the solicitors in the Department of Justice Is there nobody sufficiently competent in that department to do the work?

Mr. J. D. REID: It would simply be transferring the work to that department. They would require another solicitor to do the work. Besides, the Justice Department does not do the departmental work that Mr. Fairweather does. Most of the departments have a solicitor, I believe. It would be very inconvenient to have to send our files over to the Justice Department or to have the solicitor continually coming over here to explain matters. Hardly a day passes but a lease or a contract has to be prepared, and a solicitor is absolutely required.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the legislation which is submitted to Parliament on behalf of the Railway Department drafted by the solicitor of the department or by the parliamentary counsel—for instance, the Bill incorporating the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: I asked Mr. Fairweather to consult with the solicitor of the Canadian National Railways and with the Railway Commission, if necessary, in drafting the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it not also part of his duty to assist the Minister of Railways and Canals in the Railway Committee?

Mr. J. D. REID: Oh, yes, he appears before the Railway Committee.

Mr. CAHILL: Who was the assistant to the minister? How did that position come to be done away with?

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Graham Bell was assistant to the minister. When Mr. Campbell, who was deputy minister, became Commissioner of Highways, Mr. Graham Bell took the position of deputy minister, and the position of assistant to the minister was abolished.

Welland ship canal—construction, $3,500,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: Hon. gentlemen will remember that the new Welland ship canal was under construction at the time war was declared. Work was carried on for a time afterwards, then was closed down. There were four sections under construc-

tion: No. 1, for dredging the harbour, completing the concrete work, and regulating the weir; that contract was with the Dominion Dredging Company at the time work closed down. Then there were sections 2, 3 and 5 also under construction. These were the four largest sections of this canal. When the war ended and demobilization took place we felt it was necessary to go on with some of the work to provide employment. A great many of the men who had been working on the canal had enlisted, and there were also in that district a great many men who were thrown out of work owing to the closing of munitions plants. Hon. gentlemen will remember well the feeling of unrest there was in the country at that time. We therefore decided to go on with the work that we had under construction. We had, of course, settled with the contractors; the contracts had been cancelled. When we decided to start work again, we thought that the cost of materials and labour was so high that it would be almost impossible for the contractors to tender at a fair and reasonable price. We therefore put the old contractors at work on these four sections which would employ a large number of men, and we decided to let them proceed with the work on a cost-plus basis. We agreeed to pay them 8 per cent. These contractors understood the work, had their organizations, and we thought they would be able to do the work in the most economical way. The work goes on only from month to month, because we stipulated in the contract that we can stop the work on the cost-plus basis at any time and call for tenders, so that we could take advantage of conditions when they become normal again.

We also stipulated in the Order in Council that the contract would not extend longer than the present year, that is December 31, 1919, so that there could be no misunderstanding with the contractors or with the public. In section No. 1 we estimate that the total amount that could be expended on that work would be $500,000; No. 2, $600,000; No. 3, $700,000; and No. 5, $500,000. Then for the purchase of plant, cement, bridges, steel rails, engineering, etc., $1,200,000. They do not get any percentage on the $1,200,000, but only on the other. So that, although we have $3,500,000 in the Estimates we will pay a percentage only on $2,300,000 at the very most, if they do that amount of work.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: The work ceased about two years ago. Before construction is re-started it would be well to know what the condition of the work is at the present moment. Has an inspection been made to know the condition the work is in?

Mr. J. D. REID: The engineering staff looked over the work.

Mr. FOSTER: What is the condition of it?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am informed by the Chief Engineer that the work is in the same condition as when we closed down, with the exception of a couple of earth slides where there had been excavation.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Has an inspection been made recently? If so, the engineer will find that it is not as the minister says. There are large abutments that cost many thousands of dollars that are not in their proper condition.

Mr. J. D. REID: One of the slides occurred at Queenston Road Bridge. It was absolutely necessary to close the works down at the time, and of course we could not expect the work to be in as good condition as it would be if we had proceeded. I am informed that the large abutment that did slide in was at Queenston Road.

Mr. EULER: The hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) raised the very question I was going to ask the minister. Near the city of St. Catharines, since the work on the canal was discontinued, the cement walls collapsed and damage to the extent of thousands of dollars has occurred. Upon whom will the loss fall—the contractors or the Government?

9 p.m.

Mr. J. D. REID: If there is any loss of that kind it falls upon the Government because we settled with the contractors a couple of years ago. However, I can only give the hon. member the information which the Chief Engineer gives me, and he tells me that the hon. member has been misinformed regarding the damage.

Mr. EULER: I am not an engineer, but any person who drives past the work must see that there is a great deal of damage; the work must be reconstructed. If, of course, the damage is due to the discontinuance of the work at an improper time I suppose the loss must be borne by the Government, but if it is due to inferior work it seems to me the people who put up the work should shoulder the responsibility.

Mr. CAHILL: What do these contractors furnish for the eight per cent plus which they get, and who are they?

Mr. J. D. REID: The contractors are, for No. 1: The Dominion Dredging Company, whose head office is at Ottawa; No. 2, Baldry, Yerburgh & Hutchison, an English firm; No. 3, Doheny, Quinlan & Robertson; No. 4, the Canadian Dredging Company. We furnish the plant. They do not get any percentage on the plant, but only on the materials and labour.

Mr. BUREAU: They get a percentage on $2,300,000?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is, if they do that amount of work.

Mr. BUREAU: What do they do for that —just walk around the job?

Mr. J. D. REID: These contractors furnish for the 8 per cent what is usually furnished by contractors on a percentage basis. They furnish their organization and do the financing, and their percentage is on the same basis as that paid to any firm. The percentage I consider reasonable. They asked at the time the same percentage as is allowed by other corporations, and the hon. member will know that the Exchequer Court decided that 10 per cent was a fair and reasonable basis.

Mr. BUREAU: What case was that?

Mr. J. D. REID: Take the Dominion Dredging Company: $40,000 would be the total amount they could possibly get during the year, and there is the head of the firm, the superintendent's office, the financing, and so on. So that I think the percentage is very reasonable.

Mr. CAHILL: What financing do they do?

Mr. J. D. REID: They purchase materials and pay wages twice a month, and we pay them once a month. They pay their men in the middle of March and again at the end of March, and we do not pay them until the 15th of April, and there is, therefore, a good deal of financing in connection with the work.

Mr. CAHILL: Do they get 8 per cent plus on that financing, too?

Mr. J. D. REID: They get 8 per cent on the amount of money paid out for materials and labour, but not for the financing as well.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know if I understand this matter correctly, but it seems rather strange. We have a contract, I understand, to build the Parliament buildings on a percentage basis the same as this. Whoever is doing the work—I think it is Lyall—supplies all the equipment. In this case the minister says the work was under contract and he tells us: We have settled with the contractors and it is all off. These contractors must have had the equipment and all the material that was necessary to carry on the work. If I understand rightly, the contractors are employed because they know the work best, and that is as it should be; but the mode of payment is what I cannot understand. The minister says the Canadian Dredging Company are going to do part of that work. You are going to buy the dredges and they are going to put their men on them. They are experienced men and will handle that machinery. You are going to pay these men and you are going to pay the Canadian Dredging Company a percentage on the salaries they are paying their own men. Supposing I am in the position of these contractors; you are going to pay eight per cent on every cent that is expended on these sections, and all I have to do is to sit in my office. The minister seems to lay great stress on the question of financing. In ordinary times I would be willing to finance any one, or anything, with the credit of Canada behind me. All you have to do is to make estimates of the progress of the work and when these estimates are made you have only to go to the bank and the bank will be quite willing to advance the money to the contractors. The contractor is getting eight per cent to supply the staff which is being paid by the Government. The bookkeepers and office staff are paid by the Government, in addition to which the contractor is not using his own plant which is lying idle or is used on some other work, and the Government are buying the plant. It would pay the Government better if they would go a little farther, as they have done in connection with the Parliament buildings, have the contractor supply the plant, and give him a little higher percentage. The Government are not going to dig canals all their life and the plant may be worth nothing to them when they get through with the Welland canal, and there will be $1,200,000 gone to waste. It would pay the Government to pay ten per cent on the equipment and not be loaded up with this material and equipment when the work is done. I cannot understand what service will be rendered by the contractor for the eight per cent which will be paid on $2,800,000.

Mr. J. D. REID: We could not make a contract of this kind on the cost-plus basis and ask them to furnish the plant because

this contract might only last for two or three months. I do not think that any member of the Government expects to do this work on this basis very long or to continue it any longer than is absolutely necessary. We will call for tenders—

Mr. BUREAU: What about the plant?

Mr. J. D. REID: Whoever tenders for this work will want the plant and we will ask those who tender to take it over. They will have to take the plant over in order to carry on the work. While we have the plant we are not paying any percentage on it.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that not the contract with Peter Lyall & Sons for the Parliament buildings?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know what their contract is; I am talking about this one. Take the Dominion Dredging Company's plant; their dredges are worth $350,000, and it probably costs $10,000 a month to operate them. We are only paying a percentage on $10,000 being the cost of operation, or $800. If they had $350,000 in that plant they would want more than eight per cent on $350,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly; I know that.

Mr. J. D. REID: So we have the plant, and whoever takes this contract off our hands will have to take the plant when we call for tenders. In addition to that, the contractors are not getting eight per cent on all that is really going into the work. They are not getting it on the cement and the cement is a large item in connection with the work. We do not pay them a percentage on any of the materials we are able to supply. They do not get it on the cement, or the reinforcing steel; we have that on hand. There is a very large amount of stuff that we have on hand from the original contract and they do not get any percentage on that. When we take everything into consideration, the percentage is really, in my opinion, very reasonable. These are very large contractors and very reliable men. They always have an organization on hand that they must pay even though they are not employed in order to keep their organization together. They are out of employment for some time and they must figure on reimbursing their men to a certain extent for the time that they have not been employed. The Chief Engineer, his staff, and I went into this matter, with Council, and threshed it out, and I believe that the percentage is a fair and reasonable amount considering everything.

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot agree with the minister. Supposing the material that the contractors supplied cost sixteen per cent; that would amount to $36,000 over the $2,300,000 that the minister is going to expend. Now he is going to put $1,200,000 into plant and this plant has to be maintained. There will be wear and tear and depreciation. You will have that $1,200,000 which will be sunk anyway; whereas, if you pay double the commission and have the contractor supply his own plant a great deal of benefit to the country will result. It is human nature to take care of that which belongs to yourself better than you take care of that which belongs to your neighbour and therefore you would be better off in the end. I do not criticise the cost-plus basis only I think that it is a big mistake for the Government to supply this dredge and equipment and spend $1,200,000 and in addition pay this commission. The minister says that the percentage will not be paid on the cement which they have on hand. If I understand rightly that is cement which the contractors bought and on which they got a profit.

Mr. J. D. REID: Out of this $1,200,000 we are going to purchase plant, cement, bridges, steel rails, and pay for engineering, and so on. When the hon. gentleman states that we are going to spend $1,200,000 out of $3,500,000 on plant that will be of no value when the contract is ended he speaks without a full understanding of the situation. This is to purchase plant, the cement that is going into the work and on which they do not get a commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Why do they not get a commission?

Mr. J. D. REID: Because that is the contract; on anything furnished by the department they do not get any percentage. It is estimated that $1,200,000 will be required for this purpose, and they do not get any percentage on that. It is not all lost, because the bridges and steel rails will, perhaps, be sold later on at a small loss. They are second-hand rails that we are purchasing now. Of course, if steel rails were to depreciate in value in the next three or four years there might be a loss, but there will not be a loss altogether, for the reason that they can be sold as scrap.

Mr. BUREAU: Are the steel rails and the cement included in the $1,200,000?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, and the bridges and the engineering work. That is, in the $3,500,000.

Mr. BUREAU: That will pay the wages and material that will go into the contract?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: The cement is regarded here as equipment, which I do not think it is. I would count as equipment all the tools—for instance, the dredges, the derricks, and the machines which were used for boring. That is what I say will be of no use to the Government after this job is completed. What portion of this $1,200,000 is going into cement and steel rails? Then we can get down to closer figures.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Chief Engineer tells me we are purchasing about $300,000 of plant other than what we had on hand. That will leave $900,000 of this estimate that will go into the purchase of cement, bridges, steel rails, and so forth, and pay for engineering.

Mr. CAHILL: I understood the minister to say that one of the reasons for carrying on the work on this basis was that the contractors had to be reimbursed for maintaining their staff during the time they were idle.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman has unduly expanded my statement. What I said was that the contractors have a staff that they must always maintain in order to keep the organization intact, and in putting these men on this work they probably made an estimate for the time during which their staff was waiting for work. Everybody tells me that the percentage these men are working on is a fair and reasonable one. Then, again, when you consider that we can close down the work at any time and call for tenders—

Mr. BUREAU: By giving thirty days' notice.

Mr. J. D. REID: We can give thirty days' notice and we will do that when times are normal. I do not think it is a good time now to call for tenders, because some contractors tell me they would hardly know what prices to charge on account of the abnormal cost of material and labour. We could see no other way if we were to start up this work than to carry it out on a percentage basis.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not object to the system followed, but what seems to call for criticism is what has been done in regard to equipment. This equipment is going to cost the Government $300,000, being paid for at abnormal prices. I think it is a mistake not to have the contractor supply his own equipment. In those sections of the canal that are under contract the contractors supplied their own equipment. They had, and have still, all that is necessary to carry on the work. If the Government had paid the contractors as much as sixteen per cent on the job, it would have resulted in a very considerable saving. Let the man who is going to do the work supply his own equipment. Buy the material if you will, but let the contractor supply his own dredges and other plant. Naturally there is an inducement in this, because a person will take better care of property that belongs to him than he will of what belongs to his neighbour.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is a possibility that we will lose on the plant when we ask the contractor to take it over in the future, that is if prices go down so that we can call for tenders. That is one of the penalties that must be paid in going on with this public work at this particular time. There is no doubt that we paid more for the plant than we would expect to pay in a year from now, if times become normal again, plant and everything else will be cheaper.

Mr. BUREAU: Have the contractors not got the plant? They are the same contractors that were doing the work before, are they not?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Have you settled with them for the plant they sold to the Government?

Mr. J. D. REID: When we settled with these contractors, we purchased the plant from them, and then re-sold a great part of it.

Mr. BUREAU: To whom?

Mr. J. D. REID: We sold all of the movable plant to the public, and at prices quite a percentage higher than we paid to the contractors. We took the plant on a valuation basis made by a firm in Montreal, and then sold it at higher prices than we paid. The plant that we have left was also purchased from the contractors when we settled up.

Mr. BUREAU: That settles the question then.

Mr. J. D. REID: Two years ago, when we closed up with these men, we had to take the plant from them.

Mr. BUREAU: If the Government owns the plant it is all right.

Mr. J. D. REID: Four-fifths of the plant we have on hand belongs to us, and the other one-fifth is what we are purchasing.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister decided on finishing this work at any certain time? If so, how much does he think it is going to cost, and what is the policy of the Government with regard to it? Is the minister going right on, just making work for the time being for these contractors, and for other fellows that he wants to have on the job?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have decided to carry this work on until the end of December next, that is all that we have provided for in the Estimates. Next session the Government will have to decide what will be done.

Mr. CAHILL: Were there no other contractors that would have been willing to take this work at a percentage plus? It seems an extraordinary thing that these men should go to these works with a lead pencil on their ear and get eight per cent on the expenditures made.

Mr. McKENZIE: It seems to me we ought to have some further justification for entering upon this extraordinary expenditure. There must be great necessity for starting this work at this particular time, and motives of economy must have influenced the minister to close it down when the war broke out.

I assume that he took a proper inventory of what had been done and ascertained how matters stood when the works were closed down. The present works were started in midwinter, at a time when contractors, under ordinary conditions, would have stopped working. I assume that there is a good deal of clay work and masonry work on this canal, all of which is done at great expense in the winter season. The minister has not told us that anybody who had been overseas came to him looking for work on this canal. If a large body of men who had been overseas or who had been working in munition plants came to him and said: We are out of work; we have been working for the country in connection with the war, and we think that the Government should look after us; then the minister could figure out whether it would be cheaper for the country to give these men so much a day for doing nothing or to pay their board or to take some other step than to start this enormous work at such great expense and under such unfavourable circumstances—not for the purpose of doing the work itself, but for the purpose of giving employment. So far, however, we have not been informed that any such men have been looking for work or were actually put on the job. After all, the purpose of this work is more or less charitable; as I say, it is the giving of work to men who are out of employment, not the carrying on of an enterprise for the sake of the results for the country. If he can say that he has accomplished that purpose, he would be affording some satisfaction to the committee, although we should be paying very dearly for it. But I rather fear that there was no such justification for starting the work at this time. I should like the minister to tell us how the officials, after given periods, arrive at the amount that has been expended on this work. It is extremely difficult to make a proper estimate of the amount of clay that is removed in winter, having regard to the slides that frequently take place; and it is difficult also, in cases where tons of water have to be pumped out of the cuttings every morning, to tell how much should be allowed for work of that character. This is the first time that canal construction has been proceeded with on force account. I have never heard of a railway, a wharf or a canal being built on force account, and only because of absolute necessity should the minister carry on such a work as this under the circumstances. Formerly, these works were proceeded with under tender and contract. The minister can tell us therefore, what was the cost per unit of the various kinds of work that were being done and how the cost in pre-war days compares with the cost of the work being carried on under force account. If the minister finds that the work per unit is now costing very much more, he would be well advised to put an end to it as speedily as possible and to wait until he can carry the work on in the ordinary way.

Mr. J. D. REID: In the Niagara peninsula, thousands of men have been thrown out of work since the war ceased and since the munition plants and other war industries discontinued operations. These men were not looking for charity. They did not come to me and say: Pay me so much a day to keep myself and my family living. What they asked for was work in order that they might earn a living for themselves and their families. We did not wish to proceed with the work in the middle of winter, but we were faced with this condition of affairs. Men had been thrown out of work, families were in want, the cost of living was high. Accordingly, the Government were forced to try to provide

work in every part of Canada where there was unemployment. I remember, about the time that the war ended, there was consternation down at Sydney; the Dominion Iron and Steel works were going to close down and thousands of men were to be thrown out of employment. The Government was asked to do something to keep these men employed and to keep the Dominion Iron and Steel works going. They were asking $70 and $80 a ton for rails. I believed then that if we waited until normal times came or until we wanted to use the rails, we could buy them at a great deal less. I say frankly that if we had carried out with the Dominion Iron and Steel works the policy now suggested with regard to the Welland canal, thousands of men in the Dominion Iron and Steel works would have had nothing to do during the last several winter months. We did make a contract with them and paid them $65 a ton for rails which, if we had waited until to-day, we could buy for $47 a ton. I do not regret that we gave the contract in order to keep these men employed. The men of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company worked hard to furnish materials to win the war; so did the men in the Niagara peninsula. So it was the duty of the Government, even though they were facing a loss, even though they might get the materials cheaper a few months later, to try to keep all the plants going and all men employed. I go further and say that wherever plants are thinking of closing down because of the changed conditions, I believe it is the duty of the Government and of every member of the House to do all they possibly can to keep the wheels turning in every industry. The Niagara peninsula is a manufacturing centre; it was necessary to do something to keep the men employed, and in my judgment we acted rightly in starting a work about one-third of which had been constructed, which must be continued and which will be completed.

Had it not been for the changed war conditions the Government would have waited until things became normal. I could give the hon. member instances where private corporations should, in my opinion, have gone ahead and done more than they did in order to give employment, but when they did not do so, it was up to the Government to keep the men employed, and I have no regrets in connection with this work, with the Dominion Iron and Steel works, with the Algoma Works, and with any shipbuilding and other plants in Canada to which the Government have been able to give work until times become normal.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. ROBB: The minister has, as he knows and admits, made a departure from the custom in this country of giving contracts by tender, and to justify his position he has appealed to patriotism and endeavoured to prove that the country was undertaking this work in order to give employment to a large number of men who otherwise would not have had employment. The minister would have made his case stronger had he told the committee just how many men were engaged in that work. I suppose the minister will willingly admit that the system of doing work by force contract is, to say the least, a vicious one. The man who has the work in charge finds it in his interest to do it, not as cheaply as possible, but as expensively as possible. If men are employed at $4 a day, his commission out of that is 32 cents, but if he jacks them up to $5 a day, he gets 40 cents out of them, so that it is in the interest of the contractor to do the work just as expensively as possible. I am not going to follow this feature of the matter further. What I rose more particularly for was to say that it seems to me that, in view of the large vote asked for canal purposes, this would be the time for the minister to make a statement as to the transportation problem from the Great Lakes to the seaboard. If the Welland canal is to be deepened, what is to be done with the other canals? We hear rumours; in fact, we are told, that before the close of this session the Government may submit a policy of new canals to replace the present Cornwall canal and the Soulanges canal. The transportation interests and the grain producing interests of the Great West have a right to know now the general policy of the Government as regards the canal system.

Mr. J. D. REID: With reference to the first criticism the hon. member made as to the cost-plus basis, if I were giving a contract of my own, I believe in the cost-plus basis. I believe, moreover, that almost every corporation had, while the war was on, to go on the cost-plus basis. Wages and material are in an abnormal condition, and I do not believe any private individual or corporation would at the present time accept a contract on a tender basis.

Mr. ROBB: If the minister had given a contract for the Welland canal, would wages have gone up?

Mr. J. D. REID: Wages vary from time to time. If, say, just after the war was over, one were to call for tenders for work

on the Welland canal and to let the work on a contract, as wages were very high at that time, the contractor would probably base his tender on those wages. Every person believed they might fall, and yet the contractor could not take any chances. Wages on the Welland canal are arranged in this way: there is a fair-wage clause in the contract, and the wages paid are the same as those received by other employees in the locality. The men nearly all belong to unions, and a regular wage is arranged by the unions of each locality. As to the policy of the Government with reference to transportation from the Great Lakes to the seaboard, there cannot be any change in the water transportation situation until the Welland canal is completed, and that, even if the work is pressed, will take at least three or four years. What we are doing at the present time is just keeping the work going on the four contracts that were partially, and some of them very nearly, completed. We are not calling for tenders nor proceeding with the other work, nor have we any intention of doing so during the present year, for the reason I have mentioned. The hon. member can, therefore, see that we are not pressing navigation construction work between Welland and Montreal at present. I have in mind what the hon. member wishes to learn, namely, as to the system between, say, the head of the canal system, that is, just east of Prescott, and Montreal. That is a big question, and I do not believe it will come up during the present session. The hon. member knows this question has been before the people for a number of years. Some years ago an American corporation made a proposition to place a dam across the St. Lawrence at Cornwall for power purposes only. I opposed that at the time, not so much on account of damming the St. Lawrence, but because I believed that when that work was proceeded with it should be done by the Governments of the two countries, and not by private corporations, in order that the power developed would be supplied to the people of each country at the lowest possible cost, instead of on the basis of dividends on stock issues. The power question has been taken up very seriously by the Government of the United States, and it has, during the last few years, developed in this country much faster than we expected a few years ago.

Between the head of the canal system and Montreal I have been informed—and I understand it is a minimum estimate—that about 2,000,000 horse-power can be developed on the St. Lawrence river. My own impression is that all that power will be required; at least, Canada will require her portion of it. I believe that the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National railways running from west Montreal can use all that power. My opinion is that if the United States will assume their portion of the cost of this work—for it is an international work—Canada should assume her portion, and then we would have a complete waterway system for ocean-going vessels right up to Port Arthur. If this 2,000,000 horse power were developed, and our portion sold to the people at a minimum cost, I think it would be a great thing for the future of Canada. I can only express my own opinion. The American Government had the matter before Congress, and many people on the other side of the boundary, who are privately interested are anxious that this water-power should be developed. The chief engineer of our Railway Department and his staff have been surveying and going into the whole situation for a number of years; they have the whole matter right up to date, and are prepared to take it up at any time it is thought advisable by both governments. Of course we can do nothing more than discuss the matter with the American Government if they feel inclined to take up the proposal, and the whole matter would then be submitted to Parliament for consideration. Personally, I do not think the matter will be taken up during the present session, unless the American Government should approach us.

Mr. ROBB: Are they not developing power now?

Mr. J. D. REID: A large appropriation Bill has passed Congress for assisting in the development of water-powers in the United States; but the American Government is not developing power on the St. Lawrence as a government. Of course a great power is being developed at Messina, and is being used by the aluminum company there; I think it is from 60,000 to 100,000 horse-power. The same company is taking 60,000 horse-power from Valleyfield.

Mr. ROBB: Ninety thousand.

Mr. J. D. REID: Sixty thousand is all they have an export license for. Then there is another power company at Waddington; they want to develop on the American side Under the treaty between the United States and Canada no dam can be placed on the St. Lawrence without the consent of the

Dominion Government. The position I have taken in this House, both as a private member and as a minister, is this: If the power is to be developed, the two governments should build the dam and place the lock in the dam. They could build it as cheaply as any private concern. I believe that after the dam was completed, and after deducting what was necessary on account of navigation, they could sell the power at a nominal price which would pay both interest and something on the principal. In that way the people of Ontario and Quebec would be given cheap power, and the cost of operation of the railways, which will be operating under electric power in a few years, would be decreased very materially. Apart from navigation purposes, I believe this work would prove one of Canada's greatest assets in the way of supplying power to farmers and the railways, and, of course, the public would benefit by the decreased cost of operation.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has skillfully evaded saying whether the Government have a real navigation policy or not from the Great Lakes to Montreal, and has simply taken up time trying to draw a red herring across the trail by talking of power. The minister, when a private member, opposed the construction of a dam west of Cornwall because, as Hansard will show, he objected to the power going into the United States. If I remember well, the power was going to Messina, and the minister objected very strenuously. But he had not been a member of the Government for many weeks before he himself was party to a contract that was given to the Cedar Rapids Power Company to develop power on the Soulanges canal, off the St. Lawrence river. The idea was that this power should be developed for use in and around the city of Montreal. The minister states to-night that he knows that an export license was given for 60,000 horse-power. The newspapers say that 60,000 was granted in the first place, and subsequently another 30,000. The minister granted that license himself for the carrying of power, developed forty or fifty miles away from the United States boundary, over to Messina. I think the country will want to know what is going to be the policy of the Government with respect to this power which it is proposed to develop. Is it to be developed for canal purposes? The people of this country are not so much interested in power. The Government has placed a great load on the western grain growers; the rates have been enormously increased since this Government came into power, and that is a tax on the earnings of the man who grows grain for export. Something must be done to lighten that load, and the only way in which it can be lightened, as the minister knows, is by water transportation. What the country wants to know is whether this Government has a real policy in regard to waterways between Fort William and Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID: I did not want to evade the hon. member's question. With reference to the export of power the hon. member says that I was a party to an agreement to export this power. Previous to my becoming a minister, or at least previous to the change of Government in 1911, permission was given for the export of power, and since I have been a minister I have been trying to reduce the export. In fact, we have had a very difficult time during the last three or four years trying to decrease the export of power that was arranged prior to 1911.

Mr. ROBB: There was no power prior to 1911 at this point I speak of, it was not developed until after 1911.

Mr. J. D. REID: I think some of it was developed by that Montreal firm. With reference to the policy of the Government in regard to transportation from Port Arthur to Montreal, the Government, in 1912, I think, announced its policy; that is, they were going to enlarge the Welland canal in order that these 300,000 or 400,000 bushel freighters should go to Kingston and bring it that much nearer to Montreal. That policy was decided on then, and as to future transportation between Kingston and Montreal, that of course had not been considered up to that time. They started on work in the Welland canal. The war came and everything was changed and they have not considered any other policy up to the present time, except carrying out what they commenced on, the Welland canal. The hon. member knows that the Government could not possibly consider anything while the war was on. The treaty has not yet been signed, and until it is signed we will not consider what will be done east of Kingston to Montreal.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister has so far failed to give the Committee the answer asked for by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, that is, the number of people who are going to be benefited directly by the work on the Welland canal. It is well that we should know that. We are asked to vote $3,500,000 in a lump sum. The minister has told us that although the

work is not absolutely essential, yet in order to keep people employed it is necessary it should be proceeded with. I think the Committee and the country would like to know how many men in the Niagara Peninsula are to be benefited by the work.

Mr. J. D. REID: We have about 1,200 men at present but we expect to have probably 3,000 or 4,000 during the summer months. In addition to that, there are men employed outside, not directly
10 p.m. on the canal, in connection with materials and so forth.

Mr. JACOBS: Was this work, which is now being done by force contract, let by tender previous to the war?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: That work was abandoned when the war broke out, and it is now being undertaken under a different form of contract?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Well, is that the policy of the Government with respect to all work of that kind done throughout the country?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, it is. On a long contract, where you are going to spend a lot of money and when the work takes considerable time, I would not think of calling for tenders, owing, as I said a few moments ago, to the abnormal conditions that have to be contended with.

Mr. JACOBS: Then how is it that only to-day tenders were opened in the regular way in connection with some excavation at the Customs House at Montreal? It is an important piece of work running into about a quarter of a million dollars, and the minister of that department would not think of doing the work under a force contract.

Mr. J. D. REID: That work will take a very short time. In connection with this work, as I stated before, a lot of plant must be purchased which the contractors would not want to purchase, as the contract may terminate at any time. This contract is not for a definite period. We can cancel it at the end of any month.

Mr. JACOBS: How does the minister propose to give skilled munition workers work on the canal? He has told the Committee that the work is to take the place of that which was closed down owing to the termination of the war. I understand that the men who were engaged in munition work were skilled men who had special training. Does the minister expect that they will be satisfied with ordinary day labour on the canal?

Mr. J. D. REID: In connection with munitions they no doubt require skilled labour, but skilled labour is also required on the canal. You must have skilled men to operate dredges, drills, steam engines and various machines. A great lot of this labour I believe went from the Welland canal to munitions.

Mr. JACOBS: What were most of these men doing before the war broke out? How is it that we have to provide work for these men now if they could go back to their ordinary occupations? If these men were employed in legitimate work in which they were earning proper wages, why should we now have to provide for them a sort of glorified soup kitchen?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think it is hardly fair to say that we are providing a "soup kitchen" for the employees of the Niagara district. On behalf of the employees there I certainly resent that statement. We do not undertake to provide any "soup kitchens" but simply to give legitimate work to these men in that district. That is what we started to do, and what I believe we are doing now. A great many of these men went overseas, and coming back they want their positions again on the Welland canal. The hon. member asks me, where do these men come from, and what they were doing before? Surely he does not expect me to answer a question of that kind. How should I know? All I know is that in that district, as in others, as in Montreal, there were thousands of men who were out of employment. Will the hon. gentlemen tell me where all the munitions workers came from that were working in Montreal?

Mr. JACOBS: They left their positions to get higher salaries working on munitions.

Mr. J. D. REID: They may have done that in Montreal but not in other places; not at the Welland canal.

Mr. ROBB: The munition contractors in Ontario kept employment agencies in Montreal throughout the war hiring men from the farms in Quebec to work on munitions.

Mr. VIEN: Has the minister given any instructions to ensure that the men employed on this work are Canadians?

Mr. J. D. REID: Orders have gone out to the contractors to employ as many re-

turned soldiers as possible. The other men are Canadian citizens. As far as I know they were Canadians only that they were employing.

Mr. VIEN: The minister says that as far as he knows only Canadians were being employed, but sometimes he does not know. Has he inquired, and is he in a position to inform the committee that only Canadians are being provided with work under this system of contracts on a cost plus basis?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, those are the instructions that went to the contractors.

Mr. VIEN: Written?

Mr. J. D. REID: I had the contractors in my office and told them to do that. I am satisfied that is what they are doing.

Mr. VIEN: As part of their contract?

Mr. J. D. REID: The contract is to proceed with the work and the instructions are to employ Canadians. Unless there may be some special man that the hon. member may refer to, these contractors, who are all Canadian citizens, are employing Canadians and men who have been at the front. None of these contractors will take on any others than Canadian citizens unless it may be for some particular reason. I do not know whether the hon. member refers to foreigners, Italians, or some other people of that kind living in that particular locality. There may be some other people of that kind who have been living in that locality, but they are citizens of Canada and they have been living there for a number of years.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that twenty five or fifty per cent of the men who are seeking employment, and who will be employed on this work, are Italian labourers?

Mr. J. D. REID: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the minister give us the proportion of the Italians employed?

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot do that.

Mr. JACOBS: If my statement is untrue how is it the minister cannot give me the exact figures?

Mr. VIEN: Who had the contracts at the commencement of the work?

Mr. J. D. REID: I gave them a few minutes ago. They are the contractors who are doing the work now—the Dominion Dredging Company, of Ottawa, Baldry, Yerburgh & Hutchinson, Doheny, Quinland & Robertson, Montreal; and the Canadian Dredging Company of Midland.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. VIEN: When were the contracts cancelled?

Mr. J. D. REID: Two years ago.

Mr. VIEN: What were the arrangements between the Government and the contractors, and what are the conditions of cancellation?

Mr. J. D. REID: We simply paid them for the work they did up to the day when the contracts were cancelled and took their plant over.

Mr. VIEN: How much did you pay for the plants of these various corporations?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not give the hon. member the exact figures this evening. We took them at the invoice price less a percentage for depreciation. Then we sold a lot of the plant at a profit.

Mr. VIEN: To whom?

Mr. J. D. REID: Any person. There were engines and cars, a great many people wanted that kind of plant at the time, and we were able to dispose of a lot of it at a profit. Part of it we kept. The Dominion Dredging Company had three dredges and steam tugs and scows. That plant we kept, and the contractors are now using it and we are not paying any percentage on it. It is the intention, as soon as we feel that times are normal, to ask for tenders for this work and to ask the contractors who tender to take over the plant we have purchased. We are purchasing about $300,000 worth of new plant for this work. I explained that a few moments ago. Of course that plant would cost a great deal more than it would if times were normal, but it was necessary to purchase the plant in order to proceed with the work. When the contractors take it over there may be a loss on that because we have asked the contractors to proceed with the work in abnormal times.

Mr. VIEN: As far as I can judge from the statement of the minister, the Government has no very fixed policy. The other day the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) told us that unless for some very imperative reason, or for carrying on works necessary for the prosecution of the war, the policy of the Government was never to give a contract on force account. The Minister of Public Works told us that he gave a contract on force account only on one occasion and that was for the construction of buildings for aeroplanes and seaplanes. He said it was the policy of the Government to give no contracts on force account. We see now that

the policy of the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) is at variance with that of the Minister of Public Works. It is very curious to see there is no fixed policy of the Government. I would like to know if there is not a law which prohibits the letting of contracts without calling for tenders?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, there is not any law.

Mr. VIEN: The minister says there is no law. I say to the minister that there is a law which prohibits the letting of contracts exceeding in amount $5,000 without calling for tenders. Will the minister explain on what authority he has taken upon himself to violate the law by letting contracts of such magnitude?

Mr. J. D. REID: There is the law with reference to contracts not exceeding $5,000, but in an emergency you can also let a contract other than by tender.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister tell us what the emergency was?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have explained that several times.

Mr. VIEN: Not satisfactorily.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am sorry I cannot satisfy the hon. member, but I say again that these contracts were let in order to provide work for the people in that locality. In other parts of Canada we had to do the same thing. It would be unfair and unjust, the war coming to an end so quickly, to say to these people: We will do nothing to provide you with work; the war is now over and you can do without work and your families can starve during the winter. That is what I call an emergency.

Mr. VIEN: The emergency was not because the Government had not time to call for tenders. Surely the minister is not going to try to make the committee believe that he had not time to call for tenders? Now I want to know from him what statutory authority he had for adopting such a course?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not the statutes before me, but as I understand it, we were quite within the law in acting as we did.

Mr. VIEN: I contend that you were not.

Mr. J. D. REID: I can only put the Department of Justice's opinion against that of my hon. friend, and——

Mr. VIEN: But——

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the hon. minister who has the floor, to complete his sentence.

Mr. VIEN: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. J. D. REID: We certainly let the contract in accordance with the law, as it was interpreted to me by the Justice Department. I go further and say this: I do not believe that Parliament, or indeed any one, would justify the calling for tenders and letting a contract under such abnormal conditions as prevailed at that time. We made a contract from month to month, which is not to extend later than December 31 of this year; that is all we have done. The contractors could not possibly figure on giving us prices for any length of time that we would be justified in accepting while the war was still on. They would have wanted quite a period of time to complete the contract, and to stipulate for provisions with respect to the purchase of equipment, machinery, and so on. Any contractors I talked to did not think that we would at all be justified in calling for tenders.

Mr. VIEN: The minister stated previously that when the former contract was cancelled the Government took over from the various contractors the plant that they had on hand for carrying on the work. The policy of the Government then, was at a certain future date to give to certain contractors the order to go on with the work. Now the Government had the necessary plant in hand, and all that was needed was to call for tenders, and award the contracts in the ordinary way according to law. The minister has failed to convince the Committee that such an emergency existed as to justify him in ignoring the law. It seems to me that the law should be adhered to at all times, and that the minister will fail to find any statutory provision to justify his action. I now ask him to lay upon the Table the contracts entered into between the Government and these men for the carrying on of the work, also the opinion of the Department of Justice stating that he was justified in ignoring the law and not calling for tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will very gladly lay the contracts on the Table to-morrow. With reference to the opinion of the Justice Department the department has its own solicitor with whom I took the matter up. That solicitor consulted the Department of Justice and advised us as to whether the

work was being carried out legally. There was no doubt at all in his mind that it was being legally done, nor was there any doubt in the minds of officials of other departments where the same kind of contract was entered into. The Department of Public Works is an instance of that.

Mr. VIEN: In what respect?

Mr. J. D. REID: If the Department of Public Works could adopt that policy in one instance, would we not also be justified in this case?

Mr. VIEN: No, because the Minister of Public Works explained that the buildings for the aeroplane plant—I suppose that is the case to which the hon. gentleman alludes—could not be completed if there had been a delay of four weeks. The expenditure was for war purposes, it was late in the fall, and the buildings had to be completed before the snow came. The Minister of Public Works furthermore clearly explained at the time that it was the settled policy of the Government to always call for tenders, and never to enter into contracts on force account unless there was such an emergency as the one he cited, and which instance has been the only one in his department. I ask the minister when he lays on the Table to-morrow the contract for the renewal of this work, to also advise us of the statutory authority which permits him to dispense with the calling for tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member is a lawyer and can more readily consult the statutes than I can.

Mr. VIEN: I am afraid that the complicated Orders in Council which apply to the matter will not allow me to discover the information as easily as the minister can.

Mr. J. D. REID: There is no Order in Council except as to the contract that was let, and the statutes are easily available. I could not give any legal information on the matter other than what is to be found in the statutes with which the hon. member is familiar.

Mr. VIEN: Surely the minister will not refuse to tell the Committee on what statutory provision he bases his authority for acting as he has done? Was there any provision in the Estimates voted last year which authorized this expenditure?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member will notice in the present Estimates that the sum of $1,860,000 was voted last year. In the Estimates for 1919-20 the sum of $3,500,000 is asked for the Welland ship canal.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. JACOBS: Might I ask the minister if this paternal solicitude on the part of the Government to supply work to the unemployed in the Niagara district will be extended to other parts of the country where unemployed may also be found, and where public works are in abeyance?

Mr. J. D. REID: I can give the instance mentioned by the leader of the Opposition at Sydney.

Mr. JACOBS: It is a far cry from Niagara to Sydney. If the minister would investigate, he would find a good deal of unemployment in other districts.

Mr. CAHILL: Who are back of the Dominion Dredging Company?

Mr. J. D. REID: Colonel Gordon Stewart, Mr. Larmonth, and Colonel McNeill, the Chief Engineer tells me. I do not know the others.

Mr. JACOBS: Is Senator O'Brien a member of the firm?

Mr. J. D. REID: No. He was a member, I think, of the firm that originally had the contract, but he dropped out of the firm.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it not a fact that he dropped out only in respect of this contract?

Mr. J. D. REID: He is not in this contract now.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He is still with the firm?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, he is not in the firm, I understand.

Mr. JACOBS: He is a senator; he could not be.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister takes shelter behind the statement that some money was furnished for the supplying of rails at Sydney and he looks hard at me as if that was of immense concern to me—thinking, I suppose, that Sydney is in my constituency.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know that Sydney is not in the hon. member's constituency.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was no such depression in Sydney as the minister suggested. The Dominion Steel Works were going at full swing; there was not the slightest let-up in any department. There is no comparison between that situation and the conditions with respect to the Welland canal construction. The Department of Railways and Canals have been getting steel and steel rails from that company for

the last ten or fifteen years, and if they continued getting that material a little in advance, that was only ordinary business precaution. If the minister could get steel rails from the Dominion Steel Company cheaper than he could get them anywhere else, no great virtue is to be credited to him or to his department if a little contract was made in advance. In the county from which I come the Nova Scotia steel people were almost exclusively engaged in the manufacture of munitions during the war. That work stopped suddenly and two or three thousand men were thrown out of employment in the town of Sydney Mines. As the member for the county, I made application to the Government for assistance to the Nova Scotia Steel people by way of an advance order or something to help them out, but not twenty-five cents worth of assistance did the Nova Scotia Steel people get from the Government. That is the kind of sympathy and support that the thousands of men of the Nova Scotia Steel works who are out of employment in Sydney Mines received from the Government. Hundreds of these men were returned soldiers and had families to support, but they were obliged to get along as best they could until the company started work again. The difficulty with the minister was that these contractors who were round his office looking for jobs and reminding him of past favours that they had extended to him and to his party, were bothering him, and at least like the woman who bothered the unjust judge who neither feared God nor regarded man—and the minister was somewhat in that frame of mind—he made up his mind that he would rather let them plunge in the mud of the canal than bother him in his office. These contractors had staffs who were unemployed, and these are the men who are engaged on this work to-day. I venture to say that not a dozen returned soldiers are engaged on the whole work—not as many as would save Sodom and Gomorrah—five just men. The emergency on the strength of which the minister attempts to justify evading or passing by the law is not the kind of emergency that the law recognizes—that is, the necessity for getting the work done in a hurry. He is proceeding as he is simply because some people are looking for work; that is not the emergency contemplated by the statute.

I asked the minister quite a while ago to give us some information as to the cost of this work compared with the cost of the work done under the old contract. He did not tell us that; perhaps he can. If we are not losing very much money on it, perhaps we should not be very critical of the minister, but I do not think we should throw away a large sum of money; we have none to waste. This work is being carried on in a very unbusinesslike way. What is the sense of spending millions upon a section of a work which can be of no service until the whole project is completed? It would be ridiculous for a man to finish one-half of a house and do nothing to the other half if he knew that he could not use the house until the whole was completed. The minister is spending millions on certain sections, and when he finishes those sections he is going to stop. Large portions are not finished and will not be finished for four years. What is the use of spending money on works that will cave in, as has happened to work that has already been done? Would it not be good business to put this whole work under construction at once and see that it is all finished as quickly as possible in a uniform and proper manner so that the country will get some benefit from the expenditure? I throw out those suggestions to the minister, which, I think, are along business lines and which he would do well to follow.

Mr. J. D. REID: With reference to the first statement made by the hon. member, as to the work given to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and other corporations, representations were made to us that a large number of men in the Dominion Iron and Steel Works as well as in many other works throughout the Dominion would be thrown out of employment. Rails were the only things that the Government could take, and the order was given in order to keep the rail plant going during the winter. With reference to the Nova Scotia steel plant at Sydney, there was nothing that they manufactured that the Government could use, and not a fifty cent piece was given to that company. A very large order was, I understand, given to the Nova Scotia Steel Company at New Glasgow, I think, for cars.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not speaking about New Glasgow.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know that, but that company got an order.

Mr. McKENZIE: The car company and the Nova Scotia Steel Company are two different companies.

Mr. J. D. REID: I thought they belonged to the Nova Scotia Steel Company.

Mr. McKENZIE: No.

Mr. J. D. REID: At all events, contracts for steel ships, cars, rails and other equipment were given to companies in different parts of the country, wherever the Government could use the material. With reference to the construction of the Welland canal, the policy was settled five or six years ago that the Welland canal would be enlarged, and many millions of dollars were spent on those contracts. The hon. member stated that, by proceeding with and completing those contracts, the work would not be of much use unless we went on with all the work. The hon. member hardly understands the situation, or he would not make that statement. The situation is this, that if we completed those four contracts, we could use that part of the canal with seven locks instead of the twenty-four that are used at present; that is, with the present canal size, the work would be of great assistance. That, of course, would be the only portion that would be deep, but those are the heavy contracts for the locks, and it would probably take four years to do the work. The other work, which is mostly dredging, could be done in about two years, so that we could start it in about a couple of years from now and have the whole work completed. The hon. member will, therefore, see that we are not losing any time by proceeding with the four contracts now. When we were taking up this matter, the chief engineer and the engineering staff went into it thoroughly, and the chief engineer makes this statement at the end of his report:

> After giving the matter careful consideration, I strongly urge and recommend that arrangements be made with the former contractors to resume work upon their respective sections so that we may have the benefit of their experienced organizations. The value of such organizations is evidenced by the practice of contractors carrying many men on pay-rolls during periods of idleness.
>
> When first requested to submit an offer for the resumption of work on a cost plus percentage basis, they proposed a ten per cent basis. I refused to recommend this, and after further negotiations they agreed to accept an eight per cent basis, "cost" not to include the materials and supplies furnished by the department. For this, they agree to supply their own office staff, general superintendence, bookkeeping, purchasing and the capital necessary to carry on under the proposed conditions.
>
> I strongly recommend the acceptance of their offer, reserving our right to call for tenders for the completion of the work as soon as it may be deemed expedient to do so.

The chief engineer and his staff negotiated for some time; the whole matter was carried on by them; and after they had negotiated with those contractors and figured the matter out, as they believed, in the very best interest of the public, the matter was submitted to me; we went into it very thoroughly, and I really believed it was the only thing to do at that particular time. As I stated a few minutes ago, just as soon as the time is opportune to call for tenders, we intend doing so and not to proceed any longer on a percentage basis.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is now nearly eleven o'clock, and I do not think we should allow this item to carry to-night, because there seems to be good reason to believe that this contract was illegal. I am quite familiar with the statute as to proceeding with work costing over $5,000 without calling for tenders. The minister may be well advised, and he may have a perfect right to go on with the work; but he should have time to consult his legal advisers, and to-morrow or whenever he goes on again with his Estimates, he can inform us as to the opinion he receives from the Department of Justice upon work of this kind, namely, whether it is legal for any department of the Government under such circumstances to proceed with work under force account without calling for tenders. The point is well worth considering, and as so much money is involved, I am sure every member of the Committee would feel better if we were satisfied that this was a legal transaction and that we were voting money for absolutely legal purposes. So far as I understand the matter, the minister has not asked for tenders, and there is no good reason why the time should not be utilized in getting tenders from different contractors on this work, the work to commence at such a time as may be deemed advisable. There is, on this side of the House, no factious opposition to the item passing; but there is really a legal point involved, and it would be as well to settle it so that we might know once and for all that we are justified in voting the money, and that the minister was legally right in giving the contract. It would be well for the minister to let this item stand, and when the legal point is settled, I do not think he will have any trouble in having this item pass.

Mr. J. D. REID: Even if it were deemed advisable to call for tenders, on account of prevailing abnormal conditions, I cannot agree with the hon. member that it would be advisable to call for tenders now and to proceed with this work on contract. As the contractors state that material is so high in price and labour is so high, if we were to say

to them that they must take a contract, I do not think it would be possible to make a satisfactory one. I think it is in the public interest to go on with the work on a cost-plus basis for the present; it is the only way that I can see for this or any other similar work at the present time. As to the awarding of the contract, I took this matter up with the solicitor of the department and was informed, and believe, that we were within our legal rights. The hon. member knows that around the Council board there are a number of legal men who certainly understand the law, and would not approve of a contract that was improper from a legal standpoint. I do not know where I can get any better opinion.

Mr. McKENZIE: We want to see the opinion.

Mr. J. D. REID: I did not ask for a written opinion of the Justice Department. My solicitor gave his opinion, and he would consult the Justice Department if it were necessary. Furthermore, the Auditor General would not pass an account that was improper. If there was any other information I could give, I should be only too glad to give it. I have no desire whatever to withhold information, and so far as the contracts are concerned I will lay them on the Table. I cannot see what advantage there would be in letting the item stand, because there is no further information I can give. Some hon. member has asked me to state the difference in the cost now and before the war. We have not got into very heavy work as yet, and I do not know that I could get the details my hon. friend wants; it would be pretty hard to do so at the present time. I think the hon. member objects to our proceeding with the work at all. The Government, of course, must assume that responsibility. We believed that the possibility of unemployment in that district, and the advantage we should derive from the work, made it necessary for us to go on with it. The hon. member states that he does not believe there were five returned soldiers on that work. My information is that there are at least a dozen returned soldiers on the engineering staff—

Mr. VIEN: On a $3,500,000 work!

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member did not let me finish my sentence. I stated that there were at least a dozen men on the engineering staff, and a hundred or more with the contractors. Why does not the hon. member cheer that? We expect to have between 1,000 and 2,000 returned soldiers within a short time.

Mr. POWER: I can assure the minister that he will not get returned soldiers to dig ditches in the Welland canal. They have dug ditches in France, and they will not do it again.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member is trying to put into my mouth the statement he himself makes to the public. I never said that we wanted returned soldiers to dig ditches, and I would be the last man to ask them to dig ditches. I mentioned that we had twelve returned soldiers on the engineering staff. Is that asking them to dig ditches? The hon. member is the only one in this House who would stand up and say that I wanted returned men to dig ditches.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I never said that I wanted the returned soldiers to dig ditches, and I want the minister to apologize for having said so. I think I am perfectly within my rights in asking him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The minister, of course, is obliged to accept the statement of the hon. member that he never made such a statement in the House, but I do not know that there is any point of order raised, or that any statement has been made which should be withdrawn.

Mr. POWER: The point of order is this: The minister said that I was the only member of the House who would make the statement that I wished the soldiers to work in the ditches. I most certainly object to a statement of that kind from the minister or anybody else, and I think the Chair ought to support me in asking the minister to withdraw his statement.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member stated that I was asking returned soldiers to dig ditches. I made no such statement, and I said the hon. member was the only one who would charge me with making such a statement.

Mr. POWER: I heard the minister state that within a few days he would have 2,000 men employed on the canal. Now you could hardly have 2,000 engineers on the job, so if 2,000 returned soldiers work on the job some of them will have to dig ditches, and I objected very strongly to the minister giving positions of that kind to returned soldiers, saying that they had had enough of digging ditches in the four years they were at the front.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister told us a few moments ago that there are quite a number of lawyers around the Council board, and

that he sought their advice as to whether this contract was legal or not. Now that he has lifted the veil from what transpires at the Council board I should like to know whether the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) was satisfied that this $3,500,000 work should be done by force account, when the policy of the Department of Public Works is tender and contract.

Mr. J. D. REID: When an Order in Council is passed, the hon. member knows Council all agree.

Mr. VIEN: The minister is trying to convince the committee that it is sound policy to give such a contract without calling for tenders, because of some emergency. Sir, there are a number of contracts let, not only by the Government, but by private concerns, for construction work. What are the abnormal conditions of which the minister speaks? Is it the cost of labour, or of materials? Surely the same conditions exist for private companies. To give the minister but one example of the different views held by his colleagues, what did the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) do when he wanted ships built?

He gave contracts not on a cost-plus basis, but on so much a ton to all shipbuilders in Canada who were willing to undertake the building of ships at the price agreed upon. In the building of ships there are the same abnormal conditions that exist in connection with the digging of canals: the men must be employed; steel must be bought and all the other material required in the building of ships must be secured, and yet the policy of the Marine Department has not been the cost-plus basis. In regard to public works, the hon. Minister of Public Works said the other day that unless there was an imperious demand that the work should be let out it was the policy of the Government never to give contracts unless tenders were called for. The Minister of Railways and Canals is now trying to induce the Committee to believe that there was such an emergency by reason of the unemployment caused by the return of our soldiers, and he is compelled to admit that there are twelve returned soldiers employed in the digging of the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member should add that I said there were over a hundred men on the contractors' staff.

Mr. VIEN: If the minister had waited a moment I would have completed his statement. He said that there were about a dozen returned soldiers employed in the digging of the canal and that on the staff of the contractors there were perhaps a hundred—he would not swear to it or make a positive statement. He does not know, and it is the general policy of the Government never to know or to be aware of anything. When a minister is embarrassed he simply says, "We do not know; we are not aware of it; we have no information as to that." It is a Cabinet of non-information or lack of information. The other day the Minister of Public Works made a statement on this very subject. On the 26th of February he said:

> Somewhere on lake Ontario, I believe. I am also going to take the responsibility of starting these works before the money has been voted by Parliament, because I believe Parliament will concur in our views and vote the money in order that we may relieve a certain amount of the unemployment that already exists in the large centres. It is the duty of the Government to relieve that unemployment as far as possible. . . . By tender and contract, most certainly. Perhaps I should qualify that statement to this extent: there may be some buildings which will have to be torn down to clear the site for the new ones. That work possibly might be done by the Government, but it would only be—

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is reading from a debate during this session. That is against the rule.

Mr. VIEN: I am merely quoting the words of the Minister of Public Works on this very question of policy.

Mr. DAVIDSON: My point is that the hon. gentleman cannot read from a previous debate of this session.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is certainly well taken. It is very clear that an hon. member cannot read from a previous debate in the Official Report of the debates of the current session. That rule applies to the Committee as well as to the House.

Mr. VIEN: Will the Chairman read me the rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Bourinot at page 357 says:

> Neither can a member, in speaking, refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session—a rule necessary to economize the time of the House, and a restraint upon members to prevent them from reviving a debate already concluded.

Mr. McMASTER: There is no doubt about the accuracy of that rule which is the one rule—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McMASTER: It is the one rule—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) that the ruling of the Chair cannot be discussed.

Mr. VIEN: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I must say that there is a divergence of opinion in the present Cabinet as to the policy that should be followed when contracts are made. One minister tells us that contracts should never be let unless tenders are called for, and I must admit that this view 11 p.m. is in accordance with the law, and it is high time that we should do things properly and according to regular procedure. During the war various emergencies might have excused a different system, but we are now on a peace basis, and the last body to realize this fact seems to be the present Administration. They are trying to reorganize the country on a basis of peace, but they are reluctant to adopt the principle which prevails in times of peace, that contracts should not be given by favoritism to any particular contractor to the detriment of others. They do not seem to realize the important principle that in the expenditure of public moneys great care should be taken not to spend more than is absolutely necessary. There is a law in this country which provides that a contract which exceeds $5,000 must not be let unless tenders are called for. This is a wise law and one which has received the approbation of the majority of the members of this House. The only emergency the minister could mention was that employment had to be provided for the unemployed workmen, but he has not been able to convince the Committee that it would have taken very much more time or caused any serious hardship if he had waited three or four weeks to call for tenders. The minister argued also that the conditions were abnormal as regards the wages of workmen and as regards material that it was not expedient to call for tenders and give the contracts according to a fixed basis, but that it was preferable to give the contracts on a cost-plus basis.

In so far as the wages of the workmen are concerned, we do not anticipate any immediate reduction or any immediate downfall in the price of labour. Not only do not the Government expect such a thing but in the contracts that the Government entered into with the various contractors they have specially provided the scale of wages that is going to be paid to the labourers. Surely a scale of wages is provided in the contract. There was absolutely no necessity to give to these men the advantage of carrying on such a tremendous contract, amounting to $3,500,000, without taking upon themselves any risk whatever. They had the plant the Government bought from them and which the Government now place back in their hands without charging anything for it. They know the market quotations of the various materials that are required. They have the wages fixed in the schedule included in their contract.

I fail to see any reason which can justify the Government or the minister in letting contracts without calling for tenders. There is a certain degree of honesty and candour which the minister owes to this House but I do not believe that he has succeeded in proving that there was any such emergency as he has urged in justification of the course which he pursued. I believe it would have been more in the public interest to have delayed the work for two or three weeks which would have been sufficient time to have allowed for the calling of tenders.

I think I should emphasize the point raised by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) that we can hardly be called upon to vote this large amount without seeing the contracts which have been let by the Government or of having the advantage of studying these contracts and seeing what we are voting this $3,500,000 for. With reference to these contracts, we have only the reference that the minister made to them to-night. I think we should let this item stand until the contracts are laid on the Table and until we have an opportunity of going into them more fully.

Mr. J. D. REID: The point raised by the hon. member now that the item should stand until he sees the contracts, is well taken. I had no idea that that was the particular point that was being emphasized. If hon. gentlemen want any information or if they want to see the contracts, I have no objection to allowing the item to stand. I certainly will agree to the suggestion at once and let the item stand. I will lay the contracts on the Table and be glad to get any further information any hon. members wish. They are entitled to any information they want. I have been trying to give all the information it was possible for me to give on this item to-night. The hour is getting late and I do not wish to ask the Committee to proceed with any other items; these can come up some other time.

Mr. McKENZIE: I tried to make it clear that we wanted to see these contracts and the legal opinion upon which the minister acted. I am not at all an authority on cabinet practice, or the practice that is followed when an Order in Council comes before the Government, but I understand that when a minister is putting through a contract in connection with which he does not comply with the statute he must furnish council with his reasons for not complying with the law. Perhaps the minister will be able to give us a legal opinion and the reason that he gave to council for non-compliance with the statute. I must remind the minister that there is nobody on this side of the House who desires to stop the work if it can go along and within a reasonable time produce such a result as to give the country the benefit of the operation of the rest of the canal. If the minister would call for tenders we would have the satisfaction of knowing whether or not he could get along better after he receives these tenders than by continuing as things are now. He will find that he can get tenders to carry out this work now at very much less cost than before. He is doing it in the most expensive way. If there is a proper call for tenders from one end of the country to the other I have every reason to believe that under present conditions there being many contractors looking for work, he will likely receive very reasonable tenders.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Wednesday, April 23, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY MR. D. D. McKENZIE.

Hon. J. D. REID: I promised the leader of the Opposition last night that I would give the House answers to some questions that he asked with reference to the Canadian National Railways. His questions were:

1. What responsibility has the Canadian people assumed financially in taking over the road?
2. What is the mileage of the road and if we operate full mileage that was taken over?
3. What does he think the rolling stock of the road is now worth, and is the road fairly well equipped as regards rolling stock?
4. How much money have we expended on equipment since we took over the road?
5. How much money does he think necessary for operation and equipment during the current financial year?
6. How do receipts and expenditures balance as regards operations of the Canadian Northern?
7. What is the whole indebtedness now upon the Canadian Northern, and what is the present indebtedness per mile?
8. What did the Government take over, and what value did they get for the responsibility and liabilities assumed?

The answers are:

1. The Dominion of Canada purchased $60,000,000 common stock in the Canadian Northern Railway, being the balance outstanding, for $10,000,000, but did not thereby assume the outstanding liabilities, which remained as debts of the company.

2. The mileage of the road in operation is 9,524 miles, and all the mileage taken over is operated.

3. It is estimated that the rolling stock of the road is now worth $67,573,092.

4. We have expended $22,233,107 on equipment since the Government took over the road. This equipment, of course, can be used also on the other Government railways.

5. The estimated deficit of the Canadian Northern Railway after paying all operating expenses and fixed charges for the current year is $7,000,000. The estimated amount for equipment for Canadian National Railways for the current year is $35,000,000. This covers the requirements of the entire Government system, including the Canadian Government Railways revotes.

6. The revenue for the calendar year 1918 was $49,201,955.18, and operating expenses $45,639,651.78, and net earnings $3,562,303.40.

7. The total indebtedness of the Canadian Northern Railway as of December 31st, 1918, including funded debt, equipment securities, land securities and all liabilities outstanding, amounted to $473,174,432. The present indebtedness per mile (including equipment, land and all subsidiary companies' securities) represent $46,166.

8. The Government purchased the balance of the common stock of Canadian Northern Railway, and thereby obtained control of all of the assets of that system, representing 9,524 miles.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

JOHN A. MESSEROY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What office, appointment or employment, if any, did John A. Messeroy, of Charlottetown,

Prince Edward Island, hold or have in the taking of, or counting the military vote overseas?
2. What was the date of his appointment?
3. What was the total amount paid him as salary or remuneration for such service?
4. What was the total amount paid him for travelling and other expenses?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Special returning officer.
2. November 24, 1917.
3. $1,280.
4. $1,783.83.

NEWFOUNDLAND R.N.R. RATINGS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. To whom was application made requesting that the 188 Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings serve in the Canadian Naval Service?
2. On what date was the application made?
3. On what date did these Newfoundland Naval ratings enter the Canadian Naval Service?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1, 2 and 3. The formal application was made to the Commander-in-Chief North America and West Indies Station on 9th July, 1917, as the R.N.R. (Newfoundland) ratings available for service in the Canadian Navy were under his direct command.

Authority to utilize these ratings was given in a letter from the Commander-in-Chief North America and West Indies dated 17th July, 1917. They were entered from time to time as required between the 26th August, 1917, and 13th April, 1918.

INTERNED ALIEN ENEMIES.

Mr. JACOBS:

1. How many persons belonging to alien enemy countries are now interned in Government internment camps?
2. How many of such persons have been or are engaged in occupations while so interned?
3. Does the Government purpose remunerating such persons for work done while so interned?
4. If so, what sum will each of said persons receive per diem?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. 2,117.
2. Some 1,100 have volunteered at different times for railway and farm work.
3. Payment has been made by the employers, and prisoners have been credited for value of work done.
4. For railway work, 20 cents per hour; farm work, 50 cents per day; work in camp, 25 cents per day.

CARDINAL MERCIER.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has an official invitation been extended by the Government to His Eminence Cardinal Mercier to visit Canada?
2. If so, has the invitation been accepted?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: 1 and 2: No.

TORONTO SUBURBAN RAILWAY CO.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Have the properties, etc., of the Toronto Suburban Railway Company been acquired by the Dominion Government, the Canadian National Railways or by the Canadian Northern Railway Company? If so, by which of them?
2. What does the purchase include, what is the purchase price, and what liabilities are assumed?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Toronto Suburban Railway Company was acquired by the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

2. The purchase includes all assets of the Toronto Suburban Railway Company, including lines from Toronto to Guelph and from Toronto to Woodbridge. These assets were acquired at actual cost. Liabilities assumed, £540,000 4½ per cent debenture stock and accrued interest June 30, $54,256.63; and sundry outstanding liabilities amounting to $670,135.27.

ROYAL AIR FORCE—REPATRIATION.

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Has the Government of Canada made any arrangement with the Imperial Government regarding the repatriation of the Canadian officers, N.C.O's and men of the Royal Air Force?
2. If so, what provision has been made for their early return?

Major-General MEWBURN: 1 and 2. It has been represented to the British Government how important it is that Canadians serving in the Royal Air Force should be repatriated as soon as possible; and to that end the Overseas Ministry is now engaged in working out a scheme which, while it will not reduce the shipping facilities for the repatriation of our own troops, will materially help the repatriation of the Canadians serving in the Royal Air Force.

RIOU STORE, FRASERVILLE, P.Q.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. For how many more years has the Riou Store at Fraserville (Riviere Du Loup), Quebec, been leased for military purposes, and what is the monthly rent to be paid therefor by the Government?
2. Is the lease being renewed on the principle of continued tenancy, for at least six more years, at a monthly rental of $90, because the military authorities omitted to duly notify the owner of the said building as to the period of occupation by them?
3. If so, is it the intention of the Department of Militia or the Department of Public Works to purchase said building from Mr. Riou, at its actual value, rather than pay six more years of rent?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. (a) The lease of the Riou store at Fraserville, P.Q., will expire on the 19th May, 1922. (b) Monthly rental is $90.

2. The original lease expired on the 19th May, 1917, but, owing to the necessary notice of intention to vacate not having been given by the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5, the Department of Militia and Defence was committed for five more years' tenancy.

It may be explained, however, that this building was rented in connection with recruiting for the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Now that recruiting work is over, the building will be used, upon the reorganization of the militia, for purposes of an armoury in connection with one company of the 89th Battalion and the 20th Battery of Artillery stationed at Fraserville.

3. As the lease has only three years to run, from the 19th May, 1919, there is no intention of purchasing the property.

R. S. LENNIE.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. What remuneration did R. S. Lennie receive as Registrar for British Columbia under Military Service Act?
2. What has been paid to Lennie for expenses in connection with this work?
3. Who paid for the rental of his office?
4. What amount was paid and to whom?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. September 15, 1917, to February 28, 1919, $6,020.83. Service given since March 1, 1919, without remuneration.

2. The cost of the registrar's organization at Vancouver to April 1, 1919, was $233,955.47.

3. The Military Service Branch, Department of Justice.

4. $5,452.50 to Mr. Dominic Burns.

C. E. MAHON.

Mr. d'ANJOU:

1. What remuneration was paid to C. E. Mahon, of Vancouver, B.C., as Chairman of the Dominion Board of Arbitration, Kitsilano Indian Reserve?
2. What expense money did Mr. Mahon receive in connection with this work?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The question cannot be answered as the Department of Indian Affairs has no information on the subject.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VICTORY LOAN—MONTREAL BROKERS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT.

1. What Montreal brokers were employed in connection with the last Victory Loan?

[Mr. Gauvreau.]

2. What amounts were paid by the Government to each of the said brokers on account of (a) commission, (b) charges, and (c) travelling and incidental expenses?
3. Are there any accounts which have been presented to the Government for payment remaining unpaid? If so, what amount is claimed by each of the said brokers?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. Details of remuneration payable to Montreal stock brokers re Victory Loan, 1918. Burnet, Porteous & Co., Montreal, $2,477.70; Burneau, Dupuis & Co., Montreal, $50; Burnett & Co., Montreal, $2,000; S. Carsley & Co., Montreal, $200; H. M. Connolly & Co., Montreal, $500; Craig & Luther, Montreal, $1,173.50; Davidson & Co., Montreal, $300; Ekers, Cushing & Co., Montreal, $500; Fenwick & Ryan, Montreal, $2,730.82; Fortier, Beauvais & Co., Montreal, $1,200; Greenshields & Co., Montreal and Ottawa, $4,700.74; G. W. Hamilton & Co., Montreal, $450; Hanson & Ferguson, Montreal, $620; Herdman & Co., Montreal, $1,380; C. J. Hodgson & Co., Montreal, $3,100; Grant, Johnson & Co., Montreal, $948; C. H. Lewis, Montreal, $500; J. L. Marler & Co., Montreal, $500; McDougall & Cowans, Montreal, Winnipeg, Halifax and St. John, $18,655; Meredith & Co., Montreal, $1,750; Montreal Securities Corporation, Montreal, $1,000; R. Moat & Co., Montreal, $750; Molson & Robin, Montreal, $750; F. Nash & Co., Montreal, $750; O'Brien & Williams, Montreal, $4,345; Oswald Bros., Montreal, $4,565.40; A. Patterson & Co., Montreal, $1,750; Pitblado & Co., Montreal, $3,280; A. E. Rex & Co., Montreal, $600; A. F. Riddell & Co., Montreal, $300; H. S. Scott & Co., Montreal, $600; Strathy, Gordon & Co., Montreal, $600; Smith, Fairbanks & Co., Montreal, $2,500; Tousaw, Hart & Co., Montreal, $1,000; W. J. Turpin & Co., Montreal, $1,405; A. A. Wilson & Co., Montreal, $683.39; F. B. McCurdy & Co., Montreal and Sherbrooke, $1,500. Total allowed, $70,114.55. The above amount were determined by an audit conducted by Messrs. Thomas Bradshaw and R. J. Dilworth of Toronto and Mr. J. W. Ross of Montreal on the basis of operating expenses of the individuals or firms in question during the period and to the extent to which they have been actually engaged in the work of the loan.

3. Some claims for reconsideration are before the auditors.

PORTLAND CEMENT DUTY.

Mr. STEELE:

1. During what periods since the beginning of the year 1912 has Portland cement been admitted free of duty?

2. What amount was imported during these periods, respectively?

3. What amount was imported during the years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918, respectively?

4. What was the value of Portland cement imported in each of the above years?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Portland cement has not been admitted free at any time since the beginning of the year 1912.

2, 3, and 4. Quantity and value of Portland cement imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended 31st March, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919, respectively.

	Quantity. cwt.	Value.
1912-13	4,958,814	$1,955,177
1913-14	709,014	332,564
1914-15	287,402	123,613
1915-16	94,136	37,048
1916-17	63,074	29,719
1917-18	26,243	17,417
1918-19	25,687	26,437

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. How much has been received by the Government from the sale of lands surrendered by the Indians of St. Peter's Reserve, Selkirk, Manitoba, up to 1st of April, 1919?

2. How much of said sum has been funded?

3. What sums have been paid to the Indians as interest of such fund?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. $68,962.91.

2. $68,962.91.

3. $15,170.92.

C.G.S. MONTMAGNY.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Since the Government steamer Montmagny was sunk in the St. Lawrence river a few years ago, was there any actual attempt made to float it? If so, by whom?

2. Under what terms was such attempt made, and with what measure of success?

3. How many times was it sold, and to whom?

4. If any of the buyers failed to live up to the terms of their contract were they called upon to pay the balance of the price of sale besides losing to the Government the deposit made and the guarantee?

5. Were any of the deposits refunded? If so, on what ground?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes. The department invited tenders for the raising and delivering of the vessel at Quebec and accepted the offer of the Levis Wrecking Company for this work. No work was ever undertaken by this company. The department then entered into a contract with the St. Charles Navigation Co., for the purchase and removal of the vessel and this company worked six weeks with a staff of 22 men and 4 divers, but met with no success. The vessel was again offered for sale and the tender of the Public Enterprises Co., represented by Col. C. A. Chauveau and Horace Dussault, Levis, P.Q., accepted. An attempt was made last fall to raise the vessel, but owing to the lateness of the season, the work was postponed until this spring.

2. Answered by question No. 1.

3. Twice. To the St. Charles Navigation Company, Ltd., Quebec, and the Public Enterprises Co., Levis, P.Q.

4. No.

5. Yes. The deposit of the Levis Wrecking Company was returned as the contract was cancelled by the department and other arrangements entered into for the disposition of the vessel. The deposit of the St. Charles Navigation Company was returned as the company was prevented from carrying out their contract owing to all tugs being requisitioned for war purposes and it was impossible to obtain the necessary outfit.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between Mr. L. D. Hara, Acting Superintendent of the Welland Ship Canal, and the Department of Railways and Canals and Justice Department, relative to the seizure of two cars of coal by the Fuel Controller of Thorold, Ont.

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents exchanged between Mr. L. D. Hara, Acting Superintendent of the Welland Ship Canal, and the Minister of Railways and Canals or any other person in the said department relative to notice being served on Mrs. W. Thomas, of Thorold, Ont., to vacate her residence.

Mr. FRASER:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters and other correspondence exchanged between L. D. Hara or other persons connected with the Welland Ship Canal and the Department of Railways and Canals relative to the drowning of Michael Koebel, lock tender at Port Colborne.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence petitions and other papers concerning the proposed acquisition by the Dominion Government of the Gaspé Railway System.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

For a return showing: (a) The quantities of coal and other fuel per man per day supplied to the Canadian soldiers during December, January and February, 1918-19. (b) The character of the housing of the soldiers in each case, i.e., was it in wooden huts or in tents?

Were there floors in these places? Were the cracks in the floors covered? Had the men cots, or were they obliged to lie on the floor? How many blankets were supplied per man? (c) What was the nature of the stove or heating apparatus furnished? (d) What were the sewage and sanitary plans and conditions in these camps? (e) How were complaints on the part of the officers and men treated or disposed of?

Sir SAM HUGHES:

For a return showing: (a) The Canadian Casualties by battalions and other subordinate units in each of the battles, St. Julien, Festubert, Givenchy, Vimy Ridge, Parvilliers (or Fouquescourt), Passchendaele, Cambrai, Mons. (b) The strength of each battalion or unit immediately before entering action at the said battles, respectively. (c) The respective number of reinforcements added to each said battalion and unit during the fighting at each of the said battles. (d) The respective strength of each said battalion and unit on coming out of the fight at each of the said battles. (e) The plans and conduct of each action, including incidents and events leading up to, as well as bearing on each.

Mr. KAY:

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Government or any Member thereof, or any Department or Commission thereof, and the Board of Pension Commissioners or any Member thereof, relative to appointments to the staff of the Board of Pension Commissioners by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. TOBIN:

For a return showing how many acres of public land have been given to railway companies in the Dominion of Canada by the Federal Government from 1878 to the present time, and also showing how many acres were granted in each year during the above period of time.

Mr. DUFF:

For a copy of the report made by Lt. Jarvis, R.C.N., in regard to the steamer Stadacona.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, contracts, reports, despatches, recommendations, agreements made, received, sent or entered into by any of the Departments of the Government, and any persons, companies or corporations with reference to, or resulting from the construction of the dam across the St. Maurice river at the place called Grand'Mère.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

For a copy of all reports, recommendations, letters, memorandums, messages and estimates having reference to the construction of the piers used to anchor the booms which hold the logs that are floated on the St. Maurice river at Ste. Flore Station or above the Grand'Mère dam.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

For a copy of all documents relating to the conviction and imprisonment of Albert LeBlanc, New Richmond Station, Quebec, for an infraction of the Military Service Act, and of applications for his release.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all correspondence, records, petitions and other documents concerning the prosecution entered against Mr. Ben H. Spence, Secretary of the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, for publishing objectionable matter.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Government, the City of Quebec and other shareholders of the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada and the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, as to the acquisition by the Government of the minority holdings of the stock in these railways, which are now being operated by the Government as part of the Canadian National Railway System.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

For a copy of all instructions sent to Post Office Inspectors relating to the appointment of Postmasters in the rural districts.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—RIFLES AND AMMUNITION.

Sir SAM HUGHES moved:

For a copy of (a) Circular, supposed of German inspiration, containing ten suggestions, surreptitiously distributed among the Canadian troops about the time of the battle of St. Julien, depreciating the Canadian rifle. (b) Reports by Colonel Primsmall, a British officer, showing comparative and competitive tests between the Canadian rifle and the British (improved) Lee-Enfield rifle, both using the defective ammunition and also good ammunition. (c) Any other reports or authentic data comparing the two rifles in regard to rapidity of fire, accuracy of fire, endurance, jamming, etc. (d) Reports showing various brands of ammunition supplied by the British to their own troops and to the Canadians, also marking which were defective, irregular in size and with cases too highly annealed or were otherwise unsafe or unfit for use. (e) Reports of evidence giving instances where splendid troops of the British service armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle suffered disaster through jamming of the Lee-Enfield rifle owing to bad ammunition. (f) Reports showing that ammunition of every nation, both in the allied and enemy service, at times caused jamming through defects or dirt. (g) Reports of the withdrawal from service by order of the British authority of the defective brands of ammunition. (h) Evidence as to the finding among the Canadian troops armed with the Canadian rifle of thousands of the defective ammunition mixed with the good ammunition long after the order to withdraw the defective ammunition, and the absence of any defective ammunition in the Canadian battalions armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. (i) Report by Colonel Embury, now Brigadier-General Embury, and officers of the 28th Canadian Battalion, of the finding of brands of the defective ammunition mixed with the good ammunition the morning that splendid battalion distinguished itself when a mine was blown up under them. (j) The reasons assigned by the, then, Minister of Militia on finding that many of the Canadian soldiers were honestly and innocently prejudiced against the Canadian rifle owing to enemy reports whispered against it, and his determina-

tion not to ask any man, under such circumstances, to carry a rifle in which he had not the fullest confidence. (k) Evidence showing the unauthorized action of certain parties in England in hardening parts of the bolt action of the Canadian rifle to extreme brittleness, thus ruining the rifle after these rifles had left Canada in perfect condition.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no objection to the Order passing, subject to this: If there is any information that, in the judgment of the Government, in the public interest should not be brought down, it will not be brought down. That is understood in connection with all motions of this kind.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That applies to all these motions?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The same as it applies to the Bruce reply to the Babtie Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN CREDIT TO ROUMANIA—ALLEGED MARKETING OF BONDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): In the Financial Post of April 19 there is an article in connection with the credits established by the Government in favour of Roumania, Serbia, and Greece. The Acting Prime Minister explained the nature of those credits to the House the other day. One paragraph in that article announces that in connection with those credits an intermediary agency has been established through Sir Clifford Sifton, which acts as fiscal agent for manufacturers securing orders by marketing Roumanian bonds to cover the amount. May I learn from the Acting Prime Minister whether Sir Clifford Sifton has any authority from the Government to act as intermediary agent in marketing Roumanian bonds?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend must refer to the private marketing of Roumanian bonds. My attention has not been drawn to the article ir question, but there is no marketing of bonds in connection with the extension of Government credits to the countries mentioned. The Dominion Government makes advances to those countries to enable them to purchase goods in Canada and it takes their bonds, not for sale, but to be held in the Treasury until repaid. No intermediary agency is connected with the transactions between the Dominion Government and the governments in question except the Canadian Trade Commission established here, and the Canadian Trade Commission established in London. The members of those commissions are appointed, my hon. friend knows, by the Dominion Government. What must be in the mind of the writer is some transaction whereby bonds of the Roumanian Government or other governments would be sold to private investors in the ordinary course. There is no connection whatever between the transaction referred to and the extension by the Dominion Government of credits to the countries in question.

STRIKE OF CARTERS IN MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary's): I draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to the fact that five thousand carters are on strike in Montreal, and that this is the moving season. Why has an arbitration tribunal not yet been appointed to deal with this matter? Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to effect a settlement of this strike as soon as possible?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter to which the hon. gentleman refers is now engaging the attention of the Minister of Labour and the officials of the department. They are rendering all possible aid in securing an early termination of the strike. I shall report further to my hon. friend to-morrow in the matter.

VACANT SEATS IN THE HOUSE UNTIL DEMOBILIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I once again direct the attention of the Leader of the Government to the fact that there are five vacancies in the membership of this House. What steps are being taken to fill these vacancies in order that the people of the country may be fully represented?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: While it is common ground that vacancies in the membership of this House should be filled as rapidly as practicable, it will, I think also be common ground that these vacancies should not be filled until demobilization is completed. There are very many soldiers who have not yet returned from overseas, some of whom might possibly be candidates in the constituencies in question, but undoubtedly all the soldiers now overseas

should have the right to vote in the constituencies in which they are domiciled. It would, therefore, appear to me, as it does to the Government, that there should be no by-elections until demobilization is complete or practically complete. When it is complete, it will be for the Government to consider when the by-elections shall be held. I can assure my hon. friend that I appreciate the desirability of filling vacancies in the House as soon as practicable and so soon as it will be fair to those citizens of Canada who by reason of being overseas, would be debarred from exercising the right of franchise in this country should any elections be now held.

THE 22nd BATTALION—PLACE OF DEMOBILIZATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): May I ask whether the Minister of Militia and Defence has come to a definite decision as to the demobilization centre of the 22nd Battalion?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): The Department of Militia and Defence has not determined the locality in which any overseas unit shall be demobilized; the selection of the demobilization centre always being left entirely to the unit concerned. The first intimation I had from overseas with regard to the demobilization centre of the 22nd Battalion was that it had selected the city of Quebec. On hearing that, the city of Montreal was very much perturbed, and I have no objection to reading a cable which I sent overseas:

> You have advised the 22nd Battalion will proceed to Quebec for demobilization. Strong representations being made by Montreal that unit raised and organized there, and has been reinforced largely by men from that district. Quebec also submits strong claims. Owing to controversy, please ascertain and cable feelings of officers and of all ranks of this unit as to whether they desire to be dispersed at Montreal or Quebec. Advise number of men of this unit for Quebec and number for Montreal.

On the opening of navigation on the St. Lawrence, at the end of this month, it is hoped troops will thenceforth come to Quebec. Personally, I am anxious to meet the views of both Quebec and Montreal, because I know both cities are desirous of paying proper tribute to this wonderful battalion. It has therefore been suggested, and I am sure the Government will be glad to co-operate, that if this battalion demobilizes at the city of Quebec it shall, before demobilization, be taken to the city of Montreal, so that the people there may have an opportunity of seeing it; but if any men of the 22nd desire to be dispersed at Quebec I do not think it would be right for us to dictate that they shall go to Montreal, or any other place.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): If there is a fight between Montreal and Quebec, may I suggest that a compromise might be effected by demobilizing the battalion at Three Rivers, which is half-way between the two cities?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think that would be a happy compromise.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

INQUIRY AS TO WHEN THEY WILL BE BROUGHT DOWN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to a matter of importance to the public and to Parliament. In the speech from the Throne on the 20th of February certain legislation was promised. We have now been in session for over two months, and there has not yet been brought down legislation respecting the Franchise Act, the establishment of soldiers on the land, vocational education, pensions for soldiers and their dependents, nor regarding the housing loan provided by Estimate No. 299. I should like to know when this legislation will be brought down.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Robb), who was courteous enough to give me notice of his question: the matter of pensions for soldiers and their dependents was at an early date in the session referred to a committee of this House, under the chairmanship of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). That Committee has been prosecuting its work, and as my hon. friend is aware, it has power to recommend the form the legislation should take.

The Bill which it is hoped the Committee will agree upon will be presented to Parliament in the usual way when the report of the Committee is received.

With regard to the matter of housing, there seems to be a misapprehension concerning this legislation. The provision for housing is given effect to already, and is contained in the Estimates, Item No. 299.

> Loan of $25,000,000 to Provincial Governments to encourage erection of dwelling houses in congested districts throughout Canada, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Order in Council of the 3rd of December, 1918

—the amount of loan to any one province not to exceed the proportion of the said $25,000,000 which the population of the said province bears to the total population of Canada, as shown by the last federal census, $25,000,000.

The Government, under the War Measures Act, enacted legislation which the provinces have already acted upon. No further legislation than the item in the Estimates is therefore required in connection with this loan.

With regard to the matter of technical or vocational training, the legislation is under the consideration of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson) who will be represented in respect of it, in this House by the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder).

With regard to the important measure of soldiers' land settlement, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) has practically completed the Bill, which I am advised will be presented probably next week.

As regards the Franchise Act, its provisions are now under consideration by the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: How long will they be under consideration?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think my hon. friend—

Mr. BUREAU: What we want to know is, how soon may we expect to get this legislation before the House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When consideration of this legislation by the Government is complete, it will be brought down like all other legislation. It is impossible for me to say whether it will be brought down next week or the week after, but it will be brought down in due course. I should like to make this observation with regard to what the hon. member (Mr. Robb) suggested as to the session having already extended over two months—during the war the business of the administration was necessarily emphasized to the disadvantage of private members bringing forward and discussing matters of public interest to the various sections of Canada which they represent. The war having come to an end, it seemed proper to the Government and, I am sure, to the House, that hon. members who had not been able during the war, owing to the pressure of administrative business, to discuss such matters should have opportunity to do so, and the policy of the Government this session has been to allow private members ample time, as we have done, to discuss matters of moment to themselves and their constituents which they might desire to bring forward either by resolution or otherwise.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Speaking only for myself, may I suggest to the leader that as the session has already lasted two months and, if all this legislation is to be brought down, will probably last three months more at least, it might be advisable, as there will be no elections until demobilization is complete, that the Government should postpone its legislation on the Franchise Bill until next session. This, it seems to me, would put a speedy end to the session after proper business had been disposed of.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree with my hon. friend that three months should be required to pass the Government's legislative programme. I may suggest to him that with the facilitation which I am sure we may expect from His Majesty's loyal Opposition, we should be speedily able to clear up the Order Paper and take on additional legislation which the Government has prepared.

Mr. ROBB: If I may be permitted to speak once more with regard to the question of the franchise legislation. As the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) does not agree with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), is it not fair to the country that the Franchise Act should be brought down at once and referred to a Committee representing both sides of the House in order that it might be threshed out, and so expedite matters?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As I stated, the Franchise Bill when prepared will be brought down and the Government will take such course with regard to it as may be proper, having in view the fair consideration of its terms.

RAILWAY LABOUR DIFFICULTIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): May I bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways (Hon. J. D. Reid) a letter I received to-day from the secretary of the Prince Albert Trade and Labour Council, in connection with some difficulties that appear to be outstanding between the National railways and the Government employees, and to ask if the minister has any explanation as to a possible settlement of the trouble?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): I do not know what the hon.

member refers to. Any difficulties in connection with the employees of the Canadian National railways, as well as other railways, are settled now by a board in Montreal that has been organized by the several railway companies. The hon. member will remember that last year the railway companies and the employees got together and organized what is called the Labour Board, comprising six representatives of the employees and six of the companies, and all difficulties are referred to this board. Since the board was organized they have dealt with very many of these troubles, and in every case the result has been satisfactory. I have no doubt whatever that if there are any troubles now at Prince Albert or any other place they will come up in the usual way before the board and be satisfactorily settled.

Mr. McKENZIE: I hope the minister received a copy of this letter which I sent him to-day, in which it is stated that the board which the hon. minister mentions decided in favour of the employees but that the Government or management refused to carry out the findings of that board.

Hon. J. D. REID: I have not yet received the letter.

CREDIT TO ROUMANIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a cable despatch which appeared in the New York Times and Montreal Gazette on April 13th to the effect that the Government of Roumania professes to be insolvent, that the peasants are on the verge of revolt, and that conditions generally in that country are appalling. Is it the intention of the Government to verify these facts and, if they are found to be as stated in the despatch, will there be any modification in the decision of the Government with regard to the credit of $25,000,000 to Roumania?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend I may say that we have been in continuous communication with the Prime Minister and other representatives of the Government overseas. The action which we have taken has commended itself to them and it does not appear to me that any further inquiry such as is suggested by my hon. friend is necessary. I think we have all the facts before us.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS: I wish to ask a further question in regard to Roumania. The Montreal Star of last evening published a cable despatch from Paris to the effect that the Canadian Overseas Ministry have refused to act on the suggestion of the British War Council to form a Canadian machine force for service on the borders of Roumania, and the despatch goes on to say that in view of Canada's interest in Roumania the British people are surprised that the Canadian Government are not doing anything in this matter. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if he has any information on the subject.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have never received any information or any application of any kind in regard to the matter.

COMPLAINTS AGAINST MILITARY AUTHORITIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT: I would like to ask if there is any truth in the rumour that Canadian soldiers, before leaving England, at Buxton, Derbyshire, are asked to sign a declaration in which they bind themselves not to make any complaints against the Canadian military authorities overseas?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend I may say that I think that must be very much of a rumour.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will the Government make inquiry and give the information to the House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As a matter of courtesy to my hon. friend, if he will send me any news item, or inform me as to the source of the information upon which he has based his question, I shall be glad to cable.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is there not a regulation passed here forbidding the very thing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Archambault) speaks of? As a matter of fact, I think the minister will find there is a regulation forbidding any officer or man saying anything until he is demobilized.

Major-General MEWBURN: There may be; I am not aware of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is in your own department.

HIGH PRICE OF BUTTER—COLD STORAGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the official report from the cold storage ware-

houses indicates that the quantity of butter held in cold storage is about 48 per cent over what it was last year. In view of this fact and of the fact that butter is now selling at the highest price in history, I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to do anything towards obtaining the release of this butter for public consumption in Canada.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) I am happy to inform him that the Government are going to have erected shortly in the port of Montreal a very large modern cold storage warehouse. We hope that when this warehouse is finished it will take care of all the produce Canada may have.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 38, to amend the Canada Evidence Act.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—PREVENTION OF FIRE.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the third reading of Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), to amend the Criminal Code respecting the prevention of fire.

Mr. McKENZIE: We did all we could yesterday to prevent this Bill from passing through the Committee. We have a very full House to-day and I think there should be an expression of opinion in regard to this Bill. This is a criminal enactment which subjects any man, woman or child, in this country, to two years in the penitentiary if by some possible accident they may be the cause of a fire in their own house or anywhere else. I think this is going entirely too far and that it is infringing upon the necessary liberty of the people. It should not for one moment be stated that we in this House are creating a criminal offence where by no possibility a criminal mind or criminal intent exists. By some slight accident a person might have a defective stovepipe and if, by means of that stovepipe, a fire occurs in his house, it is, I think, a most extraordinary proposition that that person should be subjected to two years in the penitentiary. I therefore move:

That this Bill be not now read the third time but that it be read the third time this day six months.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. McKenzie, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Leduc,
Baldwin,	Leger,
Boivin,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Lesage,
Boyer,	McKenzie,
Bureau,	McMaster,
Cahill,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cannon,	Mayrand,
Casgrain,	Pacaud,
Copp,	Papineau,
d'Anjou,	Parent,
Delisle,	Pedlow,
Desaulniers,	Pelletier,
Deslauriers,	Power,
Devlin,	Prevost,
Euler,	Robb,
Fafard,	Ross,
Fournier,	Savard,
Gauthier,	Seguin,
Gauvreau,	Sheard,
Gervais,	Tobin,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	Trahan,
Hunt,	Truax,
Jacobs,	Turgeon,
Lafortune,	Vien.—51.
Lanctôt,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),	Guthrie,
Anderson,	Halladay,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Henders,
Ballantyne,	Johnston,
Ball,	Keefer,
Bolton,	Loggie,
Bowman,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boyce,	McIntosh,
Boys,	McIsaac,
Brien,	McQuarrie,
Buchanan,	Manion,
Burrell,	Meighen,
Calder,	Merner,
Carvell,	Mewburn,
Casselman,	Middlebro,
Charlton,	Morphy,
Charters,	Mowat,
Clark (Bruce),	Munson,
Clark (Red Deer),	Paul,
Clements,	Peck,
Cochrane,	Redman,
Cooper,	Reid (Grenville),
Cowan,	Richardson,
Crerar,	Sexsmith,
Cronyn,	Shaw,
Crothers,	Simpson,
Crowe,	Smith,
Davidson,	Steele,
Davis,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Douglas (Strathcona),	Thompson (Hastings),
Elkin,	Wallace,
Finley,	Whidden,
Foster (York),	White (Sir Thomas),
Fripp,	Wilson (Saskatoon).—
Fulton,	69.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Sifton,	Béland,
Green,	White (Victoria),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Borden, Sir Robert,	Sinclair (Antigonish),
Foster, Sir George,	Lapointe (St. James),

Bristol,	Kennedy,
Blake,	Déchêne,
Cockshutt,	McCrea,
MacNutt,	Molloy,
Stevens,	Kay,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Argue,	Chisholm,
Griesbach,	Gladu,
Burnham,	Proulx,
Blair,	Sinclair (Queens),
Lang,	Demers,
Maharg,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Myers,	Verville,
Reid (Mackenzie),	DuTremblay,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),	Denis,
Wright,	Brouillard,
Knox,	Ethier,
Thompson (Weyburn),	Duff,
Spinney,	Cardin,
Harold,	Michaud,
Edwards,	Fontaine,
Nickle,	Fortier,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Lavigueur,
Wigmore,	Lapointe (Kamouraska).

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 70, to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): Before the Bill is read a second time, I think we ought to have some further explanations from the minister. I agree with the object of the measure as set forth in the preamble, and if the provisions of the Bill harmonized with the preamble they would be satisfactory. The preamble states that it is expedient to provide for the incorporation of a company under which the railways, works and undertakings of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System may be consolidated, and, together with the Canadian Government Railways, operated as a national railway system. I understand from that that the Government wishes the Canadian National Railway System to be operated as much as possible on the same lines as privately owned railways are. That impression I gather from the preamble, as well as from the remarks made by the minister when we were discussing the resolution upon which the Bill is founded. On that occasion the minister said that one of the reasons for introducing this Bill was to bring the Intercolonial under the General Railway Act of Canada, and he further said, as reported at page 1454 of Unrevised Hansard, that that railway will have to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Now, if the idea is to place the Canadian National Railway System on the same footing as privately owned railways, except where the conditions are such that that cannot be done, I do not think we require two railway laws in this country. The General Railway Act is sufficient to meet all requirements, and the only matters in regard to which its provisions might not apply would be with respect to stock, stockholders, shares, capital, and anything relating to shareholders. Otherwise I do not see any necessity for the various provisions which it is proposed to enact in this Bill, or for removing the National Railway System from the operations of the Railway Act, and for changing other things that are most essential and important to the public. I admit that the Government ought to appoint the directors, and should also have certain other powers of control, but I object to the Government exercising the whole right when that right can be profitably exercised for party or political purposes, and freeing itself from responsibility so far as the burden of finances is concerned, or when risks are to be taken by the company operating the system, and criticism might ensue as a result of any action it might take. The whole tenor of the Bill is such that when anything in the way of exercising patronage or taking over the lines is concerned the power is reserved to the Governor in Council, but in financial matters the burden is left entirely with the company—there is no control by the Governor in Council or by the Canadian Parliament. In certain essential matters Parliament will have no voice whatever; it is to be ignored just as it has been in many other things since the war started, and just as is proposed to be done in that very innocent Bill No. 71 which proposes to extend the life of various Orders in Council passed by the Government. I repeat that the principle enunciated in the preamble is all right, but the various clauses of the Bill are all wrong. In my opinion the Bill should not now be submitted to Committee of the Whole, but should be laid over for further consideration, because I see no reason for the differences and the exceptions that are contemplated under it.

For instance, the Canadian National Railways are empowered to build lines whenever they please with the sanction of the Governor in Council. I think that is a wrong principle and that the Bill ought to be amended. If the Canadian Northern Railway has a charter to build a line, then the Canadian National Railways might be allowed to construct; but I do not believe

in giving a blanket lease of life to any railway company and its subsidiaries. Why not submit the Canadian National Railway System to the same ordeal as other railway companies? Then another thing, this measure would exempt the Canadian National Railways from the operation of the general Railway Act in expropriation proceedings, and give them the advantages of the Expropriation Act. The Canadian National Railway System ought not to be put under the Expropriation Act; I think that the courts of the various provinces where the other railway companies go in expropriation matters are quite capable of administering justice to the Canadian National Railway System or the Canadian Government. I think, too, that it is an autocratic and high-handed procedure for the minister or his deputy to sign the expropriation plan, file it in the registry office, and thereby have the ownership in the land vested in the Government. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I take no exception to Government ownership in this case—it is the best that can be done under the circumstances—but I do not believe in Government ownership any more than I believe in Government operation. If we are to take the experience of the United States, I think the enthusiasm that has been displayed in this House and in the country for Government ownership and Government operation is likely to be somewhat dampened. The United States have the poulation and the resources to make the experiment; Canada has not the population nor the resources to indulge in the experiment to such an extent as the United States have. From the figures given by the hon. minister to-day we see that for equipment he will require this year $35,000,000, if I understand him rightly, and that the deficit last year on fixed charges was $7,000,000. May I ask the hon. minister if that deficit covers the interest on all the bonds which the Canadian Northern Railway System has issued?

Mr. REID: The answers that I gave to-day I thought were very plain. Those answers stated that there were surplus net earnings of some three million dollars odd, but that after payment of all interest and other charges there remained a deficit of $7,000,000.

Mr. BUREAU: Interest on all bonds which are outstanding?

Mr. REID: Yes, everything.

Mr. BUREAU: You have not assumed the debt of the Canadian Northern, and still you are paying the interest on that debt. It looks like acquiescence on the part of the Government to pay that debt; but be that as it may it has nothing to do with this. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can get the right legislation by having this measure put before the committee now and discussed. As I said, we do not want two railway laws in this country. If you are going to incorporate this railway company, let it compete with the other railways with the same advantages and disadvantages that those railways have. I do not see why we should accept the expropriation clauses neither do I see why we should accept the other clauses. Except the matters relating to stockholders, there is nothing whatever to prevent the general Railway Act applying to the Canadian National Railway System, and I would suggest to the hon. minister that this measure be referred to some committee where we could hear not only the views of hon. members, but also the views of the men who are to-day operating this system. We will then be in a better position to judge of the necessity of some of the clauses in this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. members that when the hon. minister exercises his right to reply he closes the debate on the second reading.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I wish to endorse what has been said by the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), particularly on the point that we should have this measure sent to a committee. This is named as a railway company, and in most cases, according to the terms of the Bill, the Railway Act and the railway laws of this country governing railway companies will apply to it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. minister would be taking the proper course if he would send this Bill in the ordinary way to the Committee of Railways and Canals. Such action would not at all take away the power of the Government over the Bill, and, as the hon. member for Three Rivers has pointed out, it would give us an opportunity of hearing what the management has got to say about it. I do not think I am giving away any secret when I say that to-day I happened to meet the gentleman who is in charge of the Government railways, Mr. Hanna, and I mentioned this Bill to him and what my view was, that is, that it should go to a committee. Mr. Hanna and his lawyer both expressed satisfaction at the idea. Mr. Hanna stated it would give him and his staff an oppor-

tunity of coming before the committee and explaining their views as to the necessity of this legislation and the operation of the road generally. As Mr. Hanna and the legal side of the management hold that view, I think the hon. minister should comply with the request and have this Bill go where it can be fully dealt with and then be reported back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I think the minister would do well to accede to the wishes of the leader of the Opposition and have this Bill go before the Railway Committee of the House, where it can be more freely discussed than here, for the reason that the supporters of the Government would naturally hesitate to criticise the Bill and then have to vote for it if an amendment is moved in the House or in Committee here; whereas if the Bill were before the Railway Committee they would feel free to discuss it and vote as they saw fit. It is probably the most important legislation that this House will have to deal with for many years, and from my reading of the Bill I think many changes could be made in it that would be beneficial to this country. There is, no doubt, considerable opinion in this country in favour of public ownership, but the large majority of those who favour public ownership are not the investing public; that is, they are not people who have invested money in public corporations or public utility undertakings. They seem to be in favour of public ownership merely because, as a general rule, the railway companies were making in the earlier days what they consider to be large profits, and they want to be in on the profits. But few men are at all interested in public ownership from the standpoint of management, from the standpoint which we must take into consideration if we are to make a success of this undertaking. I differ from those who say that this railway undertaking is going to be a loss to us for all time. There is no reason why, in a country of this kind, a railway system of this size cannot be made to pay its own way—unless the people have so little interest in it that they allow it to become a political rather than a business undertaking. If branch lines are built where they should not be built; if terminals are developed at points where they cannot be made profitable; if unnecessary employees are taken on and others dismissed who, though good men, may not be of the right political faith; in short, if the system is treated generally as a political machine, as the political adjunct of a party, we are sure to come to grief. The history of the public ownership of railways the world over shows that railways handled by the Government direct have been a failure in every case. Australia made a failure of direct government management of railways until they put it into the hands of a commission, and even then they did not make of it what railroad men would look upon as a success, because they charge exorbitant rates. In no country has public ownership of railways been made a success until it has been taken as far as possible out of the hands of the Government. There is no reason why this undertaking should not be taken out of the hands of the Government and made responsible to Parliament. It is quite feasible, and the results would be very much better than they will be if the railway system is treated as a political machine. Our business here is to try and get this undertaking in the best possible shape for the people. The minister would be well advised to take this Bill before the Railway Committee and let us thrash the matter out and have these clauses adjusted so that they will be more workable and more satisfactory.

One very important point that the minister apparently has not taken into account is profit sharing with employees. A commission is now investigating the possibilities of closer co-operation between capital and labour in Canada. Why should we not consider this matter in connection with the largest Government undertaking that we have? The Government cannot lose anything by it. If the minister and the Government expect the railroads to go on losing money, why not offer an inducement to employees in the way of profit sharing that might be the means of producing a profit instead of a deficit? If the railroads make a profit, of course the Government should be generous enough to give the employees a share of it. It would not cause a loss to the country; it would not cause a loss to the shipper; it would produce greater efficiency and better work from the employees. Thousands of people will be employed on this railroad undertaking; why not establish some basis of co-operation between capital and labour in connection with it? It is in the interests of the minister, of the Government and of the country generally that this Bill be sent to the Railway Committee. The minister promised us certain information the other day; that information came down about thirty-five minutes ago, and now we

are asked to consider this Bill. I think it should be delayed.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is not usual for a Bill of this kind to be referred to the Railway Committee. When the Canadian Northern Bill was before the House in 1914—it was a very important Bill—it was taken up in Committee of the Whole. In fact, Government Bills are, as a rule, taken up in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CAHILL: This is an unusual Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID: Since this Bill was discussed in the House a few days ago I took it up with some of the officials of the railway and of the department, and it is my intention to ask that some of the things against which objection was raised be removed from the Bill. Serious objection was taken to section 20; when we come to that section I intend to ask that it be eliminated. Since the discussion of the Bill took place, representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the only company that would have any serious objection to the Bill, discussed the matter with me and informed me that they could see very little objection to the Bill as a whole, though there might be some objection to three clauses, one of which, I think, was section 20. When we come to these sections in committee I will explain the objections which have been raised, and it will be for the committee to decide whether we amend the clauses or not. This is a very important Bill and every member of the House should have an opportunity to say something with regard to it or to make any suggestions which he may wish to offer. It is hardly fair, therefore, to refer it to a sub-committee of a few members, or to the Railway Committee, and then have it come back here and probably be discussed all over again. When we go into Committee on the Bill hon. members will see that, on the whole, very little objection can be raised to it. The two clauses that the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) mentioned are those against which the strongest objection has been raised; I intend to ask that one be taken out, and the other we can discuss. Let us proceed with the Bill. If it goes to the Railway Committee we shall either have to discuss the Bill again when it comes back to the House, or have it passed without giving members an opportunity of understanding exactly what the Bill means. I do not think it would be fair to the members of the House to refer the Bill to a sub-committee, and I therefore ask hon. gentlemen to agree to the motion.

Mr. BUREAU: May I be allowed one word?

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be out of order at this stage.

Mr. BUREAU: With your permission, Sir, I would say just this: I quite appreciate that the members of the House desire to discuss this Bill, and I have no doubt there is considerable railway talent in the House, but my object in proposing a committee was that we might have the benefit of the advice of the experienced railway men who are practically the operators of the railway. It is only in a committee we can hear these men, and for that reason I insist upon referring the Bill to a committee. I am not suggesting for a moment that I have not confidence in the House.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On the preamble being read:

Mr. BUREAU: I wish to say, on the preamble—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman would not be in order in discussing the preamble at this stage. By the rules of the House, the consideration of the preamble must be postponed until after the clauses have been considered.

Mr. BUREAU: I thought we were considering the clauses. The preamble should not be read if it is not to be considered now. My mistake followed your error.

The CHAIRMAN: Rule 55 says:—

> In proceedings in Committee of the Whole House upon Bills, the preamble is first postponed, and then every clause considered by the Committee in its proper course; the preamble and title to be last considered.

On section 1—nomination of directors:

Mr. DEVLIN: What will be the salary of the directors?

Mr. J. D. REID: Section 5 provides:—

> The directors may be paid by the company such sums for their services as directors as the Governor in Council may from time to time approve.

Mr. DEVLIN: But we have not reached section 5 yet. Cannot the minister on this section inform us about how much the directors will get? We know that the Governor in Council may pay any salary at all.

Mr. J. D. REID: The present directors are getting $2,000 per annum, and as far as I know, that will continue to be the salary.

Mr. McMASTER: What duties will the directors be supposed to perform for this remuneration?

Mr. J. D. REID: At the present time the directors hold a meeting every week or every couple of weeks. The operation of the railway entails a lot of work, and the directors have to attend the meetings and perform the usual duties of directors of a railway company.

Mr. BUREAU: I was going to say something about your ruling on the preamble, Sir, but will not just now. Section 1 says that the Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient. Why not qualify the word "persons" to ensure that persons with railway experience will be appointed? Otherwise, the Governor in Council may appoint ordinary men like us. We have to suppose, of course, that the Governor General will always be advised wisely by Council; but we have seen such strange things lately that our minds are open to all sorts of suspicions, and the members here, representing the people, have had their privileges restricted to such an extent that we ought to take advantage of what remains to protect the people, who will pay for this railroad. A man cannot be assistant commissioner on the Railway Commission, for instance, without so many years' experience at the bar. Why not state the qualifications required, and then the Governor in Council could choose from those possessing those qualifications.

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot agree that we should limit the directors to those having railway experience.

Mr. BUREAU: Not all of them, but a certain number.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is always understood that there will be a certain number of officials on the board, but other companies, the Canadian Pacific, for example, have business men on their board. I think it is well to have business men on the board to assist and advise the officials of the road. Of course, a certain proportion of the board of directors should have railway experience. The Governor in Council would never appoint a board of directors composed entirely of men without railway experience. I hardly think it would be well to accept my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I would urge upon the Committee the advisability of eliminating political patronage from the administration of the Government Railway System. The credit of the country is involved in this undertaking to a tremendous extent, and this Government has been elected upon a pledge to abolish completely political patronage. I do not know whether that has been done. As far as the present board is concerned, I know that one of the gentlemen appointed, Mr. Laporte, is a successful wholesale grocer of the city of Montreal. As he is one of the very few friends of the Government in the province of Quebec, he is appointed to all the commissions set up by this Administration. I do not know that he has any special qualifications as a railway expert. Indeed, I believe that his qualification to be a member of all the commissions appointed by the Government lies in the fact that he is a friend and supporter of the Government.

Mr. ROBB: He is a Commissioner-General.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Yes, Commissioner-General for the province of Quebec. I am sure that policy will be continued if, when this Bill is passed, the authority of appointing directors still lies with the Governor in Council, notwithstanding the protestations of the Government that patronage has been abolished. I would suggest that instead of having the five or fifteen directors, as the case may be, appointed by the Governor in Council, they be appointed by this Parliament, which, after all, is the supreme authority. Let the majority of them be appointed by the Government and the minority by the Opposition. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice is laughing at the suggestion. Well, I knew he would laugh at it because, if it were adopted, it would deprive him and his friends of a fine source of patronage.

An hon. MEMBER: It is a Union Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Yes, it is a Union Government, but a queer union. If the suggestion I put forward were adopted it would be a guarantee to the people that there would be less political influence in the administration of the railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really did not know that my hon. friend intended his suggestion to be taken seriously, or I assure him I would not have smiled; but I was appreciating what I thought he himself understood to be a good joke. The suggestion that the Government should appoint the majority

of the directors and the Opposition appoint the others, as a means of abolishing patronage, did appear to me to show a source of humour in the hon. member. His logical mind will, of course, immediately perceive that so far from abolishing patronage it would ensure its creation, and that in double measure. It would be simply patronage squared. If the suggestion is seriously made that the Opposition should nominate the minority of the members of this Board, and the Government nominate the majority, and that this should be done in the name of the abolition of patronage, the matter admits of no discussion. I understood the hon. member for Three Rivers to state clearly and frankly that the proper method of appointment was by the Governor in Council, and that is the method now employed in the appointment of commissions certainly of equal responsibility. It is indeed the only method that has been found practicable at all in this or in any other country.

Can the hon. member suggest any commission that is appointed in any country by vote of Parliament? The Government, of course, is responsible to Parliament, but no one can point to a case where Parliament was divided into two parts, each part in its turn selecting its due proportion of the members of a commission. The bench of the country is appointed by the Governor in Council and for each appointment the Governor in Council is responsible to Parliament. This is the basic central and integral principle of our Constitution, and there is no reason for departing from it here, and for the life of me I cannot picture the consequences that might ensue from such a departure.

Mr. DEVLIN: The position taken by my hon. friend from Kamouraska appeals to me as a very sensible one. He asks that the majority of the directors be appointed by the Government and the minority by the Opposition. We in this House occupy, I suppose, a position different from that in any other Parliament in the civilized world. We have one side of the House divided into two camps—the Liberal camp and the Tory camp.

An hon. MEMBER: Camp followers.

Mr. DEVLIN: Camp followers. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior must not forget that the shareholders of this new company will be the people of Canada, not one section of the people, but all sections. We on this side of the House, as the hon. minister must observe, perhaps with regret, are a goodly number and withal a healthy number representing practically half of the shareholders of this company. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite have a majority of seven. With all their forces gathered they went up to eighteen to-day, and that is about the smallest normal majority that a Government has ever had in this country. They do not, therefore, represent very many more of the people of Canada than we do on this side of the House, and the hon. member for Kamouraska asks that the people represented by the Opposition should have some say in the nominataion of the directors who are to represent them. I heartily approve of the suggestion of my hon. friend and trust that the Minister of Railways will take it into earnest consideration and act upon it.

Mr. BUREAU: I think that if the Minister of the Interior really regards this suggestion as a joke, he casts a slur upon the Prime Minister. He will remember that in this House when conscription came up and it was the desire to eliminate patronage and favouritism, the Prime Minister asked the then leader of the Opposition to suggest a number of names of gentlemen who might act as judges. Was it not Parliament that did that? The Government chose their men and then the leader of the Opposition suggested names.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were nominated in Committee.

Mr. BUREAU: The same thing should be done here if it is the intention to eliminate politics. My hon. friend refers to the appointment of judges. You cannot remove a judge unless he is impeached. Under this Act it is provided: "The directors shall hold office from year to year unless removed by the Governor in Council for cause." The chairman of the Railway Commission, if he were a judge of the Superior Court could not be removed by the Governor in Council even for cause; the matter must be brought before Parliament. The chairman of the Railway Commission cannot be as politically useful to this or any Government as the Board of Railway Directors who will manage these railways. We know very well what it means, for we have seen it in operation on the Intercolonial, and I think there is nothing to be laughed at in the suggestion. If the Government desire the people to believe that the Canadian National Railways are operated for the advantage of the country, honestly and free from political influence, I think the suggestion of the hon. member

for Kamouraska should be taken up by the Minister of Railways, and if fifteen directors are to be appointed the Opposition should have the right to nominate five, and the Government ten, and if you are going to appoint five the Opposition could appoint the minority. The proposition is a fair and democratic one, although it may be hard for my hon. friend to appreciate it, as he has been accustomed to run the show his own way, coming to Parliament and saying, "Swallow this," as he did to-day and yesterday. He had a little innocent Bill of five lines. We were asked to swallow a whole sheaf of Orders in Council. I do not intend to swallow them in that way. There may be some of them that I might have to spit out before I got them down. I submit that this suggestion of my hon. friend from Kamouraska ought to be adopted and that this proposed provision should be inserted in clause one. All the appointments I have seen have been made through the Governor in Council so far, but these appointments have been safeguarded. The case of judges was cited by the Acting Minister of Justice, but the judges are safeguarded by the fact that the Governor in Council, once they are appointed, cannot put them out. The chairman of the Railway Commission is in the same position; the Governor in Council cannot touch him. You have to come before the House and practically impeach him the same as you would have to do in the case of a judge. But in this case it is entirely different. Patronage is going to be exercised and these appointees are going to control the business of a railway line extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and involving the expenditure of millions of dollars. As has been said by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, we in Quebec have reason to ask for this amendment, because Sir Hormidas Laporte has been a universal commissioner both under the Tory and the Union Governments. It is the same thing so far. I would suggest that the clause be amended so as to read:

The Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient, not less than five, nor more than fifteen, to be directors of the company hereby incorporated, upon the suggestion of the House of Commons, the minority being nominated by the minority in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to assure the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) that I have no intention of asking the House to swallow anything. Certainly I never need ask the hon. member for Three Rivers, because he has shown a wonderful capacity for swallowing himself. It is only about fifteen minutes since he told this Committee that these people should be appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: I have seen better since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has seen better since. So that I never could ask the hon. gentleman to swallow anything; he is capable of doing that himself.

Mr. BUREAU: Anything that is reasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all I will ever ask of the hon. member. He refers to different appointments that are made for a fixed period of time and in which the appointeees are removable by vote of Parliament upon impeachment and appointments to which that permanency does not attach, and his doctrine appears to be that if permanency attaches to an appointment then appointment by the Governor in Council is not patronage, but if permanency does not attach, and if the appointments are therefore less desirable, appointment by the Governor in Council is patronage and should be done away with. It would occur to any one that the very opposite of that proposition is correct; that the more desirable the appointment, the greater the patronage power of the appointor. As a matter of fact, the Chairman of the Railway Commission is not removable in the same way as are the other members of that commission. I think he must hold his office for ten years unless by vote of Parliament. I do not know just exactly what the provisions are. There is at all events an element of permanency to it that does not apply to the appointment of the other commissioners. The other commissioners are exactly of the same status as are these appointees as suggested by this Bill and are removable by the Governor in Council for cause. That is the case with the present Bill. The reason the chairman is placed in a different category is, I think, only in the event of his being taken from the bench because when he leaves the bench he leaves an appointment that has necessarily the element of permanency in it. I presume that was the reason that actuated Parliament away back in 1903 in attaching that condition to the chairmanship of the Railway Commission. There is no necessity for that in this case. I do not know that Parliament would like to approve of a Bill in a form that would bind the hands of the Government, which is responsible for

the proper management of this railway, to maintain in office an appointee who perhaps would not attend to his duties. That feature of it is in no way associated with patronage. The appointee is now only removable for cause just as the members of the Railway Commission are removable. In the fifteen or twenty years that the Railway Commission has been in existence there has never been an occasion for the removal of any member of the commission.

5 p.m.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): The railway commissioners are not operating railways. They have no occasion to exercise patronage.

Mr. BUREAU: They may favour one company or another but they cannot exercise patronage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They favour one company and they favour individuals; they are one of the most powerful commissions that the country ever had. They have an authority that is vast and could be exercised, if one could conceive of it being so exercised, from the patronage standpoint, which is altogether inconceivable. I think the apprehensions of hon. gentlemen opposite are not justified and really I do not think they are serious in suggesting that the officials, who must be responsible to the country for the actual operation of a great business enterprise, should be appointed not by the authority that itself is responsible to the people's representatives, but by a division of the forces in Parliament.

Mr. CAHILL: Was there not a recommendation in the Drayton-Acworth report that the directors should be appointed in some other way than by the Government? The minister speaks of the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council would nominate ultimately the directors suggested by the Opposition party, but they would be more apt to have a more uniform set of directors if they were nominated in that way than if they were nominated by the Government alone. Before we vote on this question I would like to ask the minister what were the causes that led to the conclusion that those who are now members of this board should be appointed as directors. On what ground did he arrive at the decision that these were the proper men?

Mr. J. D. REID: Mr. Hanna and Mr. Mitchell were officials of the company. Mr. Hanna was president and Mr. Mitchell was vice-president and financial controller. They are two of the leading officials of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. On account of their positions in the company they were appointed to the board. Then Mr. Woods, another director, had been on the board for ten or twelve years. He is a prominent citizen of Toronto and by reason of his experience in connection with the work of the road we considered that he would be a very valuable man to have on that board.

Mr. Hobson is a very prominent man in Hamilton and a man in whom, I think, the people of Canada have confidence. His father was chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway for very many years, and I understand that the son worked for seventeen or eighteen years as assistant engineer under his father on the same railway. I considered that Mr. Hobson would be a valuable member of the Board. Taking the province of Quebec, Mr. Jones is a man of prominence, who has had a good business experience, and he also is one in whom everybody has great confidence. Mr. Jones, I think, was for a time general manager of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Nova Scotia, and knows the country well. The company, I understand, owns and operates a railway, and doubtless Mr. Jones has acquired some experience in that regard. At all events he is a leading business man, and one in whom I felt the people would have confidence if he were made a member of the Board. Mr. Laporte has been in business in the city of Montreal as a wholesale grocer, but is likewise connected with numerous public institutions. I think he is president of one of the banks there, is more or less identified with various industries, and is held in high esteem. I think his appointment was well received in the province of Quebec. As to Mr. Barnhill, I believe he was a barrister in St. John. He is a very prominent citizen in New Brunswick, and is connected with large business interests in that province. From the reports that I received when we were making these appointments, I think that no better selection could be made from that province. Mr. Cantlie is from Nova Scotia, and is identified with various large industries there. He was selected on account of his standing in Nova Scotia and his connection with the industrial life of the province. Turning to the West, we have Mr. Riley, of Winnipeg. He is a citizen of undoubted standing and connected with large institutions in Manitoba. Mr. Hamilton is a foremost citizen of Saskatchewan and has been associated with Farmers' Institutes in Western Canada. I felt that we should have on the Board a representa-

tive of farmers in Western Canada, and that was the reason for appointing Mr. Hamilton. In choosing these directors our main object was to secure prominent and reliable men in whom the public would place every confidence. Any person who is not familiar with these gentlemen will, by making inquiry, satisfy himself that better appointments could not have been made, bearing in mind business ability and reputation for honesty. Political patronage did not enter into these appointments for the reason that the gentlemen selected have not been prominent in politics in the past as far as I am aware. They have not had any political affiliations at all, to my knowledge, and were appointed solely on their merits.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister has said that politics was not taken into consideration in making these appointments. Would he be good enough to say how many of the men whom he has mentioned as directors of the Canadian Northern railway voted for the Liberal party at the last election?

Mr. J. D. REID: I did not inquire personally of these gentlemen but I believe that a great many of them have been Liberal in their political views in the past. They may not have voted for the Liberal party at the last election—I cannot say whether they did or not—but there is no doubt that they have been known and recognized as prominent Liberals in the past.

Mr. CAHILL: Ex-Liberals.

Mr. POWER: I am somewhat surprised to hear the minister, particularly after his declaration last evening in favour of the returned soldiers, name a whole board of directors, not one of whom comes within that category. The minister should know, as every person in the House knows, that our Canadian railway troops accomplished miracles in France, and showed the Old Country how to build and operate railroads. It seems to me that this is peculiarly a sphere wherein the work of the returned soldier, who surpassed himself in building and operating railroads in France, should be utilized for the good of the country. We have been told that efforts are being made to give returned soldiers positions everywhere, but the very moment an important position is available, a position which the returned soldier could fill with undoubted success owing to his special qualifications, he is passed over, and we get instead the hacks of the Canadian Northern railway. I am opposed to this clause for another reason. The Government nominates a certain number of directors and naturally and inevitably the men so nominated will favour it. They are removable for cause but I never knew a Government, be it Liberal or Conservative, who could not get rid of a public servant when it wished to do so; and I imagine that whoever is appointed a director on this Board will feel it incumbent upon him, if he wishes to keep his position, to satisfy the demands of the ministers and the members who support the Government. We will therefore have, as we have had in the past, on both sides of politics, a carnival of political patronage and corruption such as has been witnessed on the Intercolonial railway for the past fifty years, and to such an extent that we will be unable ever to see our way clear out of the railway mess into which the country has got. I cannot in conscience give my support to a measure which will place eight or nine thousand, and perhaps more, miles of railroad under the control of men who are responsible to nobody but the Government.

Mr. FIELDING: I suppose the appointments under discussion are only of a temporary character, and are not necessarily confirmed by this Bill. Should the measure be adopted by Parliament it will be necessary, I presume, to make new appointments under its provisions. Whether the board be composed of the same members or not is another question. With all that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) have said as to the desirability of having this board so organized as to put it beyond the question of political patronage, and of having it so organized as to represent all the interests of the country, and that the Government must be held responsible for making appointments of that character, I very heartily agree.

I must say, however, that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) in the suggestion that Parliament should make the appointments. We have no precedent for that. In our system of Government it has always been deemed necessary to mark the distinction between the executive and the legislative powers. I think I am right in saying that, with the exception of the hon. Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, it is not a part of our system that the House of Commons shall directly appoint anybody; all appointments must properly be made, and should be made (with the single exceptions I have mentioned) by the Governor in Coun-

cil. To that extent I think the hon. member for Kamouraska if he presses his amendment—I hope he will not—will be laying down a principle which will be most embarrassing not only in this case but in all cases hereafter. I entirely agree with him that in the making of appointments to this board due regard should be had to see that it represents all classes and all interests in the country.

This is a tremendous experiment upon which Canada is entering. It is a big thing even as it stands to-day, but it is going to be much bigger apparently before this session ends. I would strongly urge my hon. friend from Kamouraska not to press his amendment. I think that all that has been said by him with regard to the appointment of the board, and the views of my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Power) with respect to the appointment of returned soldiers from the Railway Engineering Corps, should engage the serious attention of the Government. But I do not think we should be asked to declare that this House shall exercise executive powers.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member is quite right, the present directors were only appointed pending the passing of this Bill, when the whole matter will have to be again considered. The suggestion as to returned soldiers and the other suggestions that have been made will have to be dealt with. There is no doubt that the Government will have to give its most serious consideration to the matter with the view to having the very best men appointed to the board of directors. We want to make this railway system a success, and it cannot be a success unless it is operated free from political or any other interference. If we take in the Grand Trunk we will have nearly a billion dollars railway investment, and the Government will be responsible for its proper management. It must be remembered that the Government really will have put in these railways only $10,000,000, the amount which we have so far in the capital of the Canadian Northern Railway. It is true that the Government will have to look after the bonds outstanding, and see that every care is taken in the protection of the investments, although it did not itself borrow the money.

So far as I am personally concerned, while in the past I was not in favour of public ownership, let me say that I have the greatest confidence in the railway system that the Government now owns. I do not think after all that the results of last year were so very bad in regard to the Canadian Northern Railway. The net earnings were about $3,500,000, and the loss, after paying fixed charges, was some $7,000,000 odd. It is true that a large amount of money had to be expended in rolling stock, that money being borrowed on equipment bonds, as was done in the past; but we all know that the Canadian Northern had very little rolling stock when it was taken over. I am satisfied that if we all join in excluding patronage or any other interference with the board of directors our railways will be a success. So far as I am concerned as minister, I think that the board of directors would not hesitate to say that I have done everything possible to prevent any interference with them since the Government took these railways over.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Might I ask the hon. minister if it is proposed to appoint a director from British Columbia? I have not heard him mention British Columbia, but, as he knows, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific have large interests in that province and considerable mileage, and there is a very strong feeling that there should be a director from that province. Of course, I know that perhaps here in the East it is not considered necessary to regard the views of British Columbia on all occasions; but really in connection with these railroad matters we feel it is very necessary that a man from British Columbia should be on the directorate. There should be no trouble in getting a returned soldier there, one who is fully qualified in all respects to act as a director. I hope the minister is considering such an appointment.

Mr. J. D. REID: That question will have to be taken up when we are settling the new Board of Directors. Every province is asking for a man to be appointed from within its boundaries. Other suggestions have been made to me in connection with the operation of these railways which might also be taken into consideration. One gentleman suggested that we appoint a board of about seven or eight men, such board to comprise at least four of the most prominent officials of the road. And remember, the officials that we put in these positions must be the very best men that we can appoint. Then he suggested that we also appoint a prominent labour man and about two prominent outside men who would give their whole time and attention to the operation of this road, reporting, of course, to the Government from time to time. Other suggestions have been made, such as the appointment of a returned sol-

dier, or the appointment of a man from British Columbia or some other province. If this were my own property I would turn it over to seven or eight of the very best men I could get in Canada at good salaries, and I would not care whether they all came from British Columbia, Quebec or any other province, so long as they were the very best men, men with extensive railway experience and enjoying the confidence of the people of Canada. Unless we start out with the very best men in charge of this system, with a free hand to operate it as the Canadian Pacific railway is operated, I do not believe we can make it a success.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. D. REID: And I have the fullest confidence that the members of this House and the people of this country will give the directors to be appointed an opportunity to show what they can do with this railway system. If they are given that opportunity and that policy is carried out, I am confident that good results will follow the operation of the railway. Canada will have one of the best assets it has ever had; the people, in the East as well as in the West, will get a better service than they have ever had, and more people will be induced to come into the country. When this Bill passes and the Government comes to appoint a Board of Directors, we will consider the suggestions made by British Columbia and the other provinces. The Government, of course, must assume the responsibility of deciding what is the best way of managing this railway. If the Grand Trunk is taken in we shall have twenty or twenty-five thousand miles of railway to operate, and I repeat that we cannot take chances on any man or any board of directors by restricting ourselves to taking them from any particular provinces. Let us get the very best men we can find in Canada. The employees whom I have learned to know on the Canadian Government railways, including the Canadian Northern, are as good a lot of men as can be found on any railway in the world. Give them a chance, and you will see what the result will be.

Mr. DEVLIN: When does the minister expect to get the Grand Trunk?

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot answer that.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has the minister any idea when he is going to get the Grand Trunk?

Mr. J. D. REID: No.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does the minister know anything about the acquisition of the Grand Trunk?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member knows exactly what the position is. The Acting Prime Minister said a few days ago that negotiations were going on in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Those negotiations cannot be completed in a day or in a few days. They are proceeding, and as soon as any information is available that should be given to the House, it will be given.

Mr. DEVLIN: Has any progress been made in the negotiations?

Mr. J. D. REID: Progress is always being made.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am sure that the country will be gratified to hear the minister say that although at the outset he was prejudiced against public ownership, the limited experience that he has had has satisfied him that public ownership of this great system or galaxy of systems that the country has acquired can be made a success. That statement is particularly gratifying, coming from the source that it does. It is also gratifying to hear the minister's reply to our friend from British Columbia (Mr. McQuarrie). It would be a mistake to restrict the selection of members of the board to particular sections of the country. While there is no objection to various sections of the Dominion being represented on the board, no course that I can think of would be so disastrous as that of subordinating the selection of the best men that can be obtained in the country to selection from particular sections of the Dominion. If Kamouraska had the men who were required to run this system of publicly-owned railways then the men should be taken exclusively from Kamouraska. It is gratifying to know that the minister's view is so clear in that regard. I was struck with an interview given by Lord Shaughnessy in which he sneers at public ownership and tries to discredit it in advance. I hope that the views of the more or less noble lord will have no influence on the action of this House or on the opinion of the people with regard to public ownership. I should like to tell the noble lord that this country contributed to the Canadian Pacific Railway enough in cash, in exemption from taxation, and in other things more than double the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of its equipment. It does not reflect very highly on the more or less noble lord that he should sneer at public ownership and use his influence to destroy the idea in advance. Through no fault of its own, through no action of its own, this country must adopt

public ownership of railways. What is the alternative? After this country has paid such enormous sums, such colossal sums, such appalling sums, for the construction of these various railroads, are we to continue pouring hundreds of millions into the maw of the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, or even the old Grand Trunk? Surely the time has come when—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. When the hon. gentleman referred to the interview in question I thought it was merely by way of illustration. He is now discussing the merits and demerits of public ownership, which certainly is not in accordance with the rule that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to clause under consideration.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is the clause, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The nomination of directors for the new Canadian National Railway Company.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am one of those members who always bows to the ruling of the Chair, but in a manner my discussion was relevant, because if we were to follow Lord Shaughnessy's suggestions we would not have any—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman's discussion would have been in order when the principle of the Bill was being considered on the second reading, but certainly is not in order when the discussion is confined absolutely to the clause now under consideration.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I had practically finished the remarks I proposed to address to the Committee, anyway. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. DEVLIN: Call him "Mr. Shaughnessy," not "the noble lord."

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I suppose my hon. friend wishes me to adopt the language that he would adopt if he were speaking. I am quite willing to follow his suggestion; if he thinks it ought to be "Mr. Shaughnessy," I have no objection.

Mr. BUREAU: The member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) says that this amendment is a departure from the old rule. I think that what we are doing to-day is a departure from the rule that has been followed up to now. Formerly we had one Government-owned railway, the Intercolonial, which was run by the Minister of Railways; to-day we have a number of railways, which are going to be run by a company on the same principle as that on which a privately-owned railway is run. The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) says that Parliament is assuming executive powers. I do not agree. We are delegating the executive power to the company, and control over that executive may be retained by the Governor in Council. I say that we are the proxies of the shareholders, and the directors should be appointed by the shareholders.

Mr. FIELDING: Then they would have to be appointed by the people direct.

Mr. BUREAU: We are the proxies of the people. We have their mandate to represent their interests here, whether it is to appoint a board of directors or do anything else. This is not a question of legislation. It was not a question of legislation when the Prime Minister asked my leader in 1917 to help choose a joint committee to appoint the judges in connection with the exemption tribunals. The object then was to remove from the mind of the people the idea that any political patronage would be exercised by the people nominated. I say that we are the natural and the actual proxies of the people, and we should have our say in the appointment of the directors. I quite agree that there are details of administration which should be under the control of the Governor in Council, and for which he should be responsible. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice has said that I have swallowed myself. I am ready to swallow myself a thousand times when I see a member of this House make a better suggestion than my own. I am willing to judge myself when I have rendered a bad judgment. I am not proposing this amendment for effect; I do not want my hon. friend to measure me by his own yard-stick. I am proposing it because I believe it is for the good of the country, and my hon. friend's sneers and irony will not prevent me from stating in this House what I think is right and taking the position which I think is right. I think in this case the hon. member for Kamouraska was right in principle. I beg leave to withdraw my amendment, to give my hon. friend from Brome an opportunity to present another which is better worded.

Mr. McMASTER: I beg to suggest an amendment along the lines proposed by the hon. member for Three Rivers. The situation that confronts this country is this:

whether we like it or not, we are entering upon public ownership on a large scale, and many of us are entering upon it with a certain amount of fear. But we wish to see the experiment succeed, because if it does not succeed the situation which will confront the country will be very serious indeed. One of the conditions which will operate for the success of public ownership will be to remove the administration of the railways from any possibility of political or party control. How can we do that? The Government in this Bill proposes to name a Board of Directors, not less than five, nor more than fifteen. The suggestion is made that the board should be named, not by the Government, which after all represents only one party in this House,—the Unionist party,—but by Parliament, the representatives of the people. I have worked out a scheme which I commend to the sympathetic consideration of the House. I would amend section 1 to read as follows:

> The Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient, not less than five, nor more than fifteen, to be directors of the company hereby incorporated, from a list of not more than fifteen to be furnished by the House of Commons, said list to be composed as follows: Sixty per cent thereof by nomination of those members supporting the Government, and forty per cent by nomination of those members composing His Majesty's loyal Opposition, and upon such nomination being made the persons so nominated, and their successors, and such other persons as may from time to time be nominated in accordance with the above mentioned plan mutatis mutandis by the Governor in Council as directors shall be and are hereby incorporated as a company, under the name of 'Canadian National Railway Company,' hereinafter called the Company.

This is an attempt to have the Government furnished with a list of the full complement of directors for this company, sixty per cent being named by the supporters of the Government, and forty per cent by those who oppose the Government; and from that list the directors shall be chosen. If it is decided that only ten directors are required, the Government would name six and the Opposition four. It may be said that there is no precedent for this. I quite admit that, but we are launching on an absolutely new plan, and I think I am right when I state that the plan adopted by the Government of forming a quasi-independent company to operate the Government railways is a plan which has not been tried in any country in the world. The Government, however, has thought that it is the best plan. Let us endeavour to start right by eliminating all possibility of party patronage. We have no precedent to guide us; we are breaking new ground; let us break that new ground right.

Mr. KEEFER: This amendment is no different in principle from that moved by the hon. member for Three Rivers. It is more vicious in introducing the principle of patronage, because it introduces forty per cent of it whereas the other motion introduced only thirty-three per cent, or five out of fifteen. We have had an illustration here this afternoon of the practical inability to get along when you have factions in a House; and the same thing applies to a board of directors. The Government of the day is responsible to this House; this House meets annually, and it is within the jurisdiction of this House to haul over the coals annually the Government of the day and the directors of this road. So I do not see why we need trouble so much about the question of patronage.

Mr. BUREAU: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Mr. KEEFER: I agree, and it is for that very reason I say we should not adopt this principle, because it would open the door to patronage much more widely than if the appointments were left to the Government of the day, which would be responsible for the acts of all these directors. The Government of the day could not be responsible for the appointees of the Opposition on the board of directors. The Government is not responsible to-day for the acts of the Opposition in this House—I am speaking in a friendly and logical way. There is a vital principle here at stake—the principle of responsibility to the people. Now if this Government is going to make ducks and drakes of this road, they may do it for a year, but I take it that the people of this country and this Parliament are sufficiently independent to see that no Government shall hold office for more than twelve months that makes ducks and drakes of the millions of dollars worth of capital invested in this system. Section 2 specifically provides that the directors shall hold office ' from year to year '. I do not like that expression. I prefer ' from one annual meeting to the next '. Therefore, any complaints against the board of directors can be threshed out annually in Parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: There is one respect in which the amendment of the hon. member for Brome is important. We are living in times when, I suppose, we must establish

new precedents, but my hon. friend is introducing in the form of statute law something that is not to be found in the law of Canada, and I doubt if it can be found in the statute law of any British country in the world. The hon. member seeks to introduce into our statute law the recognition of political parties. It is a curious fact that while our British system of Government is derived from parties, and party is its very essence, there is no formal recognition of parties.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it not true that the leader of the Opposition receives a salary?

Mr. FIELDING: It is, that is the exception, and I think the precedent has been followed recently in the Legislature of Ontario. In the United States parties are often recognized. There Acts of Congress provide that certain commissions shall be composed of so many Democrats and so many Republicans. Under our system of government, however, we have never so recognized that principle. It is, as I say, an interesting and curious fact that while we have party government and party is the essence of the system, nevertheless our statute law has never recognized party at all, except in the one case referred to.

Mr. POWER: What about the War-Time Elections Act?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not as familiar with all that Act as I should be. To what does the hon. member particularly refer?

Mr. POWER: I refer to the fact that the leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister named the candidates that received their approval, and also the fact that the ballot was printed, "Vote for Government," or "Vote for Opposition." If that is not recognizing parties I do not know what is.

Mr. FIELDING: The War-Time Elections Act is about the last Act that I would be willing to accept as my guide. But I think it is a grave and serious thing for us to introduce into our general legislation this principle of recognizing parties.

What my hon. friend says as to the desirability of having both sides represented and abolishing patronage is all right. Of course the idea of taking these railways entirely out of politics is a dream and a delusion. You will never take any service completely out of politics so long as a dollar of the people's money goes into it. We may as well make up our minds to that. But an effort is being made, we are told, to conduct this enterprise without reference to politics and I should like to be helpful in that direction. I sympathize with the object of my hon. friend from Brome, but I think he is introducing a very inconvenient principle which would embarrass us hereafter.

Mr. CAHILL: The hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora referred to the fact of the Government being responsible to Parliament. He will probably remember that a few days ago there was a question on the Order Paper inquiring of the Minister of Railways whether the Canadian Northern were buying their ties from the Northern Construction Company, at what price, and so on, and the Minister of Railways answered that it was not in the public interest to give the information. Will the hon. member support a government that makes an answer of that kind, or is he sincere when he says that hon. members are independent? I can see no independence on that side of the House. I think this Bill should be taken before the Railway Committee in order that we might have a clear non-partisan discussion of this question. The minister insisted that it should be kept here, and the moment an amendment was moved, hon. members began to come into the House. I think I am quite safe in the prediction that when this amendment is voted on you will find most members on this side of the House—possibly not all because we sometimes vote independently—will support it but all members on the other side will vote against it. That is practically assured. Now, if at this session, when the people are vitally interested in public ownership of railways, questions put on the Order Paper are to be answered by the statement that it is not in the public interest to give the information asked for, what can we expect from the supporters of the Government in this matter? The Acting Prime Minister in 1917 stated, as will be seen in Hansard, that this road should be taken out of politics entirely, and its management made responsible only to Parliament. The Prime Minister himself made absolutely the same statement last year when he said that the administration should be taken out of politics and be answerable only to Parliament. The Drayton-Acworth Commission in their report recommended that it should be taken out of politics and now we have a Bill before us with absolutely no explanation of where the Government have received the information that has led them to change their minds from the view clearly expressed by the leader of the Gov-

ernment and by the Acting Prime Minister. If on this important subject of the Directorate, their appointment, and their recall, and the management, there is no greater interest among the members to your right than has been shown here to-day, the outlook will be serious. Will the Acting Prime Minister explain on what authority he now bases his change of view in regard to the appointment of directors, and on what authority does the Government change the view expressed by the Prime Minister when he said that this matter should be taken out of the hands of the Government and be made accountable only to Parliament. I think the answer to that question would be of value to the committee and to the country.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are two ways in which the Government Railways of Canada could be administered. In the first place, they could be administered, as the Intercolonial was administered, by direct action of the Department of Railways under the immediate authority and control of the Minister of Railways. That would mean that in the case of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Intercolonial, which for administration purposes is now connected with it, the Government of the day would immediately control the administration and operations of the entire system of railways. Now we are getting away from that. The Government of the day will appoint the directors of the Canadian National Railway system. Those men will have as their duty the administration of that system and will not be subject to immediate interference on the part of the Government. We appointed some time ago a Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and so far as I know, these men have had an absolutely free hand, subject only to this, that with regard to expenditures the Government must be consulted.

I am exceedingly desirous, as I am sure the Government is, that this system should be administered absolutely in the public interest without interference on the part of governments having regard to political considerations. I do not know of any way in which it can be done consistently with the principle of responsible government other than that suggested here, namely, that the Government should appoint those who are to administer the system, these men to have a free hand in the administration.

If they are the right kind of men—and I submit that the appointments which have been made have been creditable to the Government—they will not brook any interference on the part of the Government. The greatest safeguard that could be had against political interference should be in the character and standing of the men appointed to the board. My own view is that public ownership will be a success in Canada in almost direct proportion to the character, integrity, responsibility and ability of those who control and direct the operations of the Government system. The greatest service that the Government can render in reference to transportation in so far as it is under Government administration, is in the appointment of first-class men of the highest standing in the community, men of such self respect that they will feel that they will be judged so much by the success of their administration of the system that they will not brook any interference on the part of the Government.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), we are working under the British constitutional practice in this country. I cannot conceive of a division of responsibility between Government and Opposition. Even if we agreed to a division of responsibility between Government and Opposition, it is the Government who would be responsible both in Parliament and before the country. The Government cannot under any system free itself of its responsibility for the administration of the Canadian National Railway System by permitting the Opposition to name forty per cent of the board. If we did that and there was friction, let us say on the board, who would be held responsible? Who are the Opposition in this House? You might have three parties in the House. As pointed out by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens there is no such thing as a recognized Opposition under our constitutional system.

Mr. BUREAU: There is under the statute.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, it is for a particular purpose only; it must be general. The War-time Elections Act was mentioned. But look at the situation; there were hundreds of thousands of soldiers overseas whose votes had to be taken.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not the case I refer to. I refer to the statute that provides for a payment of $7,000 to the recognized leader of the Opposition.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is particular legislation from which general conclusions should not be drawn. I think it is incontrovertible that under our constitutional system every Government must assume re-

sponsibility and it cannot devolve it upon the Opposition. It must be responsible for the administration of the National Railway system. The Government will be held responsible by this Parliament. It is absolutely unsound, in my judgment, to get away from that principle.

I think I have met all the arguments put forward by my hon. friend who preceded me. As I said, the Government desires, as far as possible, that this system shall be administered absolutely without regard to politics. An earnest of the Government's intention in that regard may be found in the character of the men who, from time to time, have been appointed to the board. Public ownership will be a success only as a result of the human agencies which are employed in its administration. You may have the best machinery in the world, but it is from the men who administer that machinery that the results are to be got. It seems to me that my hon. friend, who is thoroughly familiar with constitutional practice, might very well consider whether he is wise in pressing a resolution which is in violation, as I understand them, of the constitutional principles upon which the Government is conducted under the British system.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was rather surprised to find gentlemen with such good sense as the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) take the position which is represented in the amendment before the Committee. They, and those who think with them, must see, because they are gentlemen of experience, how impossible the proposition is that the Oposition should be allowed to nominate forty per cent of the membership of the Board of Directors. Let me point out the practice that is followed in the case of the election of directors of joint stock companies. When there is an election of directors of a joint stock company, there may be different factions, but a slate is selected, and those composing the slate that wins are the directors who administer the affairs of the company for the ensuing year. Now if the plan suggested in the amendment proposed here were adopted it would defeat, I fancy, the very object that its supporters have in view. You would introduce factionalism into the board, you would immediately have a division, you would doubtless have in addition to the gentlemen representing the majority of the board a leader of an opposition as well, and there would be in my judgment no possibility of arriving at amicable decisions—you would have two factions on the board and you would have complications in the administration of its affairs. The members of the board nominated by the Opposition would feel themselves under a special obligation to those who nominated them and would be sure to run with their whisperings and promptings to the leaders in the House. Under circumstances of that kind you could not have governmental responsibility at all. It seems to me that the position which the Acting Prime Minister took in the House this afternoon is the only tenable one. After all, the Government must be responsible for the administration of the affairs of this railway system. We all recall the position of the leader of the Opposition taken a few days ago on the subject of Daylight Saving, when he twitted the Government with abandoning its responsibility. The position then taken by him was that the Government should have accepted the responsibility in regard to Daylight Saving and should have come before the House with a proposition. Because the matter was thrown open for the judgment of the House the Government was criticised, and you would find identically the same thing occur in the case under consideration only in a much more aggravated form. I was particularly struck with the logical position taken by the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) a man of large political and business experience who enjoys the respect of the great majority of the people of this country. That hon. gentleman pointed out with great force how absurd and unworkable is the proposal of the hon. member for Kamouraska and the hon. member for Brome. It is perfectly true that the Opposition in a British Parliament is not recognized constitutionally, although a precedent has been established by paying the leader of the Opposition a salary. Far be it from me to minimize the valuable services that an Opposition leader renders to a country. I am prepared to admit that the present leader of the Opposition in this House is a man of very great ability and performs services that are very valuable to Canada, but I do not believe that the precedent laid down of recognizing an Opposition in the way it has been recognized is after all a good one.

The hon. member for Pontiac Mr. Cahill) spoke of the creation of a new precedent, and claimed that the Government was evading responsibility. The Drayton-Acworth Report, as I remember it, suggested this very thing—the creation of a company to carry on the affairs of a national system of railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Would the hon. member be kind enough to read just what the Drayton-Acworth Report says on that subject?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have not a copy of the report before me.

Mr. CAHILL: I will give the hon. gentleman a copy.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. gentleman can read what he wishes after I have concluded my remarks. I am speaking subject to correction, and I do not wish to put the hon. gentleman in a position which he does not wish to occupy, but my recollection of the report is that the commissioners suggest the creation of a company to carry on the affairs of the nationally-owned railways. It seems to me that that is the only proper and feasible plan under which this great enterprise can be conducted. As the Acting Prime Minister said, you have either to adopt that plan of continue the old system of managing these roads under the Department of Railways which has not proven an entire success in the past. I take it that it is in order to get away from the old system that the present proposal of the Government has been submitted to the House. As the Acting Prime Minister stated, the matter is one that public opinion will regulate. We have some little idea of the class of men that the Governor in Council in its present mood would appoint as directors of the company. If you take the calibre of the men who were appointed as directors of the Canadian Northern Railway after that road passed into the hands of the country, you will find that it would be very difficult to improve upon the personnel of the Board, because some men of the highest character and integrity have been appointed. I like the argument advanced by the Acting Prime Minister:—that there is so much at stake in this great issue, so vast and far-reaching will be the interests of the nationally owned railways, that the whole country would be in jeopardy if this railroad system were not well managed. The Acting Prime Minister pointed out further, and I think pointed out with great force, that public opinion would regulate the appointments. After these appointments were made, under the system proposed in the Bill, year after year, when this House meets, it will be possible to criticise, and criticise severely, if occasion necessitates, the conduct of the Board or of any member of it. I am satisfied that a keen public opinion, in view of the vast importance of the question, will regulate the matter of the membership of the Board. I suggest to my hon. friends opposite the desirability of considering the effect of the amendment which they have proposed before pressing it upon the committee. I feel sure it must have been brought forward without due consideration, and I am also satisfied from my knowledge of the gentlemen responsible for it that if they carefully consider its effect they will not press the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: I listened with a great deal of attention to what the Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon concerning the unconstitutionality of the amendment which I proposed, and I believe that a great deal of weight should be given to his opinion. I have the gravest doubts as to the constitutionality of the whole scheme as outlined; it seems to me that the Government is swallowing a camel and straining at a gnat. However the responsibility has to be upon the Government and I shall withdraw the amendment, at the same time stating that if anything would have led me to insist upon the proposition, it would have been the remarks made by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson).

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. BUREAU: The amendment which has been withdrawn follows the suggestion advanced in the Drayton-Acworth Report. At page 3 of part 5 of that report the commissioners state:

> We now proceed to set out these recommendations in more detail. The trustees should be five in number. The first trustees should be named in the Act of Parliament constituting the board.

That is the first thing the Commissioners say. They are men who have made a special study of, and conducted a special investigation into, these matters, and I believe they know what they are talking about. They recommend:

They recommend:

> 1. That a Board of Trustees be constituted by Act of Parliament and incorporated as "The Dominion Railway Company."

That is now being carried out by the hon. Minister of Railways in this Bill.

> 2. That the ownership of the Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways be vested in this company.

3. That the Government assume responsibility to the company for the interest on the existing securities of these undertakings.

The constitution of the Board of Trustees and their tenure of office are dealt with in another paragraph:

The trustees should be five in number. The first trustees should be named in the Act of Parliament constituting the board.

The tenure of office should be the same as that of Judges of the Supreme Court—

My hon. friend, the Acting Minister of Justice, this afternoon argued, if I understood him correctly, that such a long term would not be advisable in a case like this.

Three trustees, one of whom should be chairman, should, if possible, be men of railway experience. They should be required to give their whole time to their duties, and salaries should be fixed adequate to command the services of the best men. Of the two remaining trustees, we think it would be desirable that one should be selected on the ground of business and financial experience, and the other as specially possessing the confidence of railway employees.

The Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon that the only way to make the Canadian Government railways succeed was to appoint the best men in the land to manage them. We all believe that; in fact, we all know it. If you get the best men, and they give all their time and attention to the Government railway system, it will be a success. But we do not think the Government will appoint the best men. That is why we want the responsibility to be taken by Parliament. My hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) said this afternoon: Let the Government take the responsibility, and get after them when you come to the House if they do not do right. What is the use? Take the Star last night, which contained a comparison between the way in which the troops were handled by the Canadian Pacific Railway and by the Canadian Government Railway. An instance is given of the Canadian Government Railway train being three hours late at a point a few miles out of Quebec, but the Canadian Pacific took the troops over and brought them into Montreal on time. Yesterday they were waiting for a Canadian Government train which was first announced at two o'clock, then at three o'clock, and at seven o'clock it had not come in. Who raises a kick in the House, who calls attention to the fact? When our troop trains were jumping off the track every now and then nobody said anything in this House. What is the use? Suppose we say: Those trustees are no good; they have done this or that. Well, they have done it, and it is no use locking the stable door after the horse is gone. You need to have such a board as will command the confidence not only of the railway employees, as the commissioners say, but of the public in general, of all the stockholders, and I think that that or a similar suggestion ought to be adopted. I do not see that we are getting away from any constitutional point. As the Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon, there are only two ways of running Government railways—you have either to run them by the Government through the Minister of Railways; or to run them by a commission or board of trustees or a company. We are now proposing to organize a company, and if we are to organize it, I think there ought to be no difference between it and any private railway company. The stockholders ought to elect the directors, and then the administrative duties of the directors ought to be looked after by the Governor in Council.

Mr. POWER: Since speaking on this clause this afternoon and making a suggestion to the Minister of Railways, I have come to the conclusion that it would be well to put my suggestion in the form of an amendment to the clause in question; that is to say, to give the minister an opportunity to show the country that he and the House are serious when they say that they intend to do the best they can for the returned soldier. As I pointed out this afternoon, the Canadian soldier in France has shown to the world that he can construct railways and run them under the most difficult circumstances possible, and I see no reason why he cannot do it in this country when he is backed by a Government so powerful as this is. I know an objection will be urged from both sides of this House, that by consecrating in our statutes the principle that returned soldiers should be appointed to such and such positions we are liable to create a militaristic class. I think the objection is a good one, but the present circumstances are such, and the wording of the Bill is such, that I do not think we need fear any such calamity—for it would be a calamity to create such a class in this country. We are going through a period of reconstruction. The returned soldier has been promised practically everything; he has been told time and again that the people of Canada will do everything for him—will find him a position. In the past few months since the troops have been coming back in large numbers I have had great difficulty in finding positions on the Government railways and on other railways for

returned men with some railway experience. For one reason or another perhaps they are not fitted mentally—that is to say, their mentality has not come back to the absolute normal, pre-war standard, or perhaps they are somewhat incapacitated by their wounds —for the first month to perform their duties in the fashion in which the ordinary concern expects them to be performed. But should there be a returned soldier placed on the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways, he will be able to enter into the feelings of the returned man, and the returned man will be able to appeal to him and say, "Well, give us a little better chance than the man who is tied down by the hard and fast rules and regulations of his board." Under those circumstances I think the best thing I can do is to embody the suggestion I made this afternoon in the form of an amendment, as follows:

That clause 1 be amended as follows: By inserting after the word "fifteen," in the sixteenth line, the following words: "At least one of whom shall be a man who has seen service as a soldier at the front."

I may say that the two amendments made this afternoon have come to a rather sad conclusion, but in this particular instance I can assure the House that I will not withdraw this amendment under any circumsances whatsoever. Should I withdraw it I would feel very much like a five-cent piece.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I support with pleasure the amendment of the member for Quebec West (Mr. Power). The member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) took exception this afternoon to the strong language used by Lord Shaughnessy in an address which he made the other day in Montreal. But what Lord Shaughnessy said was that this board would turn out to be a political organization. He was right, because the whole system of appointments smacks of strong partyism. I quote the following from a Government organ, the Winnipeg Telegram—one of the rivals in Winnipeg of the Tribune and the Free Press—of 19th April:

Making Railway Experts.

To the Editor Winnipeg Telegram:

Sir:—The west has furnished our Government with two men to fill national railway positions. A short biography of them should provide a tip to President Beatty of the C.P.R., and should also point the way to thousands of ambitious Canadian youths. It should also quiet the disbeliever in Government ownership of railways, as it clearly shows that our prairies turn out captains of industry by the simplest of training.

Charles McGill Hamilton, in the early '90s, was attending school in Indian Head and later in Regina. About 1902 he settled on a section of land near McTaggart, Sask., a village about ten miles north of Weyburn. He followed this worthy but uneventful career until two years ago, when he was nominated in opposition to the Unionist candidate for Weyburn. Mr. Calder was managing Unionist affairs in Saskatchewan, and Hamilton was prevailed upon to withdraw. A few months later he was appointed a director of Canadian National railways. Farming a section of land in Saskatchewan is a mighty good training for directing the affairs of a national transcontinental. The Canadian Pacific railway have been slow to see this.

Sydney P. Porter in Moose Jaw's early days, was a C.P.R. baggageman. Many years of this work was followed by years as homestead inspector. This latter position developed into confidential political agent of the Saskatchewan dominant party. When the by-elections were on, Syd. was there oiling the machine. This week he becomes assistant to the general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, with headquarters at Ottawa.

Handling baggage, homesteaders and political campaigns are, some say, an excellent training for managing a national transcontinental. President Beatty, please take notice. Calder can show him things in selecting men for big jobs.

Government Ownership.

This shows that we are giving too much power to the Minister of Railways and Canals. After all, biased as Lord Shaughnessy may be in regard to the whole question of Government ownership, he is right in intimating that after a while the whole thing will be a huge political system in the hands of the government of the day. Here you have two concrete cases.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What would my hon. friend propose as to the management of this great system of railways that has been literally dumped on the people of Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend would not take my advice, anyway.

Mr. RICHARDSON: A man who criticises is in duty bound to offer an alternative.

Mr. FIELDING: I see no objection to the appointment of a returned soldier on the board. I do hope that in the selection of the members of the board a competent returned soldier may be found especially one of the engineering corps to which reference was made by the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). But I do not approve, if I may use my hon. friend's own words, of "consecrating" in an Act of Parliament the appointment of a returned soldier in the form he proposes. I do not think that is a wise procedure.

Amendment (Mr. Power) negatived—Yeas, 23; nays, 38.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is no provision in this clause for a quorum. I suggest,

therefore, that the following words be added after the word " incorporated " in the seventeenth line:

A majority of those appointed shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 13 makes applicable all the provisions of the Railway Act except certain provisions. The Railway Act, by a provision that is not within the exceptions, provides that a majority shall be a quorum, consequently, there is no need of an amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. CAHILL: In order that we may get the best expression of opinion on this all-important section of the Bill, I move an amendment to the effect that this clause be referred to the Railway Committee or to a committee to be selected by the Railway Committee, consisting of fifteen members from the Government side and ten members from the Opposition side. Any vote that is taken here is practically a party vote. Some members on this side may express their opinion by their vote, but members on the Government side always vote with the party. The question of directors is one of the most important that we have to deal with in connection with this Bill, although there are about thirty sections in the Bill, all more or less bad, but some not so bad as others.

I think if a committee were appointed to consider the best means of appointing these directors we should get very much better results than we can hope to get in this Committee of Parliament, for the reason that when we sit down in a committee outside of this Chamber the suggestion of a member of the Opposition is taken for what it is worth, whereas in Committee of the Whole any suggestion made by a member of the Opposition will undoubtedly be voted down by the supporters of the Government. As this is an all-important Bill, I do think the Government should be willing to meet the Opposition in their suggestions for arriving at the best possible means of dealing with this matter, and I therefore beg to move that a committee of twenty-five be appointed, fifteen of whom shall be supporters of the Government, and ten members of the Opposition, to consider the best method of selecting the directors.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am obliged to rule the amendment out of order. The appointment of a committee is a matter that lies entirely within the power of the House of Commons, and not within the power of a Committee of the House. It would be impossible for a committee to appoint a committee, and as the House is now acting as a Committee of the Whole, it is not in order for the hon. member to propose this amendment. It should have been made when the Bill was before the House for its second reading. It cannot now be entertained.

Mr. CAHILL: May a committee not appoint a sub-committee? I would suggest that the Government appoint a committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 1 provides:

The Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient, not less than five, nor more than fifteen, to be directors of the company hereby incorporated, and upon such nomination being made the persons so nominated, and their successors, and such other persons as may from time to time be nominated by the Governor in Council as directors shall be and are hereby incorporated as a company.

Section 2 provides that the directors shall hold office from year to year. It would, therefore, seem that the directors have the privilege of filling vacancies, with the approval of the Governor in Council. Would these new appointees have to be nominated by the Governor in Council in order to form part of the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is what the Bill says. The Governor in Council fills the vacancy by the appointment of a successor.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 2 provides that the directors " may " fill the vacancy by the appointment of a successor. Is there any conflict between the two sections. But perhaps that can be considered when we come to section 2.

Mr. COPP: The Minister of Railways told us this afternoon, and we are very glad to accept his statement, that so far as he was concerned, as Minister of Railways, he would see that no politics or patronage entered into the appointment of the directors or the operation of the railway. Now, section 1 of the Bill bears very distinct earmarks of a huge political machine that is being built up in this country the like of which we have never had in the operation of our railways since Confederation. A great deal has been said of the operation of the Intercolonial. I have always been a very strong supporter of Government ownership and operation of that road, because it was a part and parcel of Confederation. Yet when I consider the mileage that is being added to the Government system and that will be controlled by this board of directors—while, of course, I realize, as does this country, that politics and patronage will not creep in so long as the system is

under the efficient management of the present Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) —I shudder to think what may happen when the present minister retires from his position, to be succeeded perhaps by somebody imbued with more partisanship than he. For instance, suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) whom I am glad to see near the minister to-night were Minister of Railways, what a great power would be in his hands to be used in support of his party. When the minister asks us to believe that politics will not be considered as a qualification of a director of this company, it is like asking us not to believe what we have seen going on for years in the operation of the different branches of this Government. In the operation of this huge system, which my hon. friend from Springfield is so prone to say has been wished, or forced, on the Government—I do not say so; these roads have not been forced on the Government, but have been taken over by the Government at a very great price to protect some of their political friends—all possible safeguards should be provided against political influence. Because, as surely as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, when this great mileage is added to the Government system of railways (and I understand still more mileage is to be added) it will be as impossible for any board of directors or any minister of railways or any government—and it is really the Government who will operate the road—to operate this gigantic system without political patronage as it would be to win an election in any constituency in the Dominion without bringing in politics.

Section 1 provides that the Governor in Council may nominate such persons, not less than five nor more than fifteen, to be approved by the Governor in Council. I want to ask my hon. friend if in all fairness he could not lay the cards on the table, at least to the extent of informing the Committee how many directors will be appointed. Does the Government intend to appoint five of their prominent supporters at large salaries, or will they find places for fifteen? I think we should have that information. The Minister of Railways says that politics are to be eliminated, but the Acting Prime Minister was not by any means so emphatic in this respect. He said that the railway would be operated, as far as possible, without regard to politics. I took his words down at the time and have them before me,—politics would be eliminated "as far as possible." Now that is a very elastic qualification. My hon. friend knows, as well as I and every man and woman in the country know, that it cannot be operated independent of politics. He has studied the matter and I think he should be able to tell us whether there will be five, seven, nine or fifteen directors. Many valuable suggestions have been made in regard to the selection of these directors. It has been suggested that different organizations might be considered, and I have no doubt that every hon. member will concede that if a returned soldier had experience or knowledge regarding railway matters he should at least be given a first place on the board. But if you are to accept the qualifications for membership on the board as suggested by the Winnipeg Telegram, from which my hon. friend quoted a few moments ago, of course the returned soldier would not be considered unless he had been a candidate endorsed by the Unionist party. If there is a board of fifteen directors selected, I suggest that at least two of its members should be representative of the labour interest. There is no class or body of men who are more interested in the operation of the railway than the railway employees, and if there are fifteen directors they should have two representatives; if the number of directors is seven or eight, then only one. At all events labour organizations should be represented on the board of directors.

Mr. J. D. REID: With reference to the question of my hon. friend as to why I have fixed the number from five to fifteen, I may inform him that when we get all the railways consoldidated it will then be decided how many directors should be appointed for the operation of the whole railway system. Probably we have made the number larger than will be really necessary, but it is impossible just at present to decide on any definite number of directors. As to the appointment of labour men and a returned soldier, I believe I stated this afternoon that I thought a labour man and a returned soldier should be on the board. These classes of men will receive the consideration of the Government. As to the question of patronage, I think it is hardly fair to compare the present operation of the Government railways with the conditions that existed a number of years ago. It is now almost impossible to have patronage on the railway system because every employee of the railway belongs to one union or another. You can not dismiss a single employee without an investigation by the union to which he belongs, whereas formerly an employee could be dismissed

and some one else appointed in his place on the recommendation of a member. In connection with promotions, if there is a vacancy in the railway the senior man receives the appointment, and there is no way by which political influence can interfere with his promotion. During the short time I have been administering the department vacancies have occurred, sometimes an agent retiring or resigning from the service, when some other man in the particular village or town sought the position. He had no possible chance of getting it, because the senior man on the road under the union was entitled to it. I think this is a fair and equitable way of filling these positions. It is obvious, therefore, that political patronage in appointments to the railway system as a whole has been abolished by the employees themselves. There is one direction in which, perhaps, political patronage might obtain; but if the directors carry out the policy they should carry out, and which I believe they are carrying out at the present time, and call for tenders for all the supplies that are required in the operation of the road there will be no possibility of patronage in that respect. The whole success of the operation of the road depends entirely on the men who are appointed as directors, and when this Bill goes through, I am certain that the men who will be appointed as directors will command the respect and confidence of the people.

If they do not they can be removed at the end of the year, or by the Governor in Council for cause at any time. If there is any dissatisfaction it can be discussed in the House. There has been, in my opinion, the possibility of interference with the operation of this great system as a result of parties outside trying to get information that it will not be in the public interest to give. That question was raised by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) this afternoon. I will illustrate what I mean. A return was asked for giving a statement of all the business done at each and every station on the Transcontinental railway, the amount of money received, and the number of cars that left each station during the year 1918. If that information is given, there is no reason why there should not be an order for a statement of all the business done between Toronto and Montreal, or between Winnipeg and some other place, with the result that the railways that are being operated in opposition to the Government system will get all the information as to the business that is being done at the stations adjoining their own railway, information which, if given, would surely injure the Government Railway system. Other questions are being asked as to what is being paid for coal and whom it is purchased from. I will tell you what happened on the Intercolonial railway during the past few years—I think that hon. members from the Eastern Provinces will bear out the statement I make; perhaps they will not say so here but I think they will not hesitate to confirm what I am going to say. We have in Nova Scotia

9 p.m.

one or two mines where the coal is much more valuable than that produced from other mines—coal that is worth probably a dollar a ton more than that of some other mines. Years ago a difference was allowed for this coal, because of its quality. A question was asked each year and the information given to the public as to the prices that the Government were paying for coal. Political influence came in each year—it is probably just the same on one side as the other—with the result that influence was brought to bear in consequence of which in the lower provinces we are paying just as much for coal that is not of this high quality as we are for the high-quality article. If the same system is followed throughout the country the directorate will not be able to get the advantages that they should get in matters of this kind. You could not get information from the Canadian Pacific, which will be the great opposition company to the Government-owned system; they do not disclose information of that kind to their own shareholders or the public. We should have men operating this system of such a character that it would not be easy for us to criticise any of their management of the road. Of course, it is possible that the men appointed may not live up to the expectations formed of them. I do not think that any Government would have any hesitation in removing a director who was not able to perform the duties satisfactorily not only to the railway but to the public. We must start out with men in whom we have confidence and we must trust these men for at least a year, or until Parliament meets again, when, if they have not carried out their duties satisfactorily, they can be removed.

Mr. COPP: Why wait until Parliament meets if they are not satisfactory?

Mr. J. D. REID: We will not wait until Parliament meets if any information has been given to the Government that would justify their removal. The Bill gives us

power to remove them for cause. If there has been any information given to the public, or if the matter is brought before the House, Parliament can take action if the Government has not acted.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend must be very innocent; or he must think I am—I do not know which. He tells us that it is impossible to exercise political patronage on a Government railway. I happen to live in a community where we have some connection with the working of a Government railway. He says you cannot dismiss men from a Government railway because you will have a strike on your hands at once. My hon. friend apparently has not been Minister of Railways and Canals long enough to get on to the game, or he does not want us to think that he has. If he will come to the city of Moncton, or if he will visit any other place in Westmorland county traversed by the Intercolonial railway, he will find that the statement that there is no political patronage in regard to employees on the Intercolonial is not altogether correct. I do not need to go back a year to prove that; I can cite him an instance occurring in the month of January last. A stationmaster wanted an employee temporarily. He wanted some one in a hurry, and he employed a young man. This young man remained there a few days, or weeks, till the patronage committee in that locality went to the stationmaster and demanded that he be dismissed because he did not belong to the Conservative party. I did not know who he was or what party he belonged to or did not belong to. The stationmaster referred the matter to Moncton and a man was sent from Moncton to investigate. He investigated the case and found that this young man did excellent work, and he did not want to displace him. Finally he made a dicker. There was another man required and he said to the stationmaster: "You had better select a Tory for this other position and maybe this young man will be kept on as well, and there will be nothing more heard about it," but the man in question was soon dismissed. That is taking place in a three-dollar-a-day job. Yet the Minister of Railways tells me, and expects me to accept his statement, that there is no political patronage in connection with Government railways. If there is going to be a cutting out and hewing away with political patronage, why has it been allowed to go on until to-day? Why not cut it out? I do not believe that the officials of the Intercolonial railway want to play party politics, but there must be somebody who is interested in it. I am only speaking of my own locality, and I know whereof I speak. This does not come to me second-hand or as a matter of hearsay; I know it

If that is the case with respect to a little job on the Intercolonial, which is not worth more than three or four dollars a day, what must be expected under this Bill and under the arrangements to go into effect when the Bill is passed? The minister may think that we are suspicious and too sceptical because we bring these matters to his attention, but nobody knows better than he does what may happen at any time on the Intercolonial Railway. A foreman in any shop, or the head of any branch, on that railway says to half a dozen of his employees "We do not want you any longer because we have no work for you to do." Accordingly these men are laid aside. However, when men are again wanted for these positions the former employees are not recalled, but other men are sent for, some political friends of that foreman, or some particular friends of the party in power. This is not held to be a dismissal—you cannot ask the railway to keep men in their employ if their services are not required.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I rise to support the demand made by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) that employees of the Government railways should be appointed to the directorate of this board. At the present time a commission appointed by the Government is engaged in an investigation of industrial conditions, interviewing employers of labour and employees in various centres in Canada for the purpose of ascertaining whether it would be possible to give the workingmen a share in the management of private industries in this country. That is a recognition that the principle involved is sound, and such being the case that principle should be embodied in this legislation and the declaration made that employees of the Government railway system ought to be represented on the Board of Directors of that great public enterprise, the Canadian National Railways. The idea of giving labour a share in the management of industries is now pretty well accepted by all the students of industrial conditions in other countries. In England the great labour unions are asking that this progressive step should be made. The Federation of Miners there are asking that the control of the mines should be vested in a council of ten, five of whom would be appointed by the miners and the other five by the Government, and as they

are supported by public opinion in England I think they stand a fair chance of obtaining what they demand. In the United States the same idea prevails, and very recently it was supported and recommended by such a conservative body as the American National Catholic War Council, the administrative committee of which is composed of four bishops. Such an advanced paper as The Nation, of New York, speaking on this policy in its issue of March 29th said:

> The bishops have taken a courageous step, possibly one that some day will be designated as the most serviceable that Catholicism has recently ventured in America. The paucity of constructive thinking in these last months has been in keeping with our inveterate opportunism in dealing with the subject of economics. That a quartette of Catholic clergymen should give the country stronger labour doctrine, more intelligibly presented and more persuasive, than the reconstruction committee of the American Federation of Labour, is a clue to the times.

I merely mention this to show that this idea is entertained not only by radicals and socialists but by all students of labour conditions in every country, and I say that in Canada we should keep abreast of the times. I move, in amendment, that the following words be added to the clause:

> At least two of the directors shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the employees of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. FIELDING: What method would my hon. friend suggest by which the employees would make the nominations?

Mr. CAHILL: Through the brotherhoods.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: At the present time I happen to live in a railway centre where all the railway employees are voting for two representatives on the Pensions Board and the Insurance Relief Fund. The employees of the Canadian Government Railways have two representatives on those boards.

Mr. FIELDING: Does that refer to all classes of employees?

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: All classes. The same means can be easily taken to choose representatives of the employees on the Board of Directors of the National Railways.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The suggestion put forward by my hon. friend in his amendment is, I submit, unsound in principle. The same considerations apply to it as were advanced by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) with regard to the appointment of returned soldiers to the Board. The Government is responsible to Parliament and to the country for appointments to the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railway System. In making these appointments it has all classes of Canadian citizens before it from which to make selections, and it is its duty to make such selection as will give the best results in the administration of the railway system. This question has come up frequently in this House, and the position which I have always taken when the suggestion has been made in connection with Bills which I have had in charge is this: That I would not discriminate against any citizen in making appointments to a commission which is to act for the Government. On the other hand I think it inadvisable in the extreme to embody in legislation a specific provision that the Government shall make an appointment from a certain class of our citizens, or upon the recommendation of a body outside, because, as I have pointed out, the Government is immediately responsible; the responsibility cannot be with those whom my hon. friend would have elect these two representatives on the Board. If we adopted my hon. friend's recommendation, the Government would have to select the parties put forward. At present it is open for the Government to appoint representatives of labour on the board of directors if it regards it as expedient and in the national interest to do so, but that is a different matter from accepting names put forward by an organization outside of the Government, and in no way responsible—not responsible to the public of Canada in the sense that the Government is responsible.

In my view, the amendment of my hon. friend should be negatived. I would point out further, Mr. Chairman, that at present there is a Railway War Board on which all classes of railway employees are represented, and very capably represented.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a temporary board.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is a temporary board, but it is probable that it will be continued.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a good board.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is a good board, and I have heard no complaints whatever from labour organizations with respect to the administration of the Government Railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: And it is a very satisfactory board to all the railways.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. CAHILL: The Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, says that in the selection of directors the Government have in their mind's eye all of the people of Canada, but he forgets that the Government in this case have but one eye and the only people they can see are the supporters of Union Government, as is exemplified in the appointments which have been made. Some hon. members opposite in commending the Government for their excellent selection of directors said that they expected everything would be fine for the Government-owned railways, and that the Government had taken a very wise course. If my recollection is correct, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated that of the directors with railway experience they had appointed Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Wood—three ex-directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. This House and the country were told by the Government that the company had made a failure of the management and operation of the Canadian Northern Railway System, for which reason we should take over their road—and incidentally we paid them some $10,800,000 more than the commissioners said should be paid. These gentlemen are to be the directors, the men who made a failure of the Canadian Northern Railway System—and the Drayton-Acworth report states that the estimate of the probable earnings and requirements of the road were out millions of dollars. These men, by getting into a position to draw their money directly from the public treasury rather than by the indirect route of getting it through Mackenzie & Mann and their friends in the Government have now been transformed into expert railway operators. The hon. minister says that it will not be in the public interest to give any information concerning the operation of this railway; he practically tells us that this is to be an air-tight political machine whereby millions of dollars can be expended through the friends of Mackenzie & Mann interests and this Government—which seem to me to be practically one and the same thing. Hon. members opposite who are blinded by their public ownership enthusiasm are quite willing to let the Government expend millions of dollars in extravagances for the benefit of the Government and themselves, thus incidentally through government management allowing themselves to again get into office at some future time. How can the Government expect to convince any man who is looking for honest information that it is not in the interest of the representatives of the people, who are the real shareholders, that we should know from whom we are buying railroad ties and what price we are paying, and who is doing our contracting on these extensions, and whether it is being done by tender and contract or by a force contract, as the Welland Canal is being done at the present time? If he insists, as he did this evening, that it is not in the public interest that the people who own this railroad and supply the funds should get any information regarding the expenditures, then it must be apparent to hon. gentlemen opposite, even though they will vote with the Government regardless of their own opinions, that this is nothing more nor less than a political machine for the sole purpose of making places for the friends of hon. members opposite, of bolstering up their bad record, and of again getting them into power. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he will tell us in what way it is opposed to the public interest to let the public, who own this road, know who supplies ties and equipment and who does the construction work. My information is that it is being done by the same old gang that has robbed this country for years, and I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. J. D. REID: There certainly is not any intention to keep from this House or from the public any information that should be published, and of course the information has been given to a very large extent in the past and will be given in the future.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not answer that question?

Mr. J. D. REID: But there are certain matters in connection with the operation that you have to keep private.

Mr. CAHILL: Not ties.

Mr. J. D. REID: I will tell the hon. member why it should be kept private. Supposing information is asked as to how much business is done at every station between Ottawa and Toronto by the Canadian Government Railway, and that information is published, any travelling freight agent of the Canadian Public railway at once knows what business we are doing at Cobourg, Port Hope and the other stations.

Mr. ROSS: That is not what is asked.

Mr. J. D. REID: You are placing in the hands of your competitors information that will enable them to interfere with the

legitimate business you are doing. That is one case.

Mr. ROSS: That question is not asked The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) asked a specific question. Why is not that answered?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am giving the reason why I say that some kinds of information should not be disclosed. The member for Pontiac says that the Canadian National Railway Board are giving contracts to "the same old gang," Mackenzie & Mann. He is trying to lead the House, and the country to believe that the board are giving contracts to Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, and that these are the owners of the Northern Construction Company. He knows that the Mackenzie & Mann of the Northern Construction Company are not Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann. He knows that the man named Mackenzie in the Northern Construction Company is Alexander Mackenzie, who is not a relative of Sir William Mackenzie. He knows also that the Mr. Mann in that firm is not Sir Donald Mann, but a nephew of Sir Donald Mann. Why, then, is he not honest about it; why does he seek to give the impression that contracts are let by the board of directors to the same old gang, to Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann?

Mr. CAHILL: And their friends.

Mr. J. D. REID: Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann are not interested, directly or indirectly, and never were interested, in the Northern Construction Company; and it is unfair to make the statement that Mackenzie & Mann are the owners of the Northern Construction Company, and thus mislead the public. Surely if these men have a company they have a right to tender as well as any other private individual or corporation. I repeat that the hon. member's statement that the board of directors are letting contracts to the "same old gang," Mackenzie & Mann, is not correct.

Mr. CAHILL: The only applause that the minister gets is from the member for Centre Toronto and some other Ontario members who are not familiar with the Northern Construction Company.

Mr. SHEARD: Where is the member for Centre Toronto? Will the hon. gentleman point him out?

Mr. CAHILL: They wander around so much when the whip cracks that it is impossible for me to tell just where they are. I meant the member for Toronto South (Mr. Sheard) and other members from Ontario. It is well known to all members from Western Canada that the Northern Construction Company practically built all the Canadian Northern railroad, and that the Northern Construction Company is the Mackenzie & Mann crowd. When the minister was asked what price was paid to the Northern Construction Company for ties, he felt the necessity for getting under cover and refused to answer the question. Why should he not give the Committee the information? If there is nothing to hide, why hide anything? The minister admitted that if Mackenzie & Mann had a company they were entitled to contracts. He tells us that the men who are conducting these National Railways are the men who have been with Mackenzie & Mann for twenty odd years. I remember when Mr. Hanna was with the Canadian Northern Railway Company over twenty years ago, when they had less than two hundred miles of railway in Western Canada. You cannot tell me that men who have been connected with these concerns practically ever since their inception are not still friends of Mackenzie & Mann. D.B. Hanna fought public ownership to the last ditch. He fought it while the Board of Arbitration was sitting in Toronto to determine how much was to be paid for this worthless stock. He was fighting public ownership less than two months ago in Hamilton, and he is still fighting it. Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Wood, who are the absolute controllers of the road to-day—with the advice, of course, of Mackenzie & Mann and the Minister of Railways—are practically the same people who have always controlled the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The minister told us this afternoon that all his appointees—he used the words "my appointees" were men of integrity and honesty. I am not doubting that; but what have they to do with this railway enterprise? Hanna and the executive, the railway men, tell these gentlemen what they are to do, and they sanction it. We are still leaving this whole enterprise in the hands of the Canadian Northern crowd, the same people who have been filching money from this country for years. No hon. gentleman can deny that and substantiate his denial. If these men had been good railway operators before they came into the hands of the Minister of Railways, they should have been able to make the road a profitable enterprise. But they were not able to do so, and we were opposing them and saying that they

were not building and operating in a businesslike way. Now we not only take them into our lap, as the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) says, but we are taking also the fellows who promoted the enterprise and who have been tapping the treasury of the country for years; and we are letting contracts to these same people. There is no getting away from that. If it is not a fact, why does the minister not give us the information? When the minister says that Mackenzie's nephew and Mann's uncle, or grandmother or somebody else, owns the stock in this enterprise, that is getting us nowhere. We know that it is the same family arrangement, and we want to know how long this state of affairs is to continue and how much money these people will be satisfied with. It would be better to give them a lump sum, get rid of the whole outfit, lock, stock and barrel, and put somebody in charge of this railway enterprise who will make it a success. If the minister is not willing to tell us who are getting the contracts for the railway construction, from whom the ties and supplies are being bought and what prices are being paid, he must expect opposition from at least some members of the committee, if not from the docile supporters of the Government.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—term of office of directors:

Mr. KEEFER: I think the first line is not very well phrased and I beg to move:

That the words 'from year to year' in line 25 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "from one annual meeting to another or until their successors are appointed."

One of the first things done at an annual meeting is to appoint the directors, but for some reason or another it frequently happens in the case of companies that the matter may go over for two or three days, and in that case you would be without a board of directors.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the intention? Is it proposed that they shall be appointed annually?

Mr. KEEFER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: I agree that the language is not very well chosen. There is another point. The section provides that the annual meeting shall be held upon the second Thursday in April of each year. Who are the persons who are to attend this annual meeting? We know what an annual meeting of shareholders is, but who are to be summoned to this annual meeting? We already have provision for the meeting of directors; we are told they meet every week. There is another thought. A little further on in the Bill it is provided that wherever there is anything to be done by the shareholders, the Governor in Council shall do it. Therefore, the shareholders and the Governor in Council are one, and this annual meeting would seem to be an annual meeting of the Governor in Council. That is merely a question of drafting to which I would draw the minister's attention. But there is a more serious objection to that clause, I think. Provision is made that in the event of a vacancy occurring the directors are to fill the vacancy. In the discussion this afternoon the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) very properly, as I thought, took the ground that the power of the Governor in Council must be upheld, and Parliament must hold the Governor in Council responsible. But in this clause you are deliberately getting away from the power of the Governor in Council, and proposing that the Board of Directors shall be a self-perpetuating body, because whenever a vacancy occurs the board must nominate the man to fill that vacancy, and the Government will have a veto power. I do not think that is a wise provision. Surely, if the power of the Governor in Council is to be upheld, as we were told this afternoon, whenever a vacancy occurs on the board it should be filled by the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council should not have to apply to the Board of Directors to ask their permission to fill it either.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will observe that by section 3 that the Governor in Council may declare that the company shall have a capital stock with or without shares as may from time to time be deemed expedient. At the commencement there will be no shareholders of the company, and the annual meeting provided for under section 2, until there is a share capital, would be a meeting only of the directors; but I do not see any objection to that. When a share capital is created the sole shareholder will be the Minister of Finance holding on behalf of His Majesty, and it would be for the Government or the minister, who would naturally have the approval of the Government, to appoint a representative to attend the meeting. The directors will also be shareholders, so that the meeting of shareholders, after the capital stock had been created, if it is created, would consist of the directors and the representative or proxy of the Minister of Finance.

With regard to the filling of any vacancy occurring during the year, the drafting follows the legislation which is usual in Companies' Acts; that is to say, if between annual meetings any vacancy should occur, the vacancy may be filled by the directors, because it is only of a temporary character. The safeguard from the standpoint of the shareholders is the fact that at the next annual meeting they have power over the appointment of the board. My hon. friend points out that the Government is entirely responsible for the appointment, and I quite agree with him in that. He will observe that section 2 provides that upon any vacancy occurring the directors may, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, fill the vacancy by the appointment of a successor. That really gives the Government power to make the appointment. Personally, I see no objection to adopting the suggestion of my hon. friend and having the appointments made to the vacancy directly by the Governor in Council, and therefore I would suggest that the section be amended by striking out, after the word "occurring," the words "the directors may, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council" and substituting therefor the words "the Governor in Council shall."

Mr. FIELDING: I would suggest that unless the Bill is to be disposed of to-night it would be well to reserve this clause so that it may be drafted more carefully in the line of my hon. friend's suggestion. In the case of an ordinary company, a vacancy that occurs during the year can be filled by the board because it is not convenient to call the shareholders together; but as the Governor in Council is the shareholder here, and as the Governor in Council is very much in evidence, the practice of a private company would not seem to be necessary.

Mr. McMASTER: I understood from what the hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) said, that his idea was that the directors should be appointed anew every year. If I am right in that idea, and I believe I am, I would point out that the amendment which he has drafted does not to my mind express very clearly the view he entertains. It looks as if the directors continued in office from annual meeting to annual meeting until their successors were appointed or until they were removed for cause. I would suggest that if they are to be appointed anew every year, that should be set forth clearly in the Act.

Mr. KEEFER: Section 2 provides for the annual meeting being held upon the second Thursday in April of each year. One of the first things done at an annual meeting is to appoint directors, but sometimes that is left over for a day or two, and in that case there would be a period during which there would be no board of directors.

Mr. McMASTER: There is no difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself, but I submit that neither the clause nor his amendment makes it clear that every year the Governor in Council must appoint new directors.

Mr. FIELDING: I suggest that after discussion the minister reserve the clause and have it re-drafted in the light of the discussion that has taken place.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think the word "may" in the second sentence is preferable to the word "shall" and is more in keeping with the sentence immediately following.

The CHAIRMAN: I must again remind the committee that we are getting into a tangle discussing two amendments at the same time. I asked the committee, if it is possible, to let the entire clause stand, or dispose of the amendments as presented.

Mr. CAHILL: As this clause will have a bearing on other clauses to follow, is it the intention of the minister to change the present directors?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not considered that matter. I believe that in the near future we will probably be taking over some of the other railways, and of course it will be necessary to make some changes in the directorate.

Mr. CAHILL: How many directors are there?

Mr. J. D. REID: There are now altogether eleven directors.

Section stands.

On section 3—Capital stock.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is to be the capital stock?

Mr. J. D. REID: We do not know how much we want. We cannot determine at the present what the capital stock may be.

Mr. JACOBS: I move that the whole clause be struck out.

Mr. FIELDING: What would be the object of having this capital stock?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This clause providing for the company having placed capital stock if the Governor in Council should so declare has been placed in the Bill for the purpose of meeting a situation which might arise. I confess I do not see at the present time any reason for it but at any time a situation might arise which might make it desirable to have capital stock. As all stock is to be owned by the Government and as the company can operate without stock under section 2, I am of the opinion, speaking offhand, that a share capital will not be necessary, and I would suggest to the Minister and to the committee that the section be allowed to stand until to-morrow. I have not been able to give it very much consideration to satisfy myself as to whether it is necessary or not.

Section stands.

On section 4—Head Office:

Mr. JACOBS: I move that the clause be amended to read that the head office of the company shall be in the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understood that the position of hon. members opposite was that there should be no politics in this matter.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I support the amendment of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). The hon. minister says there ought not to be any politics in the matter, but the mere fact that Toronto has been selected for the head office of the Canadian National Railways proves that there is politics in it. You have only to look at the map of the Canadian National Railways to see that Toronto is only on a branch line of the system. Who ever saw a town or a city on the branch line of a railway selected as the headquarters of the railway? Montreal, geographically, nationally, financially and otherwise, ought to be the railway centre of Canada, and the head office ought to be there. As soon as there was a rumour that the head office of the Government Railways might be in Montreal there was a delegation from Toronto. The Toronto Globe and the Toronto Star and all friends of public ownership clamoured that Toronto should be selected as the place of the head office. They are in favour of public ownership and are opposed to politics in the administration of the railway, but they want the head office to be in Toronto. I think the people know that Montreal is naturally the centre of the railway and is best suited for headquarters.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. KEEFER: I think that the proper place for the head office should be about the centre of the road where all three roads concentrate. Therefore I move an amendment to the amendment that Port Arthur be selected as the place of head office.

Mr. JACOBS: My reason for suggesting Montreal as the place of head office is that the head office of Canadian Pacific Railway is there, as is also the head office of the Grand Trunk Railway, which I understand we propose to take over shortly. The Canadian Pacific Railway has achieved some success operating its line from Montreal, and the Grand Trunk, had it not been saddled with the Grand Trunk Pacific incubus, would probably also have been successful. Montreal is headquarters of ocean navigation, and is a live up-to-date city. You cannot expect to run fast trains from a slow town like Toronto, and that is one of my reasons for asking that Montreal be selected as the place of head office. I think the Committee will agree that our directors, no matter how clever and astute they may be, could learn something from the heads of the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If the Government acquires the Grand Trunk, as it probably will, that system will be so vast that it may be necessary to divide the official authority. While Montreal might very well be the financial head office I suggest that, inasmuch as the West has such a large portion of this system, Winnipeg should be the operating headquarters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but if they will study the map they will agree that, inasmuch as the West embraces such a large portion of the system,—

An hon. MEMBER: It is on the main line now.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It is on the main line; it is not like Toronto. It is very important that the West should be represented in the operation of this road and it should be represented from some point in the West. I suppose that Winnipeg is the natural point. I do not suggest it because I live in Winnipeg.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Hon. gentlemen may smile, but let them look at the map and study it for themselves. It will be more difficult to operate the road from Montreal than it will be from the centre of the continent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Gaspé would be the ideal spot.

Mr. RICHARDSON: If my hon. friend thinks so, he may move a motion to that effect.

Mr. SHEARD: I just wish to say, as representing Toronto, that when the war was on and there was pressing need of every man, Toronto did not come second to any other place in its energy in meeting the situation. Our friends opposite are very deeply interested in securing places for returned soldiers and in other matters concerning them. If they will come to Toronto they will find more returned soldiers now than in the whole province of Quebec. They will find more wounded men, I venture to say, two to one, in the city of Toronto than in any other place. When it came to patriotic contributions, I think Toronto held its head up pretty well with Montreal. In reference to Red Cross contributions and to all the energies in connection with this great war, which has sustained and maintained the reputation of Canada amongst the nations of the world, Toronto has done its part as well as any other city in the Dominion. If there is to be any advantage in connection with the administration of this great national railway system, I think Toronto will speak for itself in reference to its ability, energy and capacity for great undertakings. I need do no more in defence of the constituency which I represent, than point to the great record which it has made in this titanic struggle.

Mr. FOURNIER: Although living far away from Montreal, I rise to support the amendment of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and I do so for many reasons. In the first place, Montreal is the business centre of the Dominion. I do not quite share the opinion of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard). You are not going to run railways on the Red Cross system; you are not going to run railways on patriotism; you have to run them on business principles and you have to come to the place where business is done. The head office of the Canadian National Railways is in Toronto at the present time, but the passenger agent, Mr. H. H. Melanson, who was on the Intercolonial, had to have an office in Montreal because Montreal is the centre. It is proposed to choose the location of the head office by Order in Council. We have had enough Orders in Council. Montreal is the business centre; Montreal is the head of navigation, and Montreal is the place for the railway. I want to register my protest against the head office being located in any other city. Toronto is a magnificent city, I have had the honour and pleasure of visiting it, but it never will be a great Canadian national railway centre. You have to come to Montreal.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I desire to second the amendment of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier.

An hon. MEMBER: Too late; it is seconded.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: It is not because I am representing one of the constituencies in Montreal that I favour the selection of that city. I am not the same as those gentlemen who, when a business question comes up for discussion in this House, raise the question of soldiers, of nationality, of Quebec, or something like that. Economically it is desirable that the headquarters should be located in Montreal. The directors will have to come to Montreal very often in order to deal with the matters of business which are centred there. If the head office is located in Montreal their travelling expenses will be saved. Everything comes to Montreal in the way of business, and the directors will of necessity have to come. We see big magnates travelling to Montreal in private cars. Gentlemen, save that expense as far as possible and adopt Montreal.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Is Montreal not satisfied with conditions as they are? She has got the Canadian Pacific head office, the Grand Trunk head office, and now she wants to play the hog and get the Canadian National. Surely she ought to be satisfied when she has the big end of it, or two out of three. But she is still grumbling. Industrially, commercially, from the standpoint of shipping, the amount of wealth, energy, ability and also from the standpoint of being near the centre, Toronto is the proper situation for the head offices of this railway system. Toronto is some hundreds of miles nearer the centre of the Dominion than Montreal and it is the natural location for a great enterprise. Toronto is the city of the Dominion, and will be in the near future the largest city in the country. We are preparing there for overseas shipping of which Toronto will be the headquarters. We are spending $25,000,000 to give accommodation to those liners that will run from Toronto through the Welland

canal to the head of the lakes and to my hon. friend's destination where he would like to have the Canadian National centred. We have a larger amount of stock carried in the wholesale houses of Toronto than in any other place in the Dominion and from the standpoint of shipping, finance, business and everything necessary to build up a great institution, Toronto is the natural place. You must concede that. I have heard no argument in support of the claim that the head office should go to Montreal. There is no better place for it than Toronto. We will have the Grand Trunk before you know where you are, and then you will have something to murmur about.

Mr. POWER: Without wishing to detain the House for any great length of time on this subject, it seems to me that the city through which all these roads pass should have the head office. Toronto, I am credibly informed, is only on a branch line. Montreal has the Intercolonial, and the Canadian Northern. Winnipeg, I understand, has the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial; but Quebec has all the systems.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: It has branch lines.

Mr. POWER: So there is a strong reason in favour of locating the head office in Quebec, and I submit it very humbly to the consideration of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready for the question?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to say a word at this juncture. I do not for a moment understand that the member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) was serious in moving a sub-amendment. I do not think it is fair that the House should be asked to designate any one place in Canada in which to locate the head office of the National System of Railways. I think both amendments should be withdrawn. I believe that the proposer of the first amendment submitted it with the intention of enlivening the proceedings of the House for a few moments—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: —and I anticipated that he would eventually withdraw his proposition. This company should have the same right that every other company has of selecting the place for its head office. The head office of the company can be fixed by it at any time.

Mr. BUREAU: By the Board of Directors?

[Mr. T. Foster.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: By the Board of Directors. I submit, Parliament has no right to be called upon to fix the place for the head office of this company.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no special advantage in having the head office in Toronto or Montreal. Very good reasons might be advanced why it should not be at either place. It might very likely happen, and perhaps will happen some time, that the head office will not be in either city, but that would not diminish in any degree whatever the amount of business that might possibly go to either by reason of the operations of this railway system. I would think that both Montreal and Toronto are very well represented on the board, and they should be satisfied with the advantage that comes to these two great metropolitan centres by reason of that representation. I submit that both amendments should be withdrawn and that the committee should not be asked to designate in this Bill where the head office of the company is to be.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Withdraw the amendments and select Toronto.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The selection may well be left to the directors of the company.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the hon. gentleman give some reasons why the head office should not be fixed in the Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It provokes debate, it is purposeless, and serves no good end.

Mr. BUREAU: It is always done.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the head office of the company were located in Montreal it does not necessarily mean that more traffic will flow through that city by reason of the fact. The head office of a company is very frequently in a place far removed from the company's operations and activities.

Mr. BUREAU: Who decides about the head office?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might as well be Three Rivers as Montreal.

Mr. BUREAU: We don't want it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think both amendments should be withdrawn. If not, they should be defeated by the committee.

Mr. KEEFER: I wish to withdraw my amendment. I did submit it jocularly,

thinking I would say a word for my own city, of which I am very proud.

Amendment to the amendment withdrawn.

Mr. TOBIN: Section 4 of the Bill provides that the head office of the company shall be in such place in Canada as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine. So it is the Governor in Council and not the Board of Directors which is to determine where the head office is to be.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the Government is to determine the location of the head office that is better still.

Mr. TOBIN: But the minister stated that the Board of Directors were to make the selection. If it is left to the Board of Directors it will be quite satisfactory.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no objection to a vote being taken on the amendment, but I would submit that as the designation of any place is likely to be regarded unfavourably by the Committee, those hon. gentlemen who are urging that a selection should be made here are not doing their favourite town a service by pressing for a vote. It seems to me that the head office from time to time might, as stipulated in the Bill, be determined by the Governor in Council—that is to say, by the Government which is responsible to Parliament. If the Government at any time takes action that is contrary to the will of Parliament, Parliament has its own means of dealing with the situation. However, I have no objection to the vote being taken.

Mr. BUREAU: According to the model Bill which has to be followed whenever application is made to Parliament for the incorporation of a railway, the location of the head office of the company must be mentioned, and therefore I do not see why we cannot fix the head office of this company in the present Bill. Make it Toronto, Moncton, or Winnipeg, or any other city. These proceedings must take place in accordance with the General Railway Act, and the directors may change the location by notifying the Railway Commissioners. I do not see why an exception should be made in this case and the location be left to the Governor in Council. If the directors see fit to change the location afterwards let them do so, but by all means follow the procedure that is authoritatively laid down. It looks as if the Acting Prime Minister feared that if a vote now took place it might displease some of the constituents of members who represent an important centre. It would seem as though the Government was afraid that if the location of the head office was fixed in this Bill it would arouse some criticism. If we are going to try and bring the Canadian Railway System as much as possible into harmony with the privately-owned railways, why not follow the procedure laid down in the model Railway Bill? Let the Government take a stand and we will share the responsibility with them. Let them select Toronto, Winnipeg, or any other place they choose.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is it customary for Acts of Parliament incorporating railways to contain the location of the head office?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt it very much.

Mr. BUREAU: It certainly is the custom.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It may be done some times, but not always.

Mr. BUREAU: The procedure is set forth in the model Railway Bill, and you will be asked to mention where the head office is to be if you apply for a charter of incorporation for a railway company.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Is it not the incorporators who have to insert in the Bill the name of the city in which they desire to have the head office of the railway company?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Then this case is precisely analogous; the only shareholder of the company is the Dominion Government.

Mr BUREAU: Oh no, it is the people of Canada as represented by Parliament.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Dominion Government is the shareholder in this case.

Mr. BUREAU: In trust for His Majesty.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend, if I may say so, is confusing the Government and Parliament. They are two distinct entities. The Government has its responsibility and its duties, and Parliament has its responsibility and its duties. But in this case the analogy is absolutely complete—the Government of Canada is the sole shareholder. The Government comes down to the House with a Bill and asks Parliament to support it. Either the head office is designated and the Government will carry its point on a majority vote in the House, or, as in this case, it leaves

the matter open. I submit that it should be left open for the reason that the Government railway situation is a changeable one.

Prior to 1917 we had the Intercolonial, and also the Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg; then we acquired the Canadian Northern Railway System with its head office in Toronto; now we have the Grand Trunk Pacific in receivership, and negotiations are proceeding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The situation is a changeable one, and that to my mind is a strong reason why this section should be left precisely as it is. The situation may change further in the future, although no one can foresee what will occur. The principle of responsibility is here. If the Government desire to name the city where the head office should be located it would come down to the House and ask Parliament to support it. If Parliament declined to support it, the constitutional position would be as my hon. friend knows. On the other hand, the Government comes down with a Bill in which it provides that the Governor in Council may from time to time name the place of the head office of the company. If the Government names a place that Parliament disapproves of, Parliament of course has its remedy; but I submit that the responsibility must be with the Government and the place should be such as the Governor in Council designates from time to time.

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot share that view If the place named in the Bill were determined forever as the head office of the company, the Acting Prime Minister's argument would be valid, and I could not object to it; but you have under the Railway Act the right, not in the Governor in Council but in the directors,—and I think rightly so—to change the head office at any time, provided they notify the Railway Board and advertise in the Canada Gazette. But in every Bill that has come before the House so far, and in the standard Bill, the place is designated. I do not see why the Governor in Council should take away from the directors the power which is given to them by the Railway Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in his recollection. The Railway Act does not provide that the directors may change the head office as fixed by Parliament. What the hon. member is thinking of is the Companies Act, which I understand does so provide.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. BUREAU: I may be mistaken, but I think not. I will verify it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems very clear that if in this Act Parliament were to fix the place the directors could not thereafter change it. In this Act Parliament empowers the Governor in Council from time to time to fix the place, and that place being fixed the directors could not change it. That is the way I think it should be.

Mr. FIELDING: If the Bill proposed that the head office should be in Toronto, and the amendment said Montreal, we would have rather an embarrassing situation. I think in that case I might have a "slight inclination towards Biddy"—Biddy being Montreal—but I think the principle that the Governor in Council shall have power to determine the head office is fair and reasonable. I may say to my hon. friend that this Government is not going to be in power for ever, and if it does not determine that question wisely, another Government may want to make a change. Geographically the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) has the best argument, because a glance at the map will show that in regard to the extent of the territory that this system covers Winnipeg is the more central place. I think the determination ought not to be made definitely now, and while I have a preference, I think, for Montreal, I am of opinion that the argument for leaving the matter to the determination of the Governor in Council is a fair and reasonable one.

Mr. LEGER: In order to settle the matter between Montreal and Toronto, I would suggest to the committee that the place for the head office be Moncton in the province of New Brunswick. As a matter of fact the head office was settled down there half a century ago when the Intercolonial was built, and I think the office should not be moved so far away as Toronto or Montreal. It seems to me that it is interfering with the selection made at the time of Confederation, and in order to settle the great trouble between Montreal and Toronto it seems to me that the very central railway city of Moncton should not be neglected. The most important officers should certainly not have been taken away to Toronto. It is true that the railway situation is different entirely from what it was at the time the Intercolonial was built, but I think it could be arranged to leave the great bulk of the old Intercolonial staff in the city of Moncton where the railway offices were originated half a century ago.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to lay my hand on the Railway Act, but I take the new Consolidated Railway Bill, section 73:

The head office of the company shall be in the place designated in the Special Act, but the company may, by by-law, from time to time, change the location of its head office to any place in Canada: Provided that notice of any such change shall be given to the secretary of the board.

Mr. J. D. REID: You are reading from the new Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I am. It is the same thing in the old Act; that has not been changed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The section which my hon. friend has just read is analogous to the section we are considering. If a railway company is incorporated by statute, the statute might very properly designate——

Mr. BUREAU: It always does.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: ——the head office; but it also gives the directors or shareholders power to change that head office from time to time, which is practically what this Bill asks.

Mr. BUREAU: It is quite the contrary. You say in the first clause that you incorporate this company; and those directors whom you appoint are the company, are they not? The object is to form a company to operate the railway. They are the people who have the right to change the head office, even taking my hon. friend's argument. The company is not the Governor in Council, the company is the body that is going to be formed by this Bill we now have under consideration. Therefore, they have power to change the head office any time they please.

Amendment (Mr. Jacobs) negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does clause 4 carry?

Mr. BUREAU: Before that is passed I would ask permission to read the Railway Act as it is now. I do not want to be taken as incorrect.

The head office of the company shall be in the place designated in the Special Act, but the company may, by by-law, from time to time, change the location of its head office to any place in Canada: Provided that notice of any such change shall be given to the secretary of the board.

Absolutely the same.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who is the company in this case? Is it the Governor in Council, or the directors?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 1 says:

The Governor in Council may nominate such persons as may be deemed expedient, not less than five, nor more than fifteen, to be directors of the company hereby incorporated, and upon such nomination being made the persons so nominated, and their successors, and such other persons as may from time to time be nominated by the Governor in Council as directors, shall be and are hereby incorporated as a company.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—payment of directors:

Mr. FIELDING: The directors may be paid by the company, but the directors are the company. It is like saying that the directors may be paid by themselves. I do not think it is good drafting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that is the only way it could be drafted. The company pays the money, but the directors, in deciding what they as a company pay themselves, are subject to the supervisory power of the Governor in Council.

Mr. KEEFER: I suggest that the clause read: "May be paid from the funds of the company such sums," and so on.

Mr. McMASTER: If the company has the financial career which attended the Canadian Northern and Intercolonial, there may be no funds to apply to the salaries of the directors; therefore the suggestion of the member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) may be a dangerous one.

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any particular objection to stating in the Bill the amount to be paid to the directors or to the president? We do it in the case of the Railway Commission, the Civil Service Commission and the Superior Court and other judges who are paid by the Dominion Government. Why should the amount to be paid to the president be determined by the Governor in Council instead of by Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The number of the directors runs between five and fifteen, for the reasons clearly stated by the Minister of Railways and the Acting Prime Minister. The number will depend not only upon the composition of the system, but also upon what is found most convenient in the management of the road. The amount to be paid will necessarily depend, in some degree, at least, upon who constitute the directorate. Furthermore, the number of officers appointed will also be governed by that as a very important factor. The vice-presidents are themselves officers of the company and will be paid as such. It

would seem to me that we cannot possibly fix the salaries to be paid to the directors until we know what, in point of numbers, shall be the constitution of the directorate.

Mr. BUREAU: Can we not fix the salary of the president of the Board of Directors? I do not see why he should be paid more if there are eight or nine directors than he would if there are six or seven. If these men are to make a success of the operation of the railways they will have to devote their whole time to the work; therefore their salaries ought to be determined by Parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be an unusual procedure to state in a statute what should be the salary of a president. It might be possible to fix the salary to be paid to the present president, but if he resigned to-morrow it might be impossible to get another man to fill the position at that salary, in which case the statute would bar the appointment of a president. There should be some flexibility both as to the number of directors and as to the remuneration. In a year's time, after some experience in operating the National Railways by a board, it may be found wise to reduce the number of the directors to three; and this suppositious board of three might be required to be technical men, in which event they would be paid very substantial salaries. I think, therefore, that the suggestion to leave the section in its present form is fair and that the committee should approve of it. It is not desirable that the statute fix definitely the number of directors, although perhaps that is not so objectionable; but it would be unfortunate if the statute fixed the remuneration of the directors. I do not think that the remuneration of directors is ever fixed by the constitution of a company—and this is the constitution of a company. The remuneration of officers is always a matter of by-law or resolution.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I do not agree with the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau); I think that no amount ought to be fixed as the remuneration of the directors, especially of the president. We have seen an example of this during the course of the present year in connection with public ownership. Mr. McAdoo, the former Director of Railways in the United States, left the service of the country to enter the service of Mary Pickford and Charlie Chaplin because these movie stars were offering to him higher salaries than were being paid by the United States of America. We ought not to place ourselves in such a position as to be unable to compete with any private concern if we have a good man and wish to retain him at the head of our railways.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. E. Lapointe). The gentleman he mentions was receiving $10,000, and I suppose he was replaced by a good man at the same price. It is currently known that railway companies pay their presidents and directors fabulous sums. Everybody knows that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gets $70,000 a year, and that the directors get proportionately large amounts. If the salaries of the president and directors of the Canadian National Railway Board are not fixed in this Act, is there not the danger that the Cabinet may pay them extraordinarily large amounts? I suggest that minimum and maximum amounts be stated so that excessive sums may not be paid to any one, no matter how good he is. This is particularly necessary because in the first section we do not say that these men shall give all their time to the work. They may continue to practice law, to carry on the work of a contractor, or to do anything they like, and still get the salary allotted to them by the Government.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to be understood as criticising, I simply want to know what special reasons there are for not mentioning the salaries of the president and directors of this railway company. The salaries of all the other officials of the Government—of the Railway Commission and the Civil Service Commission, for instance—are known, but no reason has been given for withholding the information as to the salaries of the officials of this road.

Mr. CAHILL: What are we paying the directors who are now operating?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think it is $2,000 per annum. The information was given the other day.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the president of the road getting?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not say what his salary is as president and general manager. As a director he receives $2,000 per annum.

Mr. BUREAU: How much as manager?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know.

Mr. CAHILL: Surely the Minister of Railways and the Government must know

what they are paying the manager. It is inconceivable that our money is being paid out through the Minister of Railways without him knowing the amount. He must surely be in a position to answer that question if he wants to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said that as director he got a salary of $2,000 per annum. Before being promoted to the position of president, he was vice-president. I will inquire what his salary is as general manager.

Mr. COPP: Who provides the salaries for the present board of directors?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. COPP: Do these directors fix their own salaries?

Mr. J. D. REID: The salaries of the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway have been fixed at $2,000, by by-law, for several years I believe.

Mr. COPP: The present board has not been there for several years.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said that the salaries of the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway have been $2,000 per annum for several years, and the present board of directors, when they took office, simply continued at the same salary.

Mr. McMASTER: I understand that a certain Mr. Hanna is the gentleman in charge of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, whose stock the Government of this country, representing the people, acquired about a year ago at an expense of something over $10,000,000. We have present in the House the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), the Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), the minister from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who is minister of so many departments I cannot remember them all, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn), the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell), and under-secretaries too numerous to mention. Do I understand that not one of these gentlemen is able to tell the representatives of the people how much public money is given to Mr. Hanna per annum for administering the affairs of this road, which belongs to us, the people of Canada? What is the aggregate amount of money paid to Mr. Hanna? Surely that is within the knowledge of the various heads of departments that we, with so much pleasure, see before us this evening.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: While it may seem strange that the Minister of Railways might not know the salary received by the general manager, I submit that that remark cannot apply to other ministers, and it is quite understandable to me that the Minister of Railways himself might not know the salary with such exactness that he would care to answer the question at the moment. I assume that the general manager is paid a very substantial salary; I hope he is. We are, however, dealing now with the allowances made to the directors, and the Minister of Railways has said that they receive $2,000 a year. I assume that they are paid this amount simply in pursuance of the precedent established some few years ago when the Government nominated directors at the time we obtained control of forty per cent of the Canadian Northern Railway stock. My own recollection is that the allowance made to the directors appointed by the Government was $2,000, and that salary has no doubt been continued. I understand it was intended to cover merely the out-of-pocket expenses of the directors in attending the meetings, or, perhaps, a little more than that. I am sure my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) will be able to get precise information on the point tomorrow.

Mr. McMASTER: I may be quite wrong, but I believe that if the Minister of Railways applied to the gentleman sitting upon his left hand he could get the information immediately and give it to the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was going on to remark that the fact of ministers not knowing the salary of the general manager is pretty good evidence that there is no politics in the administration of the road.

Mr. McMASTER: Interference is one thing, and an entire lack of information is another. I really think that the Minister of Railways knows what the general manager of this great system belonging to the people gets a year. If he does not know, it would not become me to characterize such want of information on the part of a gentleman administering one of the most important departments of the Government.

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not want to make a statement until I am sure of the facts. I have already promised to get the information. The gentleman sitting on my left has not the information. If he had, I should be very glad to give it.

Mr. BUREAU: Parliament is entitled to certain consideration on the part of the Government and the ministers. The Acting

Prime Minister said this afternoon that the object in forming this company was to make a success of the operation of these Canadian railways, and that to make a success of them, it was necessary to get the best men. Would any man of ordinary intelligence believe that these directors would give their best ability to the road for $2,000 a year, when the draymen of Montreal are striking to-day for $1,560 a year? To tell the House that shows no respect for Parliament or for the men who inquired what the salary was. We want to get at the bottom of this thing. Either the directors occupy other positions in the company and are paid for those positions, or they do not. If they are receiving only $2,000 a year as directors, you cannot expect them to give the best of their ability or much of their time to the railway company for the good of the country.

If they occupy any other positions, such as general manager, or vice president, or secretary, or under-secretary, and get additional salaries, we should be so informed. We want to know what these men who are going to act as directors are being paid for their services to the country. If we are going to go begging for men to work gratuitously, you will not get the best results. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has just said that $2,000 is practically pin-money to pay their expenses travelling back and forth. That means that they are giving their services gratis. No man will leave his business and work for the Government for $2,000 as a director, and if that is the class of men that it is intended to appoint it is high time Parliament took the matter into its hands. I do not care how much you pay a man provided his services are profitable. When I hire an employee I pay him a salary based on the degree of his usefulness to me in my office, and the same principle ought to apply in connection with the railway. To give us the bare answer that the directors are getting $2,000 is not fair, and is tantamount to saying, "You have been our laughing-stock; we have been just jollying you around and are still going to make you believe that we are going to get the best genius and ability in the country to manage the railroad."

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The directors are getting $2,000, and some in executive capacities may be getting additional salaries.

Mr. BUREAU: That is what we want to know. Are they simply directors or do they occupy other positions to which salaries are attached?

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The suggestion that we are flouting Parliament by telling the truth is indeed a new one.

Mr. BUREAU: Telling the truth partly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the directors are actually getting is $2,000 a year. There are two directors who also occupy other positions for which they receive salaries—Mr. Hanna, president of the road, and Mr. Mitchell, financial controller. As such they receive salaries voted by the directors, just the same as the management of any other company votes its money. There is no question that Parliament is entitled to know what the general manager gets, and Parliament will know. But Parliament is just as much interested financially in what the engineers on the road get as in the salaries of the general manager or the financial controller. In fact, five cents an hour in the payment of the engineers would amount to more in all probability, many times more in actual outlay, than the cost of the general manager. We do not happen to know the exact figure, although I can assure the Committee that it is a fraction of the figure that is given as being paid the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But I do not think that Parliament need necessarily know that in order to vote Clause 5, because that simply puts it in our power to pay to the directors such sums as may be deemed expedient. The principle we have gone on in the past is this: We have not asked the directors as such to give their full time to the road. They give a proportion of their time analagous to that which the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway give to that company. I do not know what the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway get, but usually directors of a large company receive something in the neighbourhood of $20 a meeting. If that is what the Canadian Pacific Company allow it would practically amount to $2,000 a year, as we are allowing in this case. In the future it will not be deemed wise to ask from the directors only a portion of their time, and if the number is smaller and we ask them to give more of their time, they will have to be paid more than $2,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Listening to the discussion during the last ten minutes, it has struck me that we are an easily deluded crowd both in this House and in the country generally. We are foolish enough to think that the business of the country is conducted in a sane, considerate, careful manner by the Government. I was think-

ing when the railways were taken over—and I am sure hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side thought the same—that the Minister of Railways would call into his office the heads of the different departments of these railways, particularly the management, and that he would say to them: "You have been in the service of the Canadian Northern for the last twenty years—or whatever it may be—and you must understand that you are no longer in the service of that company, but are in the employment of the Government. We want your full time and want to know what your salary is; and we want you to know what is expected of you by the Government. Further, we want to know the members of your staff, what they are getting and what salaries they are willing to work for." That would be something like business. But we have here to-night a sad spectacle displayed by this learned and able Government, who, in the management of this great enterprise on which they pride themselves as handling in so magnificent a manner, are unable to give an answer to a simple question that is asked incidentally. They are asked what is the salary of the chief man in the management of the road, and there is absolute silence from Dan to Beersheba. I am sorry for the hon. gentlemen who sit around the Government—I am not sorry for the Government because they could have put themselves right—for these hon. gentlemen must feel sadly humiliated by the ignorance displayed by the Government in so important a matter. Perhaps the Minister of Railways will put the question in the same category as the railway ties, and suggest that it is not in the public interest that we should know the facts. But it will never kill the public to be aware of all that this aggregation knows. What would be thought of the secretary in the most backward rural school section in any province who, if he were asked at the annual meeting how much the teachers were being paid, should say he did not know? Why, he would be told, "You are a very stupid owl, and have no right to be in the position you hold." Now, we have a great Government appointed by a big majority and consisting of a combination of the talents of two parties, and yet to-night they are absolutely unable to tell us anything at all about the working of this system as regards the most important feature of the whole thing, the services of their chief men and the salaries that are paid them. I think it is time that the people should know really what is going on, or at least, that there is nothing going on, so far as the proper management of this government-owned railway is concerned. We should hesitate before passing any further clauses of this Bill in view of what we have learned of the knowledge, the calibre and the degree of information possessed by the hon. gentlemen who propose to operate under this Bill.

On section 6—no personal responsibility of directors:

Mr. J. D. REID: I would ask that section 6 stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 6 stands.

On section 7—first meeting:

Mr. FIELDING: I venture to suggest that the members of this House and the people have a right to know the salary of every official who is paid out of the public treasury of Canada, and if the minister is not able to give us the salary that Mr. Hanna is getting, I say that we ought not to proceed further with this Bill until we get that information.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that in connection with the Government railway system information as to the salary of any officer or director should be brought down to the House, by reason of the fact that the Government is the corporation and the sole shareholder of the Canadian National Railway system. There is no doubt in my mind as to the correctness of that position. But when information is asked for it is desirable that it should be given accurately. I have no doubt whatever that the Minister of Railways has in his mind approximately what the president of the Canadian National Railway system has been receiving. I have that information myself; but if the question is asked me positively, what is the precise sum—then I desire to obtain the information in order that I may give it accurately to the House. It does not occur to me, in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways has stated that he will obtain the information and give it, that the position which is taken is in any way improper or lacking in respect for the House. As he has undertaken to get the information, it would occur to me that the Committee might very well proceed with the other sections in order that we may make progress with this legislation.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is eleven o'clock.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, that is another reason.

Mr. J. D. REID: I might say to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that a question was asked the other day about a number of officials. I brought down the information and the question was answered. It is as the Minister of Finance has stated; I would not like, offhand, to state the salaries of officials with-
11 p.m. out looking them up and being quite sure I was accurate. That is the only reason why I have asked the committee to let matters stand until to-morrow. When the Bill is again before the House I will have the information.

Mr. PEDLOW: I heartily endorse the statement made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr.Fielding). It is really a most intolerable situation when the minister who is responsible to this House and the country cannot give approximate information on an important subject of this kind. Surely he can give us the basis on which the salaries are paid if they are paid on a sliding scale or percentage. If he cannot give us the exact figure, and if the salary is on a percentage or commission basis, surely we should at least receive that information to-night. It is a most astonishing situation that the minister is not able to give the House even approximate information on this subject.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that the minister is willing to allow the matter to stand to-night and adjourn.

Mr. J. D. REID: No; I said I could not see any reason why we could not proceed with the Bill as I had promised to get this information and have it for to-morrow.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the minister will be well advised and that he will get along just as rapidly if he does not insist on further progress to-night. It is eleven o'clock now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have sent out, and if hon. gentlemen will be patient we will have this very valuable information in a moment or two.

Mr. McKENZIE: We never broke the agreement we made early in the session that eleven o'clock is a reasonable hour to adjourn.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend puts it on the ground that this is a reasonable hour to adjourn that is one thing, but if he puts it on the ground that the information asked for is not immediately forthcoming, it is another thing. I am entirely agreeable to adjournment on the ground that the hour is late, but not on the ground that information which is to be brought down is not immediately forthcoming.

Mr. McKENZIE: Whichever ground is the more agreeable to my hon. friend's sensibilities will be acceptable to us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked that telephonic communication be had with a member of the directorate who is in town, and the information that he gives is that the present salary is $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 7 carry?

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester) (translation): Mr. Chairman, before proceeding any further with this Bill, I should like to get some information form the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) about clause 7. Prior to my being returned to the House of Commons, Mr. Chairman, I had enjoyed the privilege of sitting in the Quebec legislature, where for four years I represented the very same constituency the views of which I have the honour of voicing and upholding on the floor of this House. In the Quebec Legislature I evidently had a favorable opportunity for making myself familiar with the procedure which is in force in the committees of that legislature and with the way in which the members of the provincial Government dealt with the people's representatives, whenever a public bill came up before the House. And although I sat there for several years, I must admit in all candour—and I do so without fear of contradiction from the hon. Minister of Railways—that never did I attend and I do not believe any member of this House either on this side or on the other side, ever witnessed such a sorry spectacle, such a painful sight, such a baffling spectacle as the one offered by this Government to-night. Here we have this Government drawn from the most brillant talents of both political parties throughout the country, the gifted men whom Mackenzie and Mann, after touring the provinces, could pick up and whom they intrusted with the several portfolios and Departments of the Canadian Administration. These are the men who are called upon to grapple with one of the most important problems, a reconstruction problem which has to be solved and cannont be shelved, I mean the railway problem. A Bill is brought down. We debated it this afternoon, we have discussed it to-night, and when we demand information, when we ask the Minister of Railways to bring

down and communicate to the House such data as we are entitled to, he evades answering our questions, or replies that he knows nothing about the matter.

Mr. Chairman, I want to declare this, I want to tell the members of the Government, I want particularly to tell the Acting Minister of Justice that we are sitting here as the representatives of the people, that we have been sent here to protect the most sacred interests of the Canadian people, and so long as I am able to lift my voice here, so long as I have any strength and vigour left in me, never shall I allow such a Bill to pass, without the representatives of the people being given the most elementary information with regard to this legislation. We have had enough legislation in this country which was carried by snap votes, we have had enough legislation which the representatives of the people were forced to pass under the pressure of a so-called war emergency. Those days are over. We have come back to the days when the Constitution and Parliamentary traditions in this country have to be respected, and if the Government wants to govern, the Minister of Railways ought to remember that he must govern according to Parliamentary procedure and not otherwise. Let him come before the House, supported by the acting Minister of Justice or by the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, let him come down here, supported by the Acting Minister of Justice or Maclean), let him come down here even with the support of the whole Cabinet, and I tell him, that never shall he succeed in having a Bill like this enacted and crystallised into law, unless he does us at least the elementary favour of acquainting us with the subject of his words.

Mr. CAHILL: There is no provision in the Bill as to where the directors are to meet, or who shall call the meeting. Section 7 is certainly a most unusual one; it provides:—

> The first directors may after appointment hold a meeting at such time and place as they think proper, for the purpose of passing by-laws and organizing the company.

It is most extraordinary that the so-called first directors are to hold a meeting, but there is no place mentioned for that meeting and no person designated to call it. I cannot understand how the company can hope to do business properly if they are going to act in this half-hearted way.

Mr. J. D. REID: The company is not organized yet, and it has no secretary. The directors will meet and organize and appoint a secretary.

Mr. McMASTER: May I draw the minister's attention to the fact that some one will have to take the lead in the matter, some one will have to call the directors together. They will not all be together in one place and all be moved by the spirit to get together to pass by-laws and do other things. It seems to me that the point of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) is well taken. There should be some one designated to perform this very necessary duty. The Government might give the first director named the power of calling a meeting, or, perhaps, the not unusual method of passing an Order in Council might be adopted. By Order in Council it might be provided that the first meeting might be held at a certain time and at a certain place.

Mr. J. D. REID: The directors are to be appointed by Order in Council. When such appointment is made they would be notified and the notice sent them could state that they might meet at a certain place at a certain time and organize.

Mr. McMASTER: That would be a proper method, but that is not the method that is contemplated by Clause 7. That clause merely says that the first directors may, after appointment, hold the meeting at such time and place as they think proper. If the minister would insert that the directors should meet " as they may be directed by Order in Council to do," or something of that sort, it would make the clause workable. As drafted it is not workable.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why?

Mr. McMASTER: I will do my best to answer the hon. gentleman. The clause reads as follows:—

> The first directors may after appointment hold a meeting at such time and place as they think proper, for the purpose of passing by-laws, and organizing the company.

Now, when and where are they to get together? It is quite clear that some procedure must be outlined. The Government must summon the meeting by Order in Council, or the directors may meet on the call of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is a secretary of the company.

Mr. McMASTER: How will the secretary know when to call a meeting? The secretary does not call a meeting of his own motion, he does it on instructions from the

president or the board. The point is, there is no procedure in this clause indicating how the first meeting is to be called.

Mr. TOBIN: What secretary does the minister refer to who would call this meeting together?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It might be the secretary of the company.

Mr. TOBIN: The secretary of what company?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My recollection of most companies incorporated under Acts which correspond to the English Companies Act is, that the first meeting is called by the provisional directors, and they can meet anywhere they like.

Mr. CAHILL: Who are the provisional directors?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The directors who are subscribers to the memorandum of association in the first place.

Mr. CAHILL: There is nothing of that kind mentioned in this Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Still it is an analogous case. The subscribers to the memorandum of association are the first directors, absolutely so if they state that in the articles of association. Very well, the provisional directors call the first meeting in any way they see fit.

Mr. TOBIN: Which provisional directors?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) suggested that the name of the place of meeting should be designated in the Bill. That is hardly a fair objection because the provisional directors—or the first directors, which means practically the same thing—should not be required to have their meeting at one particular place because it may not be convenient to have the meeting in one place more than another. The directors may not themselves at the time have received their charter. There is no purpose therefore, as far as I can see, in designating the place of the first meeting. In any event, the objection is very technical.

Mr. POWER: How should the first meeting of the directors of this company have been organized if this omission in the clause had not been pointed out.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They would proceed under this Bill precisely in the same way as they do under the Railway Act. Even without the direction which is contained here the provisional directors mentioned in the Railway Act get together.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Mr. POWER: There are none in this case.

Mr. McMASTER: I draw the minister's attention to the fact that there are no provisional directors mentioned in the Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The directors mentioned by the Government are analogous to the provisional directors. The Governor in Council nominates directors and these directors get together at such time and place as they deem proper, and the business of the company commences. I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentlemen are not over-earnest in putting forward this objection.

Mr. McMASTER: We are.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am glad to have the assurance of my hon. friend, but I had a higher regard for his knowledge of company law. Provisional directors, without any such provision at all, have been able under the Companies Act and the Railway Act to organize a company and commence its business. Here we have directors appointed by the Governor in Council. Even without this section they would get together for the very purpose mentioned. But to make it quite explicit there is this provision, that they shall get together at such time as they deem proper and commence the operations of the company. According to the view put forward by the hon. gentleman there would be an absolute dead centre, so to speak, no action could be taken; although the Government had appointed the directors and this provision is in the Act, still the company would remain without organization and business could not commence. I submit that that is an untenable position.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I would like to know that the word "may" in this section means. Does not the hon. minister think the word "should" is more appropriate. I would suggest also that you put "after fifteen days of their appointment" or "after thirty days of their appointment." It seems to me you should provide that a certain number of days after their appointment they "shall" do this, instead of "may."

Mr. KEEFER: It seems to me that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is thinking of shareholders and so confusing himself.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. KEEFER: The shareholders appoint their directors, then the directors meet at any time they see fit and pass by-laws, and thereafter they are governed by their by-laws. This is the same position exactly. The Government appoint a board of directors just as shareholders would do, and then it is the duty of those directors to meet, which they do whenever convenient, usually immediately after appointment. I do not see what difficulty the hon. member is labouring under.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: I want to know, Mr. Chairman, what would happen in that case with the word "may" there instead of "shall."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: "May" is the same as "shall."

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: They may not take any action. What would you do then?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I assume that my hon. friend is earnest in his desire for information, and as far as I can I am very glad to impart it to him. The duty is upon the directors of getting together and organizing. The word "may" is properly used in legislation of this kind, and really has the mandatory force of "shall." That is a well known principle of construction.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Before poceeding any further, may I suggest that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) should answer the question asked by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). He is certainly entitled to the information, and it ought to be given to him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I intended answering my hon. friend from Dorchester, Mr. Chairman, but I was prevented by somebody on the other side of the House getting the floor ahead of me. I wish to say that I dissent entirely from the remarks of the hon. member for Dorchester and I do not recollect one single particular in which I agree with him. I can very strongly commend to the Committee the adoption of this section, and after that I think we might very well rise feeling we have done a very good day's work. I cannot see any purpose in phrasing this section in any other way. As the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) has well stated, in a company where there are shareholders it is perhaps necessary for their protection that the first meeting of the directors be made public, that is, that the shareholders should know the time and place, and therefore that machinery should be set up in order to protect the rights of the shareholders; but here the first directors are nominated by the Government, they are the shareholders as well as the directors, and I do think that hon. gentlemen opposite are rather too critical of this section. I submit, with all due deference to them, that no purpose could be served by enacting the clause in any other form.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 7 carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Halifax, the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, must expect difficulties in connection with this Bill. It is a thing he can fall down and worship, because there is nothing like it in the heavens above or in the earth below, or in the waters under the earth. My hon. friend never saw any body consisting solely of directors, with no shareholders, no head office, no beginning or ending—

Mr. BUREAU: No capital stock.

Mr. McKENZIE: When we are talking of directors we always have in mind a body separate and apart from shareholders; but when we consider this Bill the directors are the whole thing, because they are pushed forward and backward, like railway time and other time, by the Governor in Council. My hon. friend will find his education and training in company law—I must give him credit for knowing a good deal about it—do not fit in here at all, and he must go to school again, because this is a company that expects to live in an atmosphere of company law, but has nothing in common with the ordinary company at all. I hope the Acting Prime Minister is in a better humour now—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am always in good humour.

Mr. McKENZIE: —and is willing to let us go home, especially if I say it is well on in the night. I will forget everything concerning the lack of information and say it is time we adjourned.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I know my hon. friend is a good Presbyterian like myself, and, consequently, does not like late hours; and as he is in a very obliging and genial frame of mind at the present time we will have very much pleasure in agreeing to his suggestion. I therefore move that the Committee do now rise. I think we will make just as much progress to-morrow.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Thursday, April 24, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ACT RESPECTING DIVORCE.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 77, respecting divorce.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. NICKLE: The object of the Bill is to constitute divorce courts in Canada. In each province the Supreme Court will be constituted a divorce court, and the Exchequer Court will be a court of divorce for the Dominion. The Bill sets out the reasons for which divorce may be granted and for which annulment of marriage may be declared. It deals with the question of domicile of husband and wife and touches also the question of alimony. There are further provisions concerning the decrees of the court. The general purport of the Bill is not only to facilitate divorce, but to harmonize the divorce laws of the country and to make the position of man and woman equal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

FISH DRIER; SOURIS, P.E.I.

Mr. McISAAC:

1. What amounts have been paid for rental on the Government fish drier buildings at Souris, Prince Edward Island, during term of the lease?
2. What was the cost for repairs asd maintenance of these building during the term of said lease? Were such repairs, if any, made at the instance of the department or of the lessee and by whom were they paid for?
3. How much insurance was collected after the building was burned in 1918?
4. Why was this building only insured for $2,000 at the time it was burned when the notice calling for tenders stipulated that the lessee must keep the building insured for $5,000?
5. Has the department given their consent to the lessee to enlarge the remaining building or erect new buildings on the site of the burnt building which was situated on the Government railroad wharf?
6. Has the Government any knowledge that such enlargements have been made and such new buildings erected?
7. Has the consent of the Minister of Railways been given to any party to erect fish sheds and gasolene sheds on this railway property?
8. What is the present policy of the Government is respect to the site and remaining buillding, in view of the fact that the existing lease expires May 14 next?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. $151 each year.
2. No knowledge, repairs and maintenance of the property at the expense of the lessees.
3. $2,000.
4. Plant originally valued at $5,000 and insured for that amount by previous lessee, the Maritime Fish Corporation, 1914, plant valued at $2,000 and minimum insurance at that amount.
5. No.
6. No.
7. The Department of Railways and Canals leased certain lands at Souris, P.E.I. to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, who sub-leased the same to the J. J. Hughes Co., Limited. The Minister of Railways and Canals consented to such sub-lease.
8. The J. J. Hughes Co., Limited, the present sub-tenants of the property, have applied to the Railway Department for a continuance of their tenancy. The application is being considered.

BRITISH WAR MISSION.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Who is the Chairman of the British War Mission?
2. Who compose this mission?
3. What are their duties?
4. When and how were they appointed?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: May I ask the member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) what he means by the "British War Mission?" So far as I know there is no such body. There is in London a Canadian Mission of which Mr. Lloyd Harris is chairman.

Question stands.

MATAPEDIA VALLEY HIGHWAY.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. How much money was expended by the Department of Public Works on the highway in the Matapedia Valley, in the Counties of Rimouski and Bonaventure?
2. When was this expenditure made and was the whole amount voted by this House so expended?
3. Over what mileage was this work done?
4. Is the Government aware of the amount of work remaining to be done to put this highway in proper order?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. $10,497.12.
2. (a) 1913-14, $1,221.69; 1914-15, $4,579.83; 1915-16, $3,043.81; 1916-17, $1,133.81; 1917-18, $517.98. (b) Yes, total voted by Parliament was $10,000; amount expended $10,497.12.
3. About 18 miles.
4. Yes.

EQUIPMENT ALLOWANCE TO OFFICERS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is it a fact that an extra equipment allowance was given to officers in England and France after the armistice was signed?

2. If so, what was the amount, and is it the Government's intention to give this to officers who have served for a definite length of time in France?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1 and 2. No, but Order in Council P.C. 2232, dated 12th September, 1918, provides that an additional outfit allowance of $100 shall be paid annually to officers on the strength of and issued with pay and allowances by the overseas military forces of Canada who have completed 12 months' service since the last payment of outfit allowance was due. The first payment of this additional allowance was made with effect from the 1st August, 1918, and no further allowance will be made to any officer until he has completed a further period of 12 months' service hereafter.

LABOUR STRIKES—THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (St. James): In view of the several strikes in Montreal and elsewhere and of many others which are threatened, in connection with which new scales of wages are being demanded; and in view of the fact that this is due to the disproportionately high cost of living, is it the intention of the Government to take immediate steps to meet the general complaint with regard to the high cost of living and to afford our people relief in that connection?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter of the high cost of different commodities is at all times having the attention of officers of the Labour Department.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Will immediate action be taken through the Department of Labour or otherwise to remedy the state of affairs revealed in to-day's Montreal Gazette with regard to the numerous strikes in Montreal which threaten to tie up the whole city?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not seen the report to which my hon. friend refers; I really do not know what he has in mind. If he refers to the strike of carters, I may say that the Department of Labour has a representative at Montreal and has offered a Board of Conciliation to both interested parties, but up to the present neither has availed of the offer. The department is doing everything it possibly can in the circumstances.

CENSORSHIP OF LETTERS FROM SOLDIERS OVERSEAS.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): I hold in my hand a letter from a Canadian military officer overseas. On the envelope there is the stamp "Passed by Censor."

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the date of the stamp?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: March 4, 1919. In the letter four or five lines have been deleted or blotted out. Is there still a censorship of letters coming from soldiers overseas, and if so, why?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government will be glad to make inquiry in the matter.

DISCHARGE OR LEAVE FOR SOLDIERS AT HALIFAX.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR (Queens, P.E.I.): I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter of importance, referred to in a Charlottetown paper of April 21, and to ask the Minister of Militia a question regarding it. This is the item on which I base my question:

> Important to Farmers. Premier Arsenault will meet a delegation of farmers having sons in the military at Halifax and who desire to have them granted home leave or discharge, on Friday 25th inst. at 1.30 p.m., in the Y.M.C.A.

Has Premier Arsenault any authority from the Government to grant home leave or discharge to any of the soldiers who are at Halifax? May I also ask why soldiers who were called to the colours after the armistice was signed are still being held at Halifax?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): I may say, offhand, that the Premier of Prince Edward Island has no authority, whatever, from the Militia Department regarding the soldiers at Halifax. I am not aware of any men having been sent there since the armistice. A certain number of troops are, of course, held there during disembarkation, and for carrying on garrison duty. If the hon. gentleman will put his question on the Order Paper, I shall be very glad to give him the answer.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 70, to incorporate Canadian National

Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 7—first meeting:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose last night, this Bill was under discussion. Sections 1, 4 and 5 had been adopted. Sections 2, 3 and 6 had been allowed to stand. The Committee was discussing section 7 concerning the first meeting of directors. Shall section 7 carry?

Mr. CAHILL: Have the Government, over night, framed an amendment to this section to make it more understandable and workable? It says that the directors may hold a meeting, but there is no provision as to when or where the meeting shall be held.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 7 is, in my judgment, all right, as it stands, and there is nothing practical in the objection of the hon. member. When the board of directors are appointed, undoubtedly, one of them will be asked, or all may be asked in the appointment to meet at a certain time and place. That is one way of arranging a meeting. If that is not done, then they can, by correspondence, without meeting, arrange where they will meet the first time. That may be done by wire.

Mr. CAHILL: Supposing a director in Saskatchewan should decide to call a meeting at McTaggart and a director who is appointed down in St. John should decide to call a meeting at St. John, just as last night members of the Committee wanted the head office at every way station along the line. Why not make the thing practical? Surely the Government have had time to make this clause understandable to people reading it. Why not insert at the beginning of the clause, or after the words "organizing the company," a provision that the first meeting shall be called at the instance of the Governor in Council by whom the directors will be notified when and where to meet; or, it might be provided that the first named director shall name the place of meeting? In the Bill, no head office is provided; no capital stock is provided; there are no directors and no shareholders. Surely it ought to be within the ability of some members of the Government to draft a section to take care of this.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no difficulty in drafting a section to take care of this, but I am afraid we are not able to draft a section to satisfy the hon. member. It is possible that one man appointed might make one excuse, and another, another, and that they would never agree to meet at any place or time. The imagination might reach to that possibility, but, if that ever takes place, then I shall have the very greatest deference for the hon. member. Such a thing is utterly unthinkable. These men, if they are not by their appointment asked to meet, will, by wire, arrange to meet at once, and there is no practical or even remote possibility of their not doing so. That is the way it is always done. As a matter of wording, of course, you might tell them where to meet the first time, or tell one of them to tell the others, but that is wholly unnecessary. A message would do the whole thing, so why go to the trouble of putting unnecessary words into this section? It is in the first place drafted by a man who has, undoubtedly, the most experience in corporation law in Canada. As to its working, there is no doubt in the mind of any sensible or reasonable man, and I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of the hon. member.

Mr. TOBIN: Who is the gentleman who drafted this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Zebulon A. Lash.

Mr. BUREAU: Here you have the result of the first error that was made. In any ordinary railway Bill it is provided that the first meeting of the directors shall be held at the head office of the company, on the call of the secretary, but here the Government do not want to determine where the head office of the company shall be for fear of hurting some friends behind them, for fear they will kick. This, they think, had better be done in the silence of the council room, after the members have gone away. Then let the word slide out that the head office will be in Toronto, or Montreal, or wherever it is. If the head office were determined, the rest would be easy. The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) need not stand behind the fact that the ablest man in Canada drafted this section. I think in the heads of the 232 members of this House there is more than in the head of one man, whoever he may be, even if his name be Zebulon. The objection of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) is rightly taken. This is our railway and we want to know when the directors are going to have a meeting to organize. We are giving them extraordinary powers, and the Government is taking extraordinary powers and setting its own powers aside whenever it is threatened with anything that is important, when-

ever it will have to guard the public treasury and see that expenditures are not made recklessly or uselessly. Section 6 of the Bill, which protects the directors from any liability to anybody, stands, and I want to have some discussion about it. It makes those men safe from the operation of the law if they do anything crooked. Further on the Bill authorizes them to do certain things, which, under the General Railway Act, no railway company is permitted to do.

I think we are entitled to know what these men are going to do and when they are going to organize, and to be in a position to see every step they take hereafter. I would ask my hon. friend to let the clause stand, and if Mr. Zebulon Lash is the only man who is sufficiently informed on the subject he should be consulted again in order that we might have a clause that would be satisfactory to the House.

Mr. CAHILL: I think the meeting should be called at some specified place, it does not matter where, and at any time and by any person you wish to designate. I do not think there would be any objection as to where the meeting should be called, or as to who should call it; but it should be stated in this clause. It ought to be at the call of the Governor in Council, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of the Interior, or the Acting Minister of Justice.

Mr. DEVLIN: I approve of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Pontiac, that it would be well to have the meeting called by some particular minister, preferably the Minister of Railways, who is the proper person to convene the first meeting. I suggest that the first meeting should be held at the seat of government here in Ottawa, where the directors might be in immediate touch with all the representatives of the Railway Department. I have no particular preference for Ottawa, but if Ottawa were selected as the place of meeting it would remove any jealousy on the part of cities like Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Vancouver, Three Rivers, Regina, and Calgary.

Mr. MORPHY: I disagree with hon. members who are opposing this clause. It seems to me that on the face of it it is workable and reasonable and provides all that any business man would want. If this House were to name a place it might happen to be the worst place that could be selected. I think that this is a matter for the directors themselves and that it is only reasonable that they should hold the meeting at such time and place as they think proper. Business men will have complete charge of the matter, and it is unreasonable to presume that they are going to act like school boys or that they will quarrel and disagree as soon as they meet. "As they think proper" means as they consider most convenient for the purposes of the meeting. They are the operative and executive officers, and surely it is fatuous to contend that they are going to behave like school boys. They are business men and we must assume that they will take the wisest course open to them.

Mr. BUREAU: The general Railway Act provides "all general meetings, whether annual or special, shall be held at the head office of the company." If the Government, for fear of displeasing somebody, are afraid to select the head office, the rest of the Bill will suffer. We are all interested to see the organization under way and the Canadian railways put on such a footing that the company will not be ashamed of them and we will not read of wrecks, and trains running behind time and passengers being disappointed. I would like to see them organize and pass their by-laws before we prorogue, so that we may be afforded an opportunity to criticise their work if it is not as it should be. There is no reason why, as my hon. friend from Pontiac says, it should not be provided that the first directors shall, after appointment, call a meeting within a month in the city of Toronto, if you will, or at the place where the head office now is. I suggest, therefore, that the directors shall within thirty days after appointment hold a meeting at the head office of the Canadian Northern Railway in the city of Toronto for the purpose of passing by-laws and organizing the company.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member for Three Rivers fails apparently to distinguish between general and special meetings of the company after it is once formed, and this clause in question, which really provides for the meeting is preliminary to the formation of the board. This clause is intended to provide for purposes of organization so that the board may get together and, after consideration, determine where the head office of the company shall be.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not say who shall call the meeting? You have a number of directors, five, ten or fifteen, and any one of them would have power to call the meeting. I think some one man should be designated to call the meeting, as is done in ordinary companies. This is an extra-

ordinary condition of things, for here is a company without a head office. There is no place where the meeting might be held. In all probability it will be held in Mackenzie and Mann's office, where no doubt they will have the counsel of Mr. Lash. I do not care where you hold the meeting, but I think it is only reasonable that some person should be named to call the meeting.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think the matter is of very great importance, but I am not sure that the clause is workable. This is to arrange for the first meeting of the directors who, it says may, after appointment, hold a meeting at such time and place as they think proper. How are they going to do the "thinking" if they have had no meeting? What is to be the evidence that they did that thinking unless they meet for that purpose? If it is proposed that they shall hold a first meeting and before that decide the time and place of meeting; they have to do some thinking but how are we to know that it is the wish of the directors? I am not captious in the matter but it does not look to me to be very practical. I do not attach as much importance to that as some other hon. gentlemen appear to do, but I think the section might be made clearer.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I think the point made by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) is a very strong one. I mentioned it in private last night after we rose. The clause says that they may meet at the time and place they think proper. They must therefore have met together if they are doing that thinking in common. The clause provides for a meeting before the meeting. It would be a simple matter to accept the suggestions of the other side and fix a definite place and time when the business of the company shall commence in connection with this very serious and large undertaking.

Mr. MEIGHEN: First of all, on the general question of thinking and meeting it is not necessary that men shall meet together in order to think. They can think as to whether they will meet without being physically together. The thinking is usually, as a matter of practice, expressed by telegraph. There is nothing new in this. This Bill combines certain things that are not combined in the usual run of legislation. Usually provisional directors are appointed; the provisional directors meet and they call a meeting of the shareholders. They pass certain by-laws and then the place where they shall meet afterwards is fixed. The general Railway Act, which contemplates provisional directors, does not say where they shall meet the first time. These people are not strictly speaking provisional directors but in so far as meeting for the first time is concerned they do the same as provisional directors. Section 74 of the Railway Act reads:

> (1) The persons mentioned by name as such in the Special Act shall be the provisional directors of the company.
>
> (2) A majority of such provisional directors shall form a quorum.
>
> (3) The provisional directors may,—
>
> (a) forthwith open stock books and procure subscriptions of stock for the undertaking;
>
> (b) receive payments on account of stock subscribed;
>
> (c) cause plans and surveys to be made; and
>
> (d) deposit in any chartered bank of Canada moneys received by them on account of stock subscribed.
>
> (4) The moneys so received and deposited shall not be withdrawn, except for the purposes of the undertaking, or upon the dissolution of the company.
>
> (5) The provisional directors shall hold office as such until the first election of directors.

The provisional directors have to meet to do that, but the Act does not provide where or when they shall meet. It is merely done as a matter of course. I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) that the matter is of no possible consequence at all. This is just the same as the provision with regard to provisional directors which has been in operation during all these years without any trouble or inconvenience whatsoever occurring.

Mr. BUREAU: The conditions are different. When you ask for a charter you have no organization whatever. You have subscribed money and deposited it in a bank whereas in this case you have a going concern. If it is possible to delay this meeting they might wait for two or three months before calling it. The Acting Minister of Justice may say that that is unthinkable but we have seen such things here that no member of this House can conceive of a thing that would not be done by hon. gentlemen opposite. Here the conditions are known; they are at present existing. We have a going concern; it is now practically what it is going to be except that there have been certain manipulations of the Railway Act in connection with this Bill to give the Governor in Council certain powers that may be advantageously used for political purposes, and putting upon the company certain obligations in order that the Government cannot be criticised if certain things are done. The Bill gives

powers to the company that the general Railway Act denies to ordinary companies and the general directors are made immune from any responsibility to any shareholder, director, officer, or employee of the company. Why not determine that within thirty days after the appointment of the directors, the president shall call a meeting in the city of Ottawa for the purpose of organizing. They have to be near the Governor in Council or the Minister of Railways, who is supposed to be the Governor in Council in this connection because they have to be checked up and he has to give his approval to everything they do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no actual president.

Mr. BUREAU: The manager, if you like.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You might create one, I suppose, but that is absolutely unnecessary. We can only pass legislation like this and hope for good results on the assumption that the men who are going to be appointed will be reasonable business men. You might say that they must meet within a week, but that does not ensure that we will get good results. They might meet within a week or they might not. If they met within a week they might never meet again. Then you would not have any clause compelling them to meet. Assuming that they will act as business men, the Bill is all right because a similar clause has proved all right during all these years.

Mr. FIELDING: There can be no objection to saying that the directors shall meet at such time and place as the Governor in Council may direct for that purpose. I do not expect that there shall be a time set, but that would meet the objection of some hon. gentlemen. I cannot see any objection to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no objection to it. It makes the Bill neither better nor worse, but if it will expedite the Bill it might as well go in.

Mr. McKENZIE: Just as the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) rose I was about to propose an amendment. The Bill now reads:

> The first directors may after appointment hold a meeting at such time and place as they think proper, for the purpose of passing by-laws, and organizing the company.

I would move that the words " they think proper " be struck out and that the following words be substituted: " may be designated by the Minister of Railways and Canals." Then it will read:

> The first directors may after appointment hold a meeting at such time and place as may be designated by the Minister of Railways and Canals for the purpose of passing by-laws, and organizing the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is all right as it is, but that is all right too.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—executive committee:

Mr. BUREAU: The board of directors are going to have an executive committee and they are going to give the executive committee powers for the administration of the road. The executive committee will not be the creature of the Governor in Council because I do not see anything in the Bill whereby the actions of the executive committee will be subject to ratification by the Governor in Council.

I therefore presume that the executive committee, or some of them, will be appointed by by-law by the board of directors, and the executive committee is practically and actually the managing body of the railway. In this case the Government declines to assume any responsibility and says: "You may create an executive committee, but if the executive committee makes any recommendations we do not have to ratify them, because we were not consulted. Go to the board of directors—we cannot go into the management of this railway; it is up to the directors to see that everything is all right." Now I want this executive committee and the powers to be entrusted to it to be controlled by Parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID: In all large corporations such as this, where the board of directors do not live at the place where the head office is located, they appoint an executive committee for the purpose of carrying on the business between the regular meetings. In the present instance the directors live a long distance apart. One of them resides in Saskatchewan, another in Manitoba, and the rest live in Eastern Canada. The object of this clause is to enable the executive committee to carry on business in the interval between the meetings of directors. The directors, of course, are appointed by the Government and are responsible for the action of the executive committee, and any action taken by the executive committee in the interval would be ratified and confirmed by the directors at the regular meeting. Otherwise, of course, the directors would be supposed to live where they could be called together at any moment, frequently on only an hour or a day's notice. At the present time, in connection with the operation of the Canadian National Rail-

ways, I think six is the quorum for an executive committee meeting.

Mr. BUREAU: To whom does the present executive committee report?

Mr. J. D. REID: To the board of directors.

Mr. BUREAU: As actually constituted.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes. The executive committee reports to the directors at the regular meeting.

Mr. BUREAU: That is only as regards the by-laws that were passed for the operation of the old Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course the directors of the old Canadian Northern Railway passed the by-laws under which the executive commmittee is now acting. Presumably the new directors will pass new by-laws.

Mr. BUREAU: There is where the trouble arises again. The by-laws may be passed by the company, which consists of directors appointed by the Government, and my hon. friends opposite take it for granted that faultless, sinless and impeccable men are going to be appointed. We on this side do not believe in that because we do not believe in the appointors, if I may coin a term, and that is the reason why we want to be careful, and desire to have some check put upon all these powers that are being conferred. As the minister says, the executive committee will be responsible to the board of directors, and the latter very often will be desirous to have some excuse with respect to the actions of the executive committee if it will only help the Government. That is what we fear, and that is what we want to guard against. There is nothing in the Bill which provides that the by-laws shall be controlled by anybody. In the case of an ordinary company the by-laws would have to be submitted to the shareholders, that is to the people whose money was invested in the enterprise, but here there is no such safeguard. I want these by-laws, and the powers which are to be entrusted to the executive, to be controlled by Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the Railway Act certain of the by-laws of a railway company, if not all, must be approved by the shareholders. In this case the by-laws that ordinarily would be approved by the shareholders have to be approved by the Governor in Council. Section 9 of the Bill says:

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Whenever under the provisions of the Railway Act, or any other statute or law, the approval, sanction or confirmation by shareholders is required, such approval, sanction or confirmation may be given by the Governor in Council.

Consequently, the by-laws would have to be approved by the Governor in Council wherever the Railway Act required them to be approved by shareholders.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a vicious principle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a pretty old one.

Mr. BUREAU: Not in other countries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a pretty old one in Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: Only since the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman was arguing that the by-laws should be approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I say they should be approved by Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I am afraid I will have to take issue with my hon. friend there. If the functions of Parliament are to be extended in that way I do not know when it is going to get its work done. However, the point I rose to speak to was that the by-laws are now required to be approved by the Governor in Council. Those by-laws, according to section 8 of the Bill, may provide for the appointment of an executive committee, but that committee must all be members of the Board of Directors. Consequently, those members of the executive committee already have received the sanction of the Governor in Council. It appears very manifest that the board, particularly if the membership is Canadian-wide, will require an executive committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the necessity for section 9 at all? Is it not understood that the Board of Directors has the right to appoint managers, and is as a body responsible for the whole management of the affairs put in their hands? Is it not also a custom, as well as a thing understood, that the board can exercise its powers in such a manner within itself as it may deem advisable? If it is the judgment of the board that a committee, the working part of that body, shall exercise the powers of a few of their own number, why should we tell them what to do? Have they not the general powers to carry on the business of the company as they deem proper?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly they have the powers within the very same sphere of authority as the powers of directors of any railway company, except as modified by this Bill. That is to say, where any railway company does not require to come to its shareholders for sanction, then this board of directors would not require to come; but if it requires to come to the shareholders, the method of doing so is to make application for an Order in Council ratifying any Act of the board which requires ratification by the shareholders.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not touch exactly the point I asked about. Why should we tell them whether they have the right to appoint an executive committee within themselves, when as a matter of common law and practice they have that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think they have that right unless it is statutorily given. No executive committee could exercise any but statutory powers.

Mr. McKENZIE: They can exercise general powers vested in such bodies.

Mr. BUREAU: From among themselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not unless they are authorized to elect an executive committee with those powers, and they could not under common law or under any practice—

Mr. McKENZIE: They could appoint a manager.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course; but they cannot delegate their powers to an executive committee unless they have statutory authority for that purpose.

Mr. BUREAU: The directors are themselves in fact an executive committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are.

Mr. BUREAU: Because they could not delegate to themselves powers that they do not possess. They have power to act as an executive committee. Each individual is a member of the executive committee. Why do you require statutory authority to tell them that five or six shall act as such. You say the members of the executive committee shall be taken from among the Board of Directors; to be a member of the executive committee you have to be a director, and you have executive power in your hands; that means something or nothing. I should judge the object of that section would be to allow the Board of Directors to appoint to that executive committee men who are not on the directorate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect of this section is simply to enable something smaller than a quorum to do the work of the entire directorate. A quorum can do it under the Railway Act now. We are empowering the Board of Directors to constitute a smaller body and, if they desire, call it an executive committee, and give to that executive committee the powers which the directors themselves have.

Mr. ROSS: How many members have you now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Eleven.

Mr. ROSS: Under this section 8 you give the directors power to appoint an executive committee and by by-laws you empower them to clothe that executive committee with any powers they see fit. You appoint eleven directors from all over the country for the protection of certain interests and to secure the advantage of certain knowledge which is supposed to be possessed by them. Are you not going to arrive at this point: That these

4 p.m.

eleven men will appoint five or six of their number, so that we will have the old gang in charge, as the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), pointed out last night. They may be in a majority, and then by by-laws, which they have power to enact without the approval of the Governor in Council, they may appoint two or three of their number as an executive committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Nine.

Mr. ROSS: It does not specify any number.

Mr. J. D. REID: Six is the number we have now.

Mr. ROSS: I know; but you have given the committee power to appoint any number, and they may appoint two, three, or four of their number. The minister says that under the Railway Act there has to be a quorum of the Board of Directors; but this section will allow the directorate to form an executive committee, and the result would be that those directors might get together and pass a by-law appointing two or three of their number members of the executive committee, with the possibility of the old gang getting in control of the Canadian Government railways,—Mackenzie & Mann and D. B. Hanna —the same old crowd. There should be some protection in the form of providing power to the Governor in Council to approve or disapprove of the executive committee appointed by your board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is another feature that I did not bring out. Any member of the board may, if he desires, attend a meeting of the executive committee.

Mr. ROSS: It does not say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You cannot say everything. You must assume that men are going to act as reasonable business men. If you are going to state every little thing in a Bill it will be endless. The executive committee may be small, that is very true, but under the by-laws as now provided any member may attend that executive committee if he desires; and it is further provided that any action taken by the executive committee as such may be reversed at the first subsequent meeting of directors. We do not want to tie down these men, who are to be entrusted with great powers, more than directors usually are tied down, and I do not think we would gain very much by doing so. I think the proper principle is to entrust them with the necessary powers, hold them responsible for the exercise of those powers, and not hold over them statutory clubs. Upon the assumption that they are not going to act as reasonable men.

Mr. ROSS: My hon. friend says that the by-laws now provide for certain things. But this Bill does not incorporate those by-laws, and we do not know if those by-laws will prevail when the new directors are appointed.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why are not the by-laws submitted at the same time as this Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The by-laws will have to be submitted to the Governor in Council for approval.

Mr. MARCIL: I did not hear the hon. minister say whether the policy of the Government was to have each province represented on this board of directors. Seeing that this is a national undertaking, are all the provinces through which this railway runs to be represented on the directorate?

Mr. J. D. REID: That question has not been decided yet. The whole matter will have to be considered when we are considering the number of directors to be appointed. We may not appoint nine, there may be fewer than that number. The object would be to select the very best men possible, and it might be that we would not be able to have every province represented.

Mr. MARCIL: Then they might all come from one province?

[Mr. Ross.]

Mr. J. D. REID: That is not likely. Possibly two or three might come from one province, in which case you could not have all the provinces represented.

Mr. ROSS: Did I understand the hon. minister to say that the by-laws will have to be approved by the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, because under the Railway Act they have to be approved by the shareholders, and under section 9 such approval has to be given by the Governor in Council, in lieu thereof.

Mr. CANNON: The previous clause gives the right to the directors to make by-laws and organize the company, and according to this clause we are giving the right to the directors to appoint an executive committee. I would like to know from the Minister of Railways or the Acting Minister of Justice what the Minister of Railways will have to do with the management of the railroad after this Bill is passed; and if the Minister of Railways will have nothing more to do with it, what control will Parliament have over the management of the road. I think this is a very important question. Our railways are going to be run by a board of directors, and these directors we know nothing about. The Government tells us the present directors might be changed later, but they might be maintained in that position, and so the action of the Government in regard to the directorate is very uncertain and indefinite. The only way the representatives of the people can control expenditure in connection with our railways or exercise jurisdiction over their management is to have in this House someone who has authority to speak for the management. If the powers contemplated in the Bill are given to the directors, the management of the railways will be taken from the minister; his department will become useless, and we shall no longer have in Parliament a minister responsible to Parliament in connection with railway matters.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Minister of Railways does not really operate railways; he did not operate the Intercolonial. He depends on his officials for the actual operation of railways. But the Government must keep in touch with the system; every day matters arise that must be brought before the Government. Moreover, there are matters in connection with the other railways throughout Canada that must come to the attention of the minister. The minister must be the medium between Parliament or the Government and this system.

The hon. member need not worry about the Minister of Railways not having very much to do.

Mr. BUREAU: He has the Welland canal on his hands.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, that will assist in giving him something to do. The Canadian National Railway Company must come before the Government from time to time so far as construction is concerned and in connection with many other matters affecting the system. The minister and the department will have plenty of work to do without looking after the operation.

Mr. CANNON: I should be the first to regret the abolition of the minister's department; I enjoy very much his presence in this House and I should be sorry if he disappeared. But after the Acting Minister of Justice has this Bill passed the Minister of Railways may discover that it goes much further than he thinks it does and that he will be deprived of powers which he thinks he still has. The example of the Intercolonial does not fit in with this case at all. The Intercolonial is a Government-owned railway operated by a commission; the Canadian National Railway Company is a company separate and distinct from the Government itself, with the powers of an ordinary railway company. The Minister of Railways has nothing to say with regard to the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and similarly he will have no control over the Canadian National Railway Company. Five, ten or fifteen men selected by the Government will have in their hands the management of all our Government railways and Parliament will have absolutely nothing to say with regard to that management. The minister pointed out that he would have something to say with regard to construction and with regard to the relations existing between this company and the other railway companies of Canada. Well, my experience indicates that quite the opposite will be the case. A few months ago I wrote the minister asking him what he intended to do in connection with certain conditions existing in a parish in my country, and he replied that he had absolutely nothing to do with the matter; that, a commission having been appointed to look after the Government railways, I would have to apply to Mr. Hanna. Three months ago, therefore, the minister acknowledged that he no longer had authority over the railways; after this Bill passes, his position will be worse.

Mr. BUREAU: What railway was that?

Mr. CANNON: The Transcontinental. The minister said that he had no authority to apply to the chairman of the new commission. Parliament should see that in this Bill the privileges of the people are preserved. Nobody knows who the new directors will be. The minister said last night that the directors might be changed. After this Bill is passed the Government will be free to appoint whom they choose. I hope they will be good men, but sometimes the Government makes bad appointments. Will the Government appoint competent railway experts to the board of directors, or will they appoint political friends to reward them for past services? I do not know; members of the committee do not know. We should insert in this Bill as many safeguards as possible. The people are getting sick and tired of the railway situation and of railway legislation brought down by this Government. The Canadian Northern Railway Bill, which was passed a few years ago, brought forth a good deal of opposition; this Bill will certainly agitate the minds of the people. We must examine this Bill very carefully and see that we do not simply hand over to the old gang of Mackenzie and Mann the railways that we bought and paid for with our millions. We want to have no more squandering of public moneys such as we had in connection with the Canadian Northern in past years.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) stated a minute ago that by-laws passed by the Board of Directors will be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I understand the minister bases that on section 9, which provides that whenever, under the provisions of the Railway Act, the sanction of shareholders is required, the sanction of the Governor in Council will be required under this Bill. Section 122 of the new law, which is going through the House at the present time, provides for the enactment of by-laws by the Board of Directors, but it does not provide that those by-laws shall be submitted to the shareholders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now discussing section 9. Shall section 8 carry?

Mr. BUREAU: Both sections work together.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member's law is right. I do not know that in my last sentence I repeated what I said previously

in answer, I think, to the hon. member for West Middlesex, namely, that such by-laws as by the Railway Act require confirmation by the shareholders will now require confirmation by the Governor in Council. There are certain by-laws, such as those that have to do with appointment of officials and the general running of the road, which do not require confirmation by the shareholders, but all by-laws of major importance have, as will be seen by reference to, I think, section 132 to be approved by the shareholders, and consequently will now have to be approved by the Governor in Council. Then section 120 says:—

> The directors shall be subject to the examination and control of the shareholders at their annual meetings, and shall be subject to all by-laws of the company, and to the orders and directions from time to time made or given at the annual or special meetings if such orders and directions are not contrary to or inconsistent with any expressed direction or provision of this Act or of the Special Act.

I apprehend the Governor in Council will have power under that section as well.

Mr. ROSS: Under the sections of the Railway Act referred to, will the sanction of the Governor in Council be necessary to a by-law of the directors appointing certain of their number as an executive committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: Where does the minister get that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the directors are expressly given power to pass by-laws of a certain character without reference to the shareholders, and unless, in a word, that power is included within section 122, the directors must get the assent, and on inquiry, I find that assent is always obtained to the by-law which constitutes the executive committee and gives its powers.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the minister point out the clause in the new Act which makes by-laws of the directors subject to the approval of shareholders?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The law is, as I understand it, that unless powers are expressly given to the board of directors, such powers cannot be exercised except with the approval of the shareholders of the company.

Mr. BUREAU: Where is the clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not need any. What I mean is this, the directors have only such powers as are statutorily given to them. The company are the shareholders, consequently, the directors cannot derive, from the company, any powers except such as may be given to them. The law gives them certain powers. Anything the law does not give them, they do not have, and therefore, they must secure confirmation of any such acts from the shareholders.

Mr. BUREAU: How do the shareholders have the right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the shareholders are the company, and the directors are acting for the company, and unless the directors have something to prove their authority for any act, they cannot do it.

Mr. BUREAU: They can by section 120.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they cannot go beyond that.

Mr. BUREAU: The shareholders cannot do anything inconsistent with law, but the directors may make by-laws or pass resolutions from time to time not inconsistent with law. The argument of the minister falls to the ground. The directors can do anything not inconsistent with this Bill by passing by-laws.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The directors may make by-laws or pass resolutions as provided in clauses (a), (b), and (c) of section 122.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not restrict the power of the former clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any power specified in section 120 they can exercise so long as it is not inconsistent with law, but anything that is not specified there, they cannot do.

Mr. BUREAU: They can, because the directors have power under another clause to manage the railway, and that implies the power to do anything which is necessary for the management. Section 122 simply says that the directors shall have power to make by-laws or pass resolutions, not inconsistent with law, for the purposes of the management. The word "management" covers everything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. ROSS: The minister's argument absolutely destroys itself. He says that if the directors are given power by the Act to do a certain thing, then they do not need to get the approval of the shareholders.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they have statutory powers, they do not require power from the shareholders.

Mr. ROSS: By this Bill, we are giving them statutory powers. Section 8 says:

> The by-laws of the company may provide for an executive committee of the board of direc-

tors, to exercise such powers as the by-laws may specify.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the by-laws of the company, not the by-laws of the directors.

Mr. BUREAU: Who is the company,

Mr. ROSS: Who are making these by-laws?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The company.

Mr. BUREAU: If I ask who is the company, the minister says "the directors." If I ask, who are the directors, the minister says "the company." That is the minister's style of arguing. In this case the company is a body of directors appointed by the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then what is the difference between the company and the directors? The directors are the company and the company is the directors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is going round in a circle.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister made the circle, I cannot get out of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 8 says:

> The by-laws of the company may provide for an executive committee of the board of directors, to exercise such powers as the by-laws may specify.

That is to say, whatever powers the directors may have as a directorate, they may revest in the executive committee. Under section 120 of the Railway Act, the directors are given certain powers, and any powers there vested in them, they may revest in the executive committee. Any powers not given to them, they cannot revest in the executive committee. If any powers are given to them by the shareholders, they, in turn, could revest them in the executive committee, provided those powers were not inconsistent with the by-laws.

Mr. BUREAU: What are the by-laws that require to be ratified by the shareholders, and in what section does the minister find that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 132, if I remember correctly, contains certain of them. It is a very long section and I do not suppose the hon. member wants me to read it.

Mr. BUREAU: It provides that if you want to issue securities you must have a two-thirds vote of the shareholders.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I see it is provided that the directors can make by-laws relating to the business affairs of the company, the appointment and dismissal of officers, and the conduct of the general business of the company. Now, the Governor in Council are the shareholders of the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Well, as there are no shareholders in the proper sense, should not all by-laws be submitted to the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Committee might very well discuss that point. I do not think there could be any objection, unless perhaps it would be that it would virtually give to the Governor in Council a dictating power as to salaries and management. Whether that is wise or not is a matter that is open to discussion, but it certainly would tend to place the management of this road more on a footing of political patronage than it is at present. There is, however, much to be said the other way.

Mr. NESBITT: I for one am not alarmed at the power given to the directors, and I hope the Government will be in a position to appoint independent directors who know something about the management of railways and who will not be interfered with. I am strongly opposed to the suggestion that the by-laws as drafted by the directors should be submitted entirely to the Governor in Council. Of course there are certain by-laws which have to be submitted to the Governor in Council, such as those relating to the issuance of securities. But to require the directors to submit by-laws relating to the real operation of the road, as for instance the appointment and dismissal of officers, would be to bring it immediately under the influence of political patronage, and that is what I hope we shall avoid. Clause 8 is simply the ordinary clause passed by all large corporations. You have to have an executive management. Frequently very large powers are given to executive bodies who, of course, have to report to the directors before taking any particularly important step. It is a simple every-day proposition to allow the board of directors to appoint an executive committee to have the immediate management of the road.

Mr. BUREAU: Not in railway companies.

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, look at the Canadian Pacific Railway and you will see who the executive committee are. It is they, and

not the board of directors, whom we have to thank for the very great success of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As to submitting all by-laws, I think we ought to take it for granted that we are going to appoint, or at least endeavour to appoint, as directors and especially the executive, men who know something about railways. As to the Minister of Railways being relieved of his responsibility, that is impossible, for so long as we are owners of the railway, the Government will be responsible for the actions not only of the executive committee but of the board of directors.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend seems to be surprised at the suggestion that the by-laws should be submitted to the Governor in Council. The Railway Act provides: "All such by-laws, rules, and regulations, except such as relate to tolls and such as are of a private or domestic nature and do not affect the public generally, shall be submitted to the Governor in Council for approval."

Mr. NESBITT: What are you reading from?

Mr. BUREAU: The Railway Act, Chapter 37, Revised Statutes, 1906.

Mr. NESBITT: Get the new Act.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, last night I was called down for using the new Act and that is my reason for quoting from the old Act to-day.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can see no objection to having all by-laws subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It would be a safeguard and I think it should be added to Section 8. It can do no harm, and I am not disposed to allow the people of the country to be governed by laws made by independent bodies over whom we have no control. The provision is in the general Act as read by the hon. member for Three Rivers, and I think we should very well add it to Clause 8 that all by-laws shall be submitted to the Governor in Council for approval. These by-laws, if they are submitted to the Governor in Council, will come under the eye of the Department of Justice and I presume it will be seen that they are proper by-laws.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section which the hon. member for Three Rivers read concerns by-laws that have to do with the public safety.

Mr. BUREAU: I think I so stated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Similarly, by-laws passed by this company will go to the Governor in Council for approval when they are of the same character as those mentioned in the section read by the hon. member. As to having all by-laws submitted to the Governor in Council for approval, I am personally disposed to agree with the hon. member for North Oxford, but at the same time I cannot help expressing my joy at finding the leader of the Opposition so much in love now with Orders in Council. If we are to approve of all by-laws passed by the Canadian National Railways we will have to approve of them by Orders in Council, and I sincerely hope we shall not again be taunted by the leader of the Opposition with government by Order in Council. We are endeavouring to avoid that, and at all events we feel disposed to leave the railway management a freer hand in the actual management of the road.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Acting Minister of Justice is wrong if he thinks that I am a convert to government by Order in Council. I have always advocated in this House the principle that the law should be found in the statute, and every one who has paid any attention to what I have ever said knows that. But these by-laws should be submitted for approval to a body that is responsible to this House. I am not in favour of by-laws; I want the enactment to be specific and clear in the statute, but if we must have them let us have some check on them. I do not think we should give a free hand to these directors to make such laws as they may see fit without having them approved of by some body responsible to Parliament. You are creating them a miniature parliament capable of making laws binding on the people.

I am not in favour of giving such a free hand to anybody. No matter who is making the laws touching the property and liberties of the people, they must ultimately come to this Parliament and submit to the jurisdiction of the body that represents the people. That is the only purpose I have in wanting to have the by-laws subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. KEEFER: I would like to say a word or two on behalf of the railway men. I know what their desires are in regard to this matter because I was called before them a year ago. They distinctly state that it is their desire that the management of this road shall be, as far as possible, divorced from all political action. They would like to see the road, if possible, operated by a commission. The proposal contained in this Bill is the nearest approach

to a commission that we can make. A company only acts by its board of directors, and through its by-laws, and if we are going to have every Act expressed by a by-law supervised by the Governor in Council, we are going to drag into the management of the road that political interference which is directly opposed by the railway men. Take the question of promotion, for instance. If a man serves faithfully, his superiors know whether he should be made a locomotive foreman, a yardmaster, a trainmaster, a divisional superintendent or something of that kind. These men go up to more important positions. Surely it is better to leave all such questions as that to the management whether it be the executive committee or whether it be the general manager of the company. As the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said, any promotion to a treasurership or anything else, should come from that independent tribunal, instead of having to come before the Governor in Council. The Government of the day, no matter what it was, might have some person that they would like to have appointed to a position. I earnestly hope that this House will never dream of having every act of this independent tribunal or board of directors confirmed by Order in Council. It is against the wishes of the men in every respect.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want the hon. gentleman to have any misunderstanding as to what I propose. I do not at all think that every movement in connection with this concern, or every act, must be authorized by a by-law. That before a man can be appointed or promoted, or a locomotive purchased or repaired, a by-law must be passed is something that I have not suggested and I have no such idea. These men that the hon. gentlemen speaks of must be sane and sensible men. We trust them to do their work properly. I would be very sorry to think that what we call politics should be divorced from this enterprise. To divorce politics from it would be to divorce from it every influence that should be brought to bear on the question of public ownership. The people that are selected for the management of this road are not any better than the rest of us. They are human beings, influenced by human proclivities and human ambition. We do not propose any petty interference with them in the management of the road, but we maintain that the general supervision of the Government property and of the people's property must be in the hands of the representatives of the people of this House. To suggest that for the buying of such stock as may be required, the engagements for freight and such measures as are necessary for the general advancement of the road it is necessary to pass by-laws is absurd. We must give these men a free hand but there are certain things on which they will want by-laws as well as they want statutes and if there is anything in the operation of the road that requires a by-law, it ought to be submitted to the Governor in Council and indirectly in that way submitted to the influence and control of this House and of the people as represented by the Governor in Council.

On section 9—approval by Governor in Council instead of shareholders:

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would ask the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) for his reasons why that which, under the provisions of the Railway Act or any other statute, requires the approval of shareholders has to be confirmed by the Governor in Council? It seems strange that we should supersede all statutes applicable to an ordinary company when we are creating a company to manage the railways that the Government are acquiring. This is another example of a resort to Order in Council under which the Government is allowed to do anything. We do not know where the end is going to be. The war is over now and I think that this company which we are incorporating by Act of Parliament should be subject to the very same rules and regulations as any other company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Committee will appreciate how difficult it is to meet the wishes of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We have just been suffering a volley of criticism because we do not require that all by-laws of the company shall be submitted to the Governor in Council, and now we are attacked because we admit that any should be submitted to the Governor in Council. All we ask to be submitted are such as under the Railway Act are compellable in the case of the ordinary company to be submitted to the shareholders before they are effective. We say that such by-laws of major importance as are required to be submitted to the shareholders must in this case be submitted to the Governor in Council. We think that a fair line of division.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not think that this clause should carry immediately. Under this clause the Government are taking the power by Order in Council to issue securities against this new undertaking which

would include the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental. They might therefore, with the sanction of the Governor in Council, be permitted to go into the markets of the world and sell some $150,000,000 to $250,000,000 worth of bonds and we in this Parliament would have absolutely no control over the expenditures of that money. We are handling an asset free of incumbrance to the company. The company by this Act. are taking power to do all things necessary to carry on the undertaking, to extend the lines and operate the railway.

They also have power to issue securities. If they did so they would have the privilege of floating all these securities against this undertaking and spending the money, and there is absolutely no provision in this Bill requiring them to come to Parliament for sanction of such action, or to account for the expenditures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the hon. gentleman fears is expressly forbidden by section 26 of this Bill.

Mr. CANNON: Are there any shareholders of the Canadian Northern Railway who have not sold their shares to the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are no shareholders, that is, owners of shares, whose shares are not sold. There are, however, certain shares which the owners have pledged with the Government of British Columbia for some contract, which shares they have not been able to deliver to the Minister of Finance, and consequently they have not been paid for.

Mr. CANNON: What is the number and value of such shares?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Speaking from memory, and not attempting to say that I am certainly right, I think it is about a million and a half of shares, the value of which would be only $200,000.

Mr. CANNON: Has the Government entered into negotiations with the British Columbia Government for the acquisition of those shares?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has not; it is simply waiting for delivery.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If I remember rightly, the only class of by-laws that require to be submitted to shareholders for approval under the Railway Act, are those dealing with the issuance of bonds and the placing of mortgages on the road. Is it intended that this board of directors shall have power to issue bonds, or execute mortgages, in connection with the railway system under its control? I would like the minister to state what by-laws he refers to, if it is not intended that the board of directors in this case shall have the power to issue bonds or execute mortgages?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say that I can enumerate all the classes of by-laws that require submission to shareholders, but the class that my hon. friend refers to does, namely, the class providing for the issue of bonds or stocks. Also under section 151 of the Railway Act of the present session all by-laws that have to do with agreements for sale, lease and amalgamation of lines require submission to the shareholders as well, and there may be others also as to which this is necessary. Those two classes of by-laws passed by the directorate of this company will require submission to the Governor in Council. The general question which the hon. gentleman raises also, as to the issue of bonds, is covered by section 26 of this Bill, and a reference to that section will show that the directorate will not have power, with the sanction of the Governor in Council, or otherwise, to bond any lines except the Canadian Northern Railway. They cannot bond the Canadian Government Railways, which include the Prince Edward Island, the Intercolonial, and the Transcontinental.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They cannot bond those.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They cannot bond them. That will be made apparent when we come to the discussion of clause 26.

Mr. CAHILL: I think the minister confirms my argument. The Canadian Government Railways are being incorporated in the Canadian National Railway System are they not, they are being taken over?

Mr. J. D. REID: Only for operation purposes.

Mr. CAHILL: There is no limitation of that character in the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is section 26. The hon. gentleman's argument was that this directorate would be able to bond the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, and he says he finds confirmation of that in my speech. All I said in my speech was that they could not bond them at all, because section 26 forbids it. If that is confirmation of his argument, it is easily confirmed.

Mr. CAHILL: There are contradictory statements in this section. By this Bill you

are incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company.

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

Mr. CAHILL: You are incorporating a company through whom you take over the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, we do not.

Mr. CAHILL: Where is the provision for operating merely?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the Act we provide for operating the Canadian National Railways.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Definitions, "Canadian Government Railways:"

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Will the taking over of the branch lines connected with the Government system rest in future with this company, or will it rest with the Minister of Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: The branch lines will all come under the operation of this Bill.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: I mean branch lines now owned by private companies. An Act has been passed which authorizes the Governor in Council to take over any railroad not exceeding two hundred miles in length, which connects with the Intercolonial or any other Government railway. Will that power in future rest with this new corporation, or will it continue to be vested in the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The power continues as it is at present under the statute, it is not affected by this Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the intention that the Intercolonial, and its branch lines, shall come under the management of this company?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are proud of the old Intercolonial Railway, and we do not want its identity to be lost in the Canadian Northern System.

Mr. J. D. REID: This section defines what "Canadian Government Railways" and what "Canadian Northern" means.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would gather from the Bill that the Canadian Northern System will dominate everything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 11 makes quite clear what is contemplated.

Mr. COPP: I want some information with respect to paragraph (a) of this clause, in order to ascertain what line, or lines of railway, it is intended to include in the Canadian Government Railway System. The paragraph sets forth:

> "Canadian Government Railways" means and includes all such railways or parts thereof, and all such properties, works, powers, rights and privileges or interests or any of them as may be designated, whether generally or in detail, in any Order in Council from time to time subsisting.

Now, reading that far, I presume that means any lines of railway that have already been taken over or that hereafter may be taken over by Order in Council. Would the hon. minister be good enough to tell me just what lines of railway have been taken over and have been under operation as the Canadian Government railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think the Order in Council which was laid on the Table of the House defines what has been placed under the operation of the Canadian National railways.

Mr. COPP: The hon. minister misunderstands me. I want to know what other railway companies are operated under the Canadian Government railways referred to in this Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Intercolonial railway and the branch lines that were being operated by the Intercolonial railway——

Mr. COPP: From Montreal to Sydney?

Mr. J. D. REID: From Montreal to Sydney; the Prince Edward Island railway, the International railway——

An hon. MEMBER: All the branch lines.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Moncton.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Quebec and Saguenay?

Mr. J. D. REID: It is being operated by the contractors at the present time. Then the Hudson's Bay railway is also being operated——

An hon. MEMBER: The Quebec and Lake St. John?

Mr. J. D. REID: That was part of the Canadian Northern system before.

Mr. COPP: I would like a plain statement of the railways operated by the Canadian Government railways without interruption from hon. members.

Mr. J. D. REID: Perhaps I might repeat and say, all the railways that were being operated by the Minister of Railways until they were transferred.

Mr. COPP: When was that?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think some time in January the Order in Council was passed. So far as my memory goes, it includes the line between Winnipeg and Moncton, the International railway between Montreal and Sydney, all the branch lines connected with the Intercolonial, and the Prince Edward Island railway. The Quebec and Saguenay is being operated by the contractors at the present time, but when it is completed it will also come into this Canadian National system. The Hudson's Bay railway has been placed under the management of the Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. COPP: Was it with the Canadian Government system before the Order in Council?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, it was under construction and the contract was taken out of the hands of Mr. McArthur, a settlement was made with him, and then the operation of the road was handed over to the Canadian National Railway system. In other words, putting it concisely, all the railways that were being operated by the Minister of Railways have been handed over to the management and operation of this Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. COPP: Will the hon. minister be good enough to say what he refers to in this clause:

> "Canadian Government railways" means and includes all such railways or parts thereof, and all such properties, works, powers, rights and privileges or interests or any of them—

What does he propose to include there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The definition in (a) of section 10 says that it includes all these railways or parts thereof and all properties, works, powers, rights, and so on. "Powers," for instance, might be running powers, which would be appurtenant to a railway. I do not need to define the word "rights."

Mr. COPP: I understand that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Rights, privileges, and so forth—anything we have a right to entrust,, under section 11, to the company having been so entrusted and then becomes part of the Canadian National railways. That is the definition.

5 p.m.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. COPP: The information I am seeking is this; what, for instance, in connection with the old Intercolonial Railway system from Montreal to Sydney, Halifax and St. John would be included in regard to works, powers, rights and privileges? What would there be besides the railway itself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: All it has. Has it not works in the city of Moncton? The hon. gentleman knows all about that. It will have certain rights and powers. I do not know whether it has running powers over some other road; it may not; if so, none can pass. The same applies to the Transcontinental or any other road which comes within the meaning of what is embraced in Section 11, so that the Governor in Council has power to entrust such powers, rights, works and properties to the Canadian National Railways. If they have no special powers, rights, works or properties, none can pass; but if they have they will be included in what passes under the Order in Council; that is all. They might have agreements, for example, as to exchange of traffic; if so those would be part of what would pass. All would be included in the subject matter embraced in the Order in Council, and having been so embraced it would become part of the Canadian Government Railways.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If it is thought proper by the board of directors to absorb a branch line, will the board be entitled to act upon its own initiative, or will it have to come before Parliament or the Governor in Council? Mr. Hanna and his colleagues might think it advantageous for the Canadian National Railways to get control of a branch line. What would happen in such an instance? It would be managed on business principles, I suppose, like any other railway company, but would the board of management be empowered to act in such a case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 11 answers that.

Mr. J. D. REID: Sections 11 and 12.

Mr. POWER: Do rights, powers, privileges, etc., include the owning and operation of hotels?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they have any they would be included.

Mr. MARCIL: Will this company have the power to open hotels?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman mean to build them?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes, to operate them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not considered the subject, but I would say yes, in this way—the Canadian Northern Railway Company will be operated by the Canadian Government Railways, but the Canadian Northern Railway Company will still possess the powers it formerly possessed, and it has power to build hotels. I presume that under the charter of the Canadian Northern, hotels could be even built, but I do not like to speak too definitely on that. This Bill merely provides for a unified operation of these various systems.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the hon. minister any idea of the number of hotels formerly under the management of the Canadian Northern Railway Company? They have a number of large hotels in Winnipeg.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; just two—Brandon and Port Arthur.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hotel in Winnipeg is operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. POWER: Should the company desire to manage hotels in Quebec, I would highly recommend to the consideration of the President of the Privy Council that he should have them licensed.

Mr. BUREAU; Does section 10 empower the Government to turn over the Intercolonial to the Canadian National Railway Company?

Mr. J. D. REID: That section is merely a definition. The power to entrust the company with the management and operation of a Government-owned railway is in section 11.

Mr. BUREAU: But section 10 really leaves the definition to the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Governor in Council may entrust to the Canadian National Railway Company only such Government-owned railways as section 11 permits.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the two sections ought to be considered together?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: The thirty companies mentioned in the schedule of the Bill operate certain railways which are parts of this Government-owned system. I suppose some of these companies are created by local Act; their powers are independent of this House. When and by what method is the physical transfer of these companies from the old to the new management to take place, if it has not taken place already? We had some evidence last night that the Minister of Railways does not know much about the officers of these Government-owned roads or what salaries they are receiving. It is about time we knew who our officers are and how much we are paying them. Are they subject to our control, or to the control of the thirty or forty companies mentioned in the schedule to this Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's first point is a legal one. He says: When and how are we going to transfer the Intercolonial and other roads to the Canadian National Railway Company?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not concerned about the Intercolonial. I refer to roads that are operated by companies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the Canadian Northern system?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are owned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company and are operated as part of the Canadian Northern system; nothing that I am aware of requires to be done in that regard. Two companies that have independent charters will be taken care of under section 21 of this Bill, which provides for an agreement between His Majesty and the company for any of the purposes specified in sections 361 and 364 of the Railway Act. The intention is to bring about a unified management of all these roads immediately after the passing of this Act; there is no reason for delay, so far as we are aware. As to the salaries of the officers, information was given to the committee some time ago in response to a question. It is true that these salaries are not fixed by the Governor in Council, but that is because, with a view of divorcing the road from political control, the Governor in Council is not directly managing it. All this will now be under the care of the directorate of the Canadian National Railway Company; that is the system we submit to Parliament for approval.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are these companies named in the schedule still to exist under their respective names?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They can be amalgamated under section 21.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that we are to have general control of the management, but that the names of these companies are to be continued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not necessarily. The intention is to amalgamate the companies

that have independent charters, as well as a great many more. That amalgamation, as I say, is already provided for under section 21.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have taken over these vast properties and are maintaining them, but they are operating under private names, and to the outside world they are owned by private corporations. The names of all these constituent companies of the old Canadian Northern System are still in use; when are we to discard them? When are these trammels to be thrown off? When will these properties be owned by us just as the Intercolonial and Transcontinental are owned? The taxation on these properties in the different provinces, amounting to a considerable sum of money, is paid by the Government, as are the salaries of the manager and of the employees.

If these properties actually belonged to the Government, we would pay no taxes at all, because the property of the Crown is not subject to private taxation in school sections or municipalities. No taxes are paid on the Intercolonial, nor on the Transcontinental from Winnipeg to Moncton. Why, then, should we be paying taxes on these thousands of miles of railway as private concerns when, in fact and in law, we are not liable to taxation at all? I am giving this as a reason why we should wipe out these conventionalities which stand in the way of actual, real ownership of those properties which we are supposed to own and for the management of which we are now providing. If this is a Government railway, why should it be called the Canadian Northern and why should it have around it all the machinery that it had when it was the Canadian Northern? The country thinks it owns these properties altogether, when in fact there are in the way what seem to be unnecessary machinery and complications which should be wiped out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under section 21, an amalgamation is provided. The hon. member's question is: To what extent shall we take advantage of that, and when? One of the purposes of this Bill is to pave the way for amalgamation and for getting rid of the various entities that have comprised the system as separate entities. It is the intention to amalgamate just as rapidly as we can, but all cannot be amalgamated, because in respect of some there is still outstanding stock. Where there is outstanding stock, amalgamation would be very inconvenient because stock would have to be given. Where there is not outstanding stock, it is the purpose to amalgamate without any unnecessary delay. Of course, immediately amalgamation takes place, the name goes out of existence.

Mr. BUREAU: If I understand rightly, there are only two sets of railways owned by the Government, the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Government railways, the latter comprising the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental. The object of the Bill is to consolidate those two systems. The preamble says:

> Whereas His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada has acquired control of the Canadian Northern Railway company and of the various constituent and subsidiary companies comprising the Canadian Northern system, as specified in the schedule to this Act.

The schedule mentions a number of constituent and subsidiary companies of the Canadian Northern. Does the list contained in the schedule show the names of all the constituent and subsidiary companies, because I see in the list of subsidiary companies the Canadian Northern Steamships, Limited? Would that come under the control of the company which is now being incorporated?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; we now own the stock in that company.

Mr. BUREAU: I find in the Canada Gazette, of January 11, 1919, a notice signed by Mr. Colson, Acting Under Secretary of State, headed "Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Ltd.," and stating:

> Public notice is hereby given that under the first part of chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, known as "The Companies' Act," and amending Acts, letters patent have been issued, etc.—

I want to read the names of the petitioners for this charter, and also a few of the powers granted by the Government to this company. My object in bringing this before the House is to find out whether or not this is a separate concern incorporated for a separate purpose, or whether the Government will allow people at large or foreign to the Government to use the name "Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Ltd.?" This seems, on reading the names, to be a first cousin to the Canadian Northern system. Some of the petitioners, whom I happen to know personally, may not be directors, but they are closely connected with the Canadian Northern. The notice continues:

> Letters patent have been issued under the seal of the Secretary of State of Canada, bearing date the 30th day of December, 1918, incorporating Gerard Ruel, barrister-at-law.

If I am not mistaken, this gentleman is general counsel of the Canadian Northern.

Lorne William Mitchell, treasurer.

I think this gentleman is also closely connected with the present administration.

Wilfred Bankart Langmore, solicitor; Charles Durno Cowie, secretary, and Frederick Joseph Buller, paymaster, all of the city of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, for the following purposes, viz:—

To construct, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, charter, own, maintain, operate and manage:—

(a) steamships vessels, tugs, car ferries, dredges, lighters, barges, boats, and water craft of every description.

That would include the steamers, the King George, and the other "Kings" that plough the ocean.

(b) structures, erections, buildings, hotels, shops, stores, works, appliances, mills, machinery, plant and equipment of every nature and kind whatsoever, on land or on water deemed by the company to be necessary or required for or in connection with the construction, manufacture, maintenance, operation, navigation, management, renewal or repairs of the company's vessels, works, undertakings, appliances or equipment, etc.

I am not going to weary the House with an enumeration of all the powers that are asked for, because they are very numerous. Will there not be a conflict of authority in this case, if those people are really Canadian Northern railway people who are incorporated under the Companies Act to manage that part of the "properties, works, powers, rights and privileges or interests," which the Canadian Northern railway have, which are enumerated in the schedule and which contain inter alia a subsidiary company, the Canadian Northern Steamships, Ltd. There must have been some reason for this incorporation, and if the company incorporated by letters patent is to exercise all the powers it asks for in these letters patent, it covers the construction of docks, the erection, equipment and management of hotels and all those things, part of which form an asset of the Canadian Northern Railway. I want to know what authority or control it exercises over any part of the system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last company which the hon. gentleman named, Canadian Northern Steamships, Limited, is a subsidiary company. While the Canadian Northern Steamships Company did own certain vessels—the Royal George and the Royal Edward—I believe it owns now only the Perry at Vancouver and a new steamer built at Quebec. The Canadian Northern Steamships Limited is a subsidiary company of the Canadian Northern Railway Company whose stock we own. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, is a new company not yet organized. The charter has just been taken out at the instance of the Government and the stock when issued will be owned by the Government. The stock of that company so owned by the Crown may, under Section 29 of this Bill, be transferred to the Canadian National Railways for the purposes of amalgamation if the Government so desire. The intention is to have all operated together. The company is formed merely for the purpose of taking over the Government steamships being built.

Mr. BUREAU: For the purpose of taking over Government steamships?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Government ships that are being built and such as we will operate ourselves. The stock will be owned by the Government and under Section 29 may be transferred to this company, so that the whole may be operated together.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Does the Government intend establishing a line of steamships as well as railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are building steamships now and it is contemplated they will be operated by this body.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It has been found advisable by railway and steamship companies to have a separate charter for each steamship. A steamship worth $20,000 or $30,000 might run into an ocean liner worth a couple of millions and under marine law all you would lose if your captain were held responsible would be your steamship provided she was regularly incorporated. But if you took her in as part of the Canadian Government Railway and there were a collision, I presume you would have to pay a considerable sum for damages.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have a charter for each steamship.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Have you taken over all branch lines you intend taking over in Eastern Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: All we intend taking over at the present time.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Has any consideration been given to the Gaspé line?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not considered taking over any other than those mentioned in the Estimates of last year. Two of those refused to accept the offer—the Caraquet and another.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: What about giving Quebec a show in the matter? The Gaspé line is 200 odd miles long and was built ten years ago.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not had any request from them to be taken over. I think they are paying well and do not want to be taken over.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL: Both the hon. member for Gaspé and myself have been advocating this matter for twenty years in this House. Unfortunately the road fell into the hands of a local company who became insolvent and the country has been held back for want of a proper service. The service is nothing compared to what it would be under Government control. Gaspé is a seaport open ten months of the year, and there is a great opportunity there for the Canadian National Railway Company to get a splendid feeder. The roads taken over in New Brunswick are important, but they are not more important than the Gaspé railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: The shareholders have never, so far as I know, approached the Government to sell their railway and we are not anxious to purchase.

Mr. TOBIN: Is it the intention of the Government to take over the Lotbinière and Megantic?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not considered that matter since it was taken up in the House a couple of years ago.

Mr. TURGEON: Is the Minister of Railways now considering the question of taking over the Caraquet and Restigouche railway? In further efforts to have this road absorbed or taken over, I would like to be informed whether I shall have to apply to Mr. Hanna, say, or the company, or shall I have to deal again with the Minister of Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: If the railway is taken over it will only be a matter of negotiation between the Government and the owners. If the Government took it over, under this next section we could hand it over, if we so desired, to the management of the Canadian National railways for operation.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister said that the Canadian Northern Steamships Limited formerly owned the Royal George and the Royal Edward, but that now they own only the Perry at Vancouver. What has become of the Royal George and the Royal Edward?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. J. D. REID: They were sold some years ago during the war.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the object in getting letters patent to constitute the Government a company to operate steamships? Why not come before Parliament and let the people know that you have an organization within an organization and tell us what you are going to do. The Department of Marine looks after the interests of our waterways generally, and if you are going to operate a system of steamships in connection with the railway it will be well to have a Parliamentary charter. I do not see that there is anything to gain, and it seems strange to me, and I am sure to those who are not acquainted with the devious ways of the Government, suspicious, that you should get letters patent to have these men run a railway line and a hotel system which would be better run as a branch under the executive of the railway company.

I asked what was the reason for this incorporation and the Acting Minister of Justice did not answer, but said that they formed a company and that the stock is owned by the Government. That million is the property of the Government. We know that the Government must be behind this company because with a million dollars they could never begin to have plans of the road and surveys made and to accomplish all the great things that they have taken power to do. There is nothing serious about this Bill except that the Governor in Council wants to take hold of this railways system and avoid criticism by this House by getting behind the company that we are creating. If you are going to take a subsidiary company like the Canadian Northern Steamships Limited, is there any necessity for this charter which was granted in September last to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited? Whenever the Government wants to exercise power of this kind or to become a competitor in any kind of business, whether merchant marine or railway, Parliament is the proper authority to appeal to. The members of this House, having a mandate from the people, are the persons to discuss these matters and to say whether or not the Government ought to go into this business. In this case, if the object is to form a company to operate a line of steamships for and on behalf of the Government, why not come before Parliament and ask for a charter to that effect and let us have an opportunity of discussing with you the wisdom or otherwise of forming such a

company. I do not see why you should issue this charter when you already have the Canadian Northern system charter authorizing you to do the things that you say you desire to do. I have not read the law but still that company have been operating the Royal George and the Royal Edward. They must have power in connection with their railway to operate any kind of steamers connecting their railway terminals with Europe or with any other country beyond the seas. The Acting Minister of Justice said that while these gentlemen were incorporated by charter the stock was owned by the Government. I want to know why this charter was issued instead of using the charter of the Canadian Northern Steamships Limited which was granted by Parliament. I do not think it is right for the Government to launch into an enterprise like that, issue from itself to itself, or to certain men the right to use the Government's name and to operate any kind of an enterprise without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman could not have been listening to the very clear explanation of that very point made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair): Charters are taken out first of all for each of the boats constructed in order that the liabilities for each boat may be limited to the boat itself. That is the practice of those operating steamships. That is the practice we are following precisely for the reason stated by the hon. member for Guysborough. Then all the stock of the various companies representing the various single boats, is connected with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited more for convenience than for any other purpose. It costs practically nothing to get the letters patent—only $100 which comes to ourselves—and then all the stock is collected and held by this company. Either the Minister of Finance or the Government holds that stock and it is that stock which may be transferred under section 29 to the Canadian National railways. That is the reason this company has been incorporated.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand the minister to say that he wants incorporation for each steamer so as to limit the liability.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: For what particular steamers was the charter for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited issued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have just explained. This is a holding company and it holds the stock of the separate companies. That is more convenient than to have the stock of all the separate companies held separately and each one separately transferred to this road. They are all collected together in that way and we have the whole thing in one.

Mr. BUREAU: Why did you not come to Parliament? This company could have been as well incorporated by Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no need to come to Parliament for everything. It is very pleasant to come to Parliament but if we came to Parliament for every single thing it would be a slow process.

Mr. BUREAU: If you are going to incorporate a body of men to handle public money and to operate the property of the people, Parliament is the proper place to come for the incorporation of that company. If the hon. gentleman takes the ground that it is no use coming here, I say that we are not going to sit here like dummies or like an Indian figure in front of a cigar store. We have come to the point where the ministers think they are gods, think they know everything, and that they can do anything without regard to Parliament. I object to that principle. Whether this is a holding company, an operating company or any other kind of a company that is going to handle the moneys or do the business of the people of Canada, the Government have no right to confer upon a certain number of their creatures rights which are conferred generally on outsiders who apply for incorporation. Parliament should be consulted and we should know what we are doing with these operating companies, what they are going to hold and why we are incorporating them. Parliament is entitled to be consulted as to whether or not it is advisable to have such a company. The principle is absolutely wrong and my hon. friend need not say that it is a slow process to come to Parliament with everything. You are going to take a million dollars of the people's money and put it into the hands of this operating or holding company without consulting Parliament. It is not fair to the people that the Government should enter upon any such policy. If that is their policy let them say it and then we will go to the people and tell them that our usefulness is gone and that the Government is prepared to act without reference to the views of the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is getting unnecessarily excited. All this is done under the authority of Parliament. This is done under the Companies' Act.

Mr. BUREAU: The War Measures' Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not the War Measures' Act, but the Companies' Act, and it is just what the hon. member would have power to do in regard to any company.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman is shifting. I do not say you have not power to do it, but the principle is wrong, because you should come to Parliament in such a case even if it does happen to come under the Companies' Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One would ordinarily understand that Parliament meant to give the powers it did give and did not mean to be bothered with the exercise of those powers in each individual case.

Mr. BUREAU: This gives authority to spend $1,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Every dollar has been spent with the direct authority of Parliament.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would the Minister of Railways tell the committee how many steamers he has at present?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are five altogether.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: May I be allowed to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the desirability of developing Canadian trade rather than United States trade?

The CHAIRMAN: I must draw the attention of the committee to the fact that we have been discussing clause 11 for the last half hour, although clause 10 has not yet been passed.

Mr. BUREAU: It was understood that clauses 10 and 11 should be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 11 has not yet been reached.

Mr. BUREAU: I asked the Acting Minister of Justice if it would not be better to consider both clauses together and he replied in the affirmative, and I understood the committee unanimously consented to that being done.

The CHAIRMAN: The question just asked by the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) would be quite in order if clause 11 was under consideration.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. BUREAU: I move that clauses 10 and 11 be considered together.

Mr. J. D. REID: And shall both be passed together?

Mr. BUREAU: That is another question. The first man who made a break in referring to clause 11 was the Acting Minister of Justice.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Now, Mr. Chairman, am I in order in referring to this matter?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, under clause 11.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I took occasion to ask the minister what use he was making of these vessels, because the people wish to know if they are to be employed in developing Canadian trade. Much surprise was caused by the Canadian Voyageur being chartered last November to carry sugar to New York from the West Indian Islands, which is not promoting Canadian trade. Not even the insurance was taken out in Canada, it being placed with Messrs. Johnston and Higgins of New York. Cannot we place in the hands of Canadian brokers the marine insurance that is necessary on our vessels? With reference to the steamer McKee, which is one of the vessels referred to by the minister, the following questions were put by me in the House and answered on April 7:

1. To whom is the Steamer McKee chartered?
2. What is the nature of the cargo, the rate of freight per ton, the port of loading and port of discharge?
3. What is the return cargo, rate of freight per ton, and port of destination?
4. Is the hull insured? If so, with what company and for how much?
5. Is the freight insured?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. To the American Metal Transport Co., of New York.
2. Cargo of coal from New York to Chili, rate of freight 30 shillings per ton D.W. per month, and the charterers assume all expenses except wages of the crew.
3. Return cargo is ore, the rate of freight per ton is 30 shillings per ton D.W. Port of destination, New York.
4. The hull is insured through Willcox, Peck and Hughes of New York for $336,000.
5. Yes.

It therefore appears that the Railway Department is using steamers that were built at great expense by the Canadian Government for the purpose of developing American trade. Now there has been a great deal of difficulty of late in selling coal from the mines of Nova Scotia and keeping those mines going, and yet this boat was chartered to carry coal from New York to the

west coast of South America. Why is she not engaged in carrying Canadian coal, which would mean providing work for Canadian miners in the counties of Cape Breton and Pictou and elsewhere in Nova Scotia? I do not know whether the minister is considering this question or not, but if we are going to send out steamers to engage in trade we should at all events consider the question of using them for the development of Canadian trade and not the trade of a foreign country. If there is any justification for the large expense incurred in the building of these vessels, it must be found in their being used in the development of our own trade. I would like to have some information from the minister as to why Canadian vessels are employed in helping the trade of a foreign country.

Mr. J. D. REID: The steamship to which the hon. gentleman alludes was chartered to carry coal from New York to Chili. I made inquiries about it and learned that the steamer McKee, while on her way from New York to Prince Edward Island with a cargo of rails, was wrecked and had to be taken to New York and repaired. This was in the winter season and the vessel is a small one, adapted to the navigation of the Upper Lakes rather than to ocean navigation. After being repaired she was chartered to carry a cargo on the Southern route, where she was not exposed to transoceanic risks. That was done in order to keep the vessel employed until the opening of navigation on the St. Lawrence, when it is intended that she shall operate between Nova Scotia and St. Lawrence ports. The Government originally had the Sheba and two other vessels of similar type that were suitable for ocean traffic.

Two of these have been lost since the commencement of the war, one as the result of a collision while on her way from a Nova Scotia port to New York, the other being sunk by a submarine en route to Europe with a cargo belonging to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Mr. BUREAU: Was she carrying steel rails?

Mr. J. D. REID: I think steel rails which were being sent by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to Europe for war purposes. The Government then purchased the Drummond and McKee, but they are not really vessels suited to ocean navigation. It was for that reason that the charter in question to southern ports was allowed to be taken out. Both vessels will return immediately and be placed in service between Nova Scotia and Lévis at the opening of navigation.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it intended to transfer the properties of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, to the company whose incorporation we are considering, or will the properties of the Canadian Northern Steamships, Limited, be transferred to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited?

Mr. J. D. REID: When the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway System was transferred to the Minister of Finance, the transfer of the stock of the Canadian Northern Steamships, Limited, to the same authority followed automatically. As the Acting Minister of Justice has explained, a company is being formed under the Companies Act to operate each steamer which is being constructed by the Government. If we were to build fifty steamers a charter must be taken out for each, and the stock represented by each charter would be transferred to the Canadian Merchant Marine, Limited. When we get to that point and there is, let us say, a million dollars worth of stock in existence, that stock can be transferred either to the Minister of Finance or to the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister did not understand my question. Will the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, operate these vessels or will the company that we are now incorporating? In other words, is it intended to transfer the property of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, to the Canadian National Railway Company so as to form part of that system?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Canadian National Railway Company that we are now incorporating will control and operate the Canadian National Merchant Marine. It is carrying out a similar policy to that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member is aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have all their vessels separate from their railway, the stock of the Canadian Pacific Steamship Company being held by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Steamship Company being operated by the board of directors of the railway company.

Mr. BUREAU: Who are the directors of the Canadian National Merchant Marine now?

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course, it has not been organized, but the directors of the Canadian National Merchant Marine will be practically the same as those of the Canadian National Railways. There might be one or two changes, for this reason. If you have a general manager of the steamship company who is giving its whole time to its management, you might put him on the board of directors of the Canadian National Merchant Marine; or instead of having fifteen directors as on the railway, you might take seven or eight directors and name them as directors of the Canadian National Merchant Marine.

Mr. BUREAU: Always forming part of the Canadian Government Railways?

Mr. J. D. REID: It will always be really part and parcel of the Canadian National Railways. In other words, you cannot very well operate the Canadian National Railways without having a regular steamship line both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, and this is intended for that purpose.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand from what the hon. minister says that this is intended for ocean-going steamers?

Mr. J. D. REID: It might apply also to inland steamers. For instance, the Canadian National Railways may have lake steamers running between, say, Port Arthur and Midland; or it may have steamers carrying coal between Lake Erie ports and Montreal. There is a very large amount of coal used there. So this would apply to any vessels used for that purpose.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CANNON: When the Government took over the Quebec and Saguenay railway, how near to the city of Quebec did the rails of that line come?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Quebec and Saguenay commences at the terminus of the Quebec and Montmorency, about thirty miles from Quebec, and extends east to Murray Bay or Nairn's Falls.

Mr. CANNON: There are about thirty miles between the terminal and the city?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have running rights over the Quebec and Montmorency.

Mr. CANNON: When did the Government acquire running rights on that thirty miles?

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. J. D. REID: The chief engineer in charge of the construction of the Quebec and Saguenay made an arrangement some time last fall. I could not give the date from memory; it was several months ago.

Mr. POWER: I understand that last August the Quebec and Saguenay did not have running rights into Quebec. I do not know whether the matter has yet been settled.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am speaking only from memory. When the contractor started to operate the railway two rates were charged, one on the Quebec and Saguenay and another on the Quebec and Montmorency into Quebec. Perhaps I am wrong in stating that running rights were acquired. Anyway, a satisfactory arrangement as to rates was made and approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. CANNON: Under that arrangement, how much does it cost to enter the city of Quebec?

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot give that information offhand, but if the hon. gentleman wants to see the agreement I shall be glad to send him a copy of it, and to explain the arrangement that has been made for the carrying of traffic from the end of the Quebec and Saguenay line into Quebec.

Mr. POWER: I understand that this arrangement has been made between the Quebec Street Railway Company and the contractor.

Mr. J. D. REID: The contractor is in charge of the operation only while the road is under construction. As soon as construction is completed and the road taken off his hands the Government will have to make a permanent arrangement for operating over the whole line into Quebec.

Mr. POWER: Has the Government considered the question of taking over the thirty miles?

Mr. J. D. REID: Under an Act passed three or four years ago we were to take over three roads, the Quebec and Montmorency, the Lotbinière and Megantic and the Quebec and Saguenay, on a valuation to be made by the judge of the Exchequer Court. But when it went to the Exchequer Court there was some question as to the interpretation placed by the judge upon the subsidies that had been paid and the interest during construction and the valuation of the Quebec and Montmorency and of the Lotbiniere and Megantic has never been finally decided. A valuation was placed

on the Quebec and Saguenay and we passed a Bill to take it over. Since then the war intervened and we have not considered the matter. At some future time we shall have to decide whether to go ahead with the purchase of that thirty miles, or to acquire running rights over the Quebec and Montmorency into Quebec. Of course, if we do not wish to purchase the Quebec and Saguenay outright, we can apply for running rights and the Railway Commission can decide on what terms and conditions those rights should be given. From any conversations that have been had—the matter has been seldom mentioned—I understand that there would be no trouble in arranging the matter with those connected with the Quebec and Montmorency. I have been urging the contractors to give me an idea as to when the road will be in operation to Murray Bay, and I am assured that passenger traffic will be handled not later than the first of July.

Mr. MICHAUD: How many miles would that be?

Mr. J. D. REID: Murray Bay is about ninety miles from Quebec; about sixty miles will be completed to Murray Bay.

Mr. MICHAUD: Has the company made any proposal to the Government with regard to the purchase of the road?

Mr. J. D. REID: We have not taken the matter up since it was before Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am pleased to hear that the train to Murray Bay will be running by the first of July. I think the Government has made a good bargain in acquiring by agreement those running rights on the Quebec and Montmorency. Has the minister any idea as to the time it will take to run those trains between Quebec and Murray Bay, and will there be a through car attached to the daily train from Montreal central station over the Canadian National railways? As I am a summer resident of Murray Bay, and as I know the conditions there, I would suggest that the minister see that arrangements are made to have a through car service between Montreal and Murray Bay during the summer season, because a large number of people from the United States and from the district of Montreal have summer residences at Murray Bay, St. Irénée and Cap à l'Aigle. If such an arrangement be made, the service will be a source of revenue to the railway.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member, of course, knows that at the city of Quebec there is now a union station, namely, the Canadian Pacific, for all railways. The Canadian Northern, I think, runs in there now, and since their station was burned or pulled down, they, of course, being part of the Government railways, will use that station. The summer traffic usually commences about the first of July.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before that.

Mr. J. D. REID: I thought that on the first of July trains should be put on the Quebec and Saguenay to take care of the whole summer traffic instead of using the ferry from St. Denis to Murray Bay. In order to do that, a first class train should leave Quebec at night after the arrival of all the different trains, and go to Murray Bay; a day train might also be put on. We would start out with a service that all would be proud of, and we would show that the Quebec and Saguenay is not such a bad road after all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: During eight months of the year there is no necessity of having a fast passenger service, but in June, July, August and possibly on to the 15th of September there is quite a large population along that shore, so that a fast service will be required. Many American tourists and Canadians, too, spend the summer months at Murray Bay, Cap à l'Aigle and St. Irénée. If you had a train which could reach those points early in the day you would attract more people there.

As regards local traffic, I am quite sure that within a few years from now the minister will be surprised at the quantity of freight that can be gathered along that shore. There is on foot just now another project which the minister has possibly heard of, and which, if it materializes, will mean the development of the remaining section of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. I understand that another syndicate contemplates building from Nairn's Falls as far as Chicoutimi. If that project materializes it would certainly make a very valuable asset of the Government road.

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot remember just now the amount of business Mr. Grant told me a few weeks ago was being done on the Quebec and Saguenay, but I was surprised to know that there was so much. That railway is giving a splendid service, and I have not had any complaints, except that at the start complaints were made about the freight charges. I took the matter up with Mr. Grant and told him to take it before the Railway Commission, and see that rates were made on a basis that the

Railway Commission would consider fair and just.

Mr. POWER: Has the right-of-way along the Quebec and Saguenay been purchased and paid for?

Mr. J. D. REID: When we took it over, there were some few cases that had not been settled, but before the owners get the money they must give us a clear title. The Department of Justice have a firm of solicitors looking at the titles, and they will not let the money be finally paid out until clear titles are obtained. An amount will be kept to cover payment for those cases that have not been settled.

Mr. POWER: Complete payment has not been made?

Mr. J. D. REID: The money has been paid into a trust company which is holding it until clear titles are obtained, and then we get title from them.

Mr. CANNON: The minister said he was very much surprised at the report made by the engineer as to the traffic carried on the Quebec and Saguenay.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said I was surprised there was so much traffic. There was an impression that there would be very little traffic on the Quebec and Saguenay, and what I wished to convey to the Committee was that I was surprised to learn from the statement Mr. Grant gave me that there was so much more than I expected.

Mr. CANNON: I spent last summer at St. Irénée on the line of the Quebec and Saguenay, and I could see how the line was being built. I think the minister will very soon have more than a surprise on account of the very peculiar way in which the line is being built. The line at St. Irénée is being built right next to the river St. Lawrence, and when there is a high tide in the fall or in the spring, I am afraid the whole thing will wash out.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like to have some information as to the Government's shipbuilding programme. There is a certain degree of uneasiness on the part of the people over the fact that the Government is embarking on the ownership of vessels. It is a risky undertaking in any event, and in the last report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries I see there is an indication that it is to become a permanent policy. We were told that the building of vessels was a war measure, and then that it was necessary to build ships in order to give employment to our people. As I suggested once before during this session, I do not think he could have hit on a much worse programme than the building of ships if he wanted to give employment. We are importing the plates from abroad, and the expensive articles that go into the construction of a ship are also being imported; and the labour provided people in the construction of the ships is a bagatelle compared with the expense entailed. I observe in the last Marine and Fisheries report that the Government purpose to build about 200,000 tons of shipping annually at an estimated cost of about $40,000,000. I can scarcely believe that to be the case.

The CHAIRMAN: The question asked by the hon. member would be in order only so far as it might relate to ships which are to be constructed or controlled by the Canadian National Railway. But the shipbuilding policy of the Government certainly cannot be discussed on clause 11 of the Bill.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think it has already been explained that all ships owned by the Government are under the control of the Railway Department. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I would like to obtain from the minister a statement as to the policy of the Government in regard to this matter. Is it intended that 200,000 tons shall be built each year, and that large liabilities shall be incurred for that purpose? If it is, I would like to have a full explanation as to what use is to be made of the ships. I can understand why the Government should build certain classes of ships in connection with their railway system, and have a line of ships across the Atlantic to connect with the railway system at Halifax and St. John. But there is no more reason for the Government to undertake the building of tramp vessels than to embark on the ownership of automobiles or trucks on the streets. One can understand their establishing a steamship line across the ocean to carry the traffic of the railways, but as I understand the programme, that is not what they intend to do and is not what they have done so far. What does the minister say?

Mr. J. D. REID: All I can answer for this evening are the vessels that are now being constructed—I think about fifty in all. These vessels are to be operated in connection with the Canadian National Railway. We have no steamers on the Pacific, and we require a number of vessels to do the business that the Canadian

National Railways will have with the Far East. Then we need vessels on the Atlantic to go to the West Indies and South America. I do not think we can call these "tramp" vessels, and it is in the interests of Canada to do business with those countries. Up to the present time we have had only two of these new vessels. With reference to the shipbuilding policy of the Government, I hope the hon. member will not think me discourteous if I say that that is a matter that can be answered fully by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who has just returned. After a few days he will be going on with his Estimates and will, I am sure, be glad to give information in connection with the matter.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, has been organized for the purpose of taking over the steamship end of the Canadian National Railway system, and that this is being done because it is necessary to have a steamship line in connection with the railway in order to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway and carry freight around the world. As it appears to me, this Canadian Government Merchant Marine Company is only a dummy and the operation and control of these steamships will be under the Canadian National Railway system. That is, Mr. Hanna who is president of the organization, will see that some one competent to handle steamships will be appointed, like Mr. Bosworth of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to look after the steamship line, which will include both light vessels going through the Sault canal and navigating on the Great Lakes, and ocean-going steamers. If that is so, I do not see why this particular company should not at this time, before its organization, decide where the chief place of business shall be. The only reason seems to be the fact that the Governor in Council would not be exposed to criticism, unless the question were brought before the House and a motion were made to change the place from Toronto to Montreal. I think the main office of the organization which is going to handle the steamships should be at a tidewater port, and if this end of the business is to be in Toronto the minister might as well stand up and tell us so.

Mr. J. D. REID: The company can have the head office changed at any time. With reference to the matter of having the principal place of business at a tidewater port, the general manager, whoever he is, can be located at Montreal or wherever it is necessary for him to be in order to do the business of the company.

We will no doubt take over the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific and have all these railways incorporated under one Act. The whole railway system will have to be reorganized when we get it together. Then the question of the head office organization must be dealt with. We cannot deal with these matters until we get the whole railway situation settled. Negotiations are going on and I hope they will move with sufficient rapidity to enable us to deal with the matter during the session.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand from the minister that when the situation is cleared up the whole railway system will have to be reorganized? Does he mean by reorganization that he will have to submit to Parliament a new Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID: If an agreement is arrived at whereby we take over the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, we must certainly come to Parliament. It will be such an immense system and so important that we must reorganize it. When the matter comes up we will be in a position to give much more definite information than we can at present.

Mr. POWER: I would urge on the minister the advisability of establishing a line of freight steamers sailing from St. John or Halifax in winter and from Quebec in summer. As the minister is aware, the Transcontinental has its water terminus in Quebec. It has been repeatedly urged by the board of trade and other public bodies in Quebec that steps be taken to impress upon the Government the advisability of running a line of steamships such as I have suggested for the purpose of carrying western grain. If my information is correct the Transcontinental railway can do the business of carrying western grain far cheaper than the Canadian Pacific. The grain would go through our own Canadian ports. This has been for some years a matter of great concern to the city of Quebec. I take this opportunity, now that we know definitely that steamships are under the control of the railway, of asking the minister to look into the matter with a view to increasing the business of the Transcontinental railway, taking away the business from rival roads, decreasing the cost of transportation to the western farmer, and in general helping on the prosperity of the country.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall be very glad to take this matter up with the head of the road.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Has the minister come to a decision with regard to certain flag stations the establishment of which has been suggested to him along the line of the Quebec and Saguenay railway? Some time ago I sent petitions to his department in regard to the erection of a flag station at Le Petit Debarquement, between Cap Tourmente and Petite Riviere St. François; at Le Ruisseau Jureux, near St. Irénée; and also at Nairn's Falls behind Murray Bay. I would ask the minister to be good enough to let me know what decision he arrived at in the matter. I submitted statements showing the amount of traffic available at these places. I have had no definite answer yet to my request.

Mr. J. D. REID: I asked Mr. Grant to look into that matter very thoroughly and give me a report. I have not yet received that report. As soon as I get it I will send it to the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) and discuss the matter with him.

Mr. CASGRAIN: While we are speaking on the Quebec and Saguenay railway, I would like to submit an observation to the minister concerning his department, and it may also concern the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is the intention to complete the extension of the road to Murray Bay by next season. But there will still be the service of the steamer Champlain which is being operated between the south shore and the north shore or between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay. The service of this boat may not be so necessary when the new railway is completed which will take people from Montreal and Quebec direct to Murray Bay. Will it be possible to devise a plan by which this boat will render a double service that will be useful to the people of other parts of the country, such as Cap à L'Aigle, St. Fidèle, St. Siméon and Tadoussac along the north shore below Murray Bay, which places will never have the benefit of the railway if they are unable to have any communication with it. As the service between the north and the south shore will not be so necessary as in the past, the boat might carry on a service between Murray Bay and Tadoussac and then cross to the south shore once or twice a week and make connections for the people who wish to take the boat for Murray Bay and below that point.

Mr. J. D. REID: The operation of this boat has been carried on by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I will bring the matter to the attention of my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), and I will also try and get the railway in operation as soon as possible.

Mr. COPP: The operation of the ferry between Cape Tormentine and Port Borden is under the Department of Railways and Canals. While the Government are embarking on the enterprise of building steamers for traffic, is it the intention to build another ferry to run between these two points? As the minister well knows, the ferry, after being operated through the ice in the winter time, has to go into drydock for repairs each summer, and for a considerable time there is no connection between these two points. While the Government is engaged in building vessels I would urge upon the minister the great necessity of building a twin ferry so that one boat could always be kept in operation. When the ferry service is discontinued between Cape Tormentine and Port Borden the traffic has to cross between Summerside and Point du Chêne, and the offices have to be moved. New buildings have been erected at the junction point of Sackville for the purpose of accommodating this traffic, but when the traffic is diverted to the other route they are left unused. I notice by the papers that the vessel has been laid off this week for repairs. This suspension of the ferry dislocates trade, and is very inconvenient for those who use that route.

Mr. J. D. REID: Owing to the great cost of vessel construction it would probably not be right to consider the building of another ship for this purpose at present. If I remember correctly, the Scotia was operating at Mulgrave and a new steamer was put on in her place. It was proposed at one time, I think, to fix up that vessel so that she could be used on this route and thus have a spare vessel when the ferry was compelled to lay up for repairs once a year, or might be disabled by accident. The vessel in question is much smaller, but by running more frequently she might meet the need temporarily for three or four weeks.

Mr. COPP: Such a boat might answer as a substitute for two or three weeks, while the regular ferry is undergoing repairs. If that were done it would prove of great advantage to the people who use that route for trade purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: Clause 11 is very wide in its scope. It reads:

The Governor in Council may from time to time by Order in Council entrust to the company the management and operation of any lines of railway or part thereof, and any property or works of whatsoever description, or interest therein, and any powers, rights or privileges over or with respect to any railways, properties or works, or interests therein, which may be from time to time vested in or owned, controlled or occupied by His Majesty, or such part or parts thereof, or rights or interests therein as may be designated in any Order in Council, upon such terms and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time decide; such management and operation to continue during the pleasure of the Governor in Council and to be subject to termination or variation from time to time in whole or in part by the Governor in Council.

The minister will admit that this confers upon the Governor in Council very wide powers, under which it can do practically anything it likes with any branch of railway forming part of the system. I think the public should be apprised of whatever action the Governor in Council takes in such matters, and I would therefore suggest that whenever an Order in Council is passed taking advantage of any of the powers granted under this section it shall not go into effect until it has been published in the Canada Gazette, so that the public may be afforded an opportunity of knowing what is going on and given a chance, if any objection is entertained, to remonstrate to the department or the Government.

Hon. gentlemen opposite professed to be shocked this afternoon when I proposed the submission to Parliament of the by-laws which might be passed by the company. I notice, however, that in Australia all such by-laws have to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within thirty days of their adoption, and, if Parliament is not in session, within thirty days after it shall have convened. The commissioner in Australia is given very wide powers and can make by-laws applicable to every branch of the administration of a railway, but these by-laws must be submitted to the Governor-General and do not become effective until after they have been published in the official Gazette. In Volume 15, Commonwealth Acts, 1917, is the Statute dealing with the Government railways. Section 88 provides:

(1) The commissioner may make by-laws, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribing all matters which by this Act are required or permitted to be prescribed, or which are necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying out or giving effect to this Act, and in particular for the following:

Then follows the enumeration of the subjects upon which by-laws may be made, and paragraph (2) of the section reads:

No by-law shall have any force or effect until it has been—
(a) approved by the Governor General; and—
(b) published in the Gazette.

And then paragraph (3) reads:

(3) By-laws shall not be deemed to be Statutory Rules within the meaning of the Rules Publication Act, 1903-1916.
(4) All such by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of the Parliament within thirty days after the making thereof, if the Parliament is then sitting, and if not, then within thirty days of the next meeting of Parliament.

Now in view of the wide powers conferred by the section in the Bill we are considering, I would suggest adding to the section:

Such Orders in Council to be published in the official Gazette of Canada before they take force and effect.

Mr. J. D. REID: If the hon. gentleman will read the clause he will see that it merely entrusts to the company the management and operation of the lines of railway in question. In the past, so far as the Intercolonial railway was concerned, its operation was entrusted to a general manager, and then a commission was appointed to manage and operate the railway.

Mr. BUREAU: "Upon such terms and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time decide." That is how the clause reads, and we want to know under what terms it is to be carried out.

Mr. J. D. REID: We formerly had a general manager and all that this clause means is that we propose to do the same thing here—entrust to a board of management the operation of the Government Railway system.

Mr. BUREAU: No, the powers in regard to management can be restricted or enlarged.

Mr. J. D. REID: We must trust the board of management. For instance, if the board of management submits by-laws and the Governor in Council passes an Order in Council with respect to them, the Government must accept the responsibility of its action no matter what the public may think. Then when Parliament meets all the Orders in Council that have been passed can be laid upon the Table for the consideration of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all I want. I want the Orders in Council which will be passed under section 11 to be laid upon the

Table within a certain time after Parliament convenes.

Mr. J. D. REID: It is entirely in the hands of hon. members to have those Orders laid upon the Table. The very fact of it being mentioned in the Bill does not make it any more certain that the Orders will be laid upon the Table—

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, yes.

Mr. J. D. REID: For this reason the House is entitled to all Orders in Council, and if they are not laid upon the Table by the Minister of Railways hon. members will ask for them and they will be produced. I do not see that this proposal would afford any greater protection. I do not think we should load the Bill up any more. As was said by the Acting Minister of Justice this afternoon, we are trying to keep away as much as possible from laying Orders in Council upon the Table.

Mr. BUREAU: We are trying to keep away—why?

Mr. J. D. REID: Because there has been so much complaint about Orders in Council having been passed that one does not want so many Orders in Council as the hon. member does.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister does not understand what I am driving at. The clause is clear that these powers may be exercised through the Governor in Council from time to time by Orders in Council. It is not an approval; you have got to enact by Orders in Council. You entrust certain things to the management, and the words must be written down on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and then enacted by Order in Council. It is very easy for the minister to have an extra copy struck off every time he makes a recommendation to Council. The Order in Council will say what is being entrusted to the company, and the company is then supposed to act in the best interests of the country; but the Governor in Council can impose restrictions while entrusting this property to the company, because at line 21 of section 11 it says:

—upon such terms and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Governor in Council may from time to time decide; such management and operation to continue during the pleasure of the Governor in Council and to be subject to termination or variation from time to time in whole or in part by the Governor in Council.

I think the House is entitled to know what parts of the road are being entrusted to the company and under what regulations and conditions they are being operated. The minister says that we do not want to load the Bill for nothing. It will not load it at all; it will just be a reminder to the minister that within a certain time at the beginning of each session all these Orders in Council must be deposited upon the Table of the House, and I think the people, through their representatives, ought to be posted in what is going on in connection with their railway system. I suggested just now that these Orders in Council have no force until publication in the Canada Gazette. I am willing to withdraw my assertion that they have no force, but I think they should be published in the Canada Gazette so that the people can be kept informed of how their railway system is managed. I think it is a suggestion that the minister ought to agree to.

9 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: The Commonwealth of Australia and the different Australian states have had a long experience in state ownership of railways, and it would seem to me to be wise for us to follow their custom and have the by-laws passed by the Board of Directors and approved by Order in Council placed on the Table within thirty days from the time they are passed if Parliament is sitting, or within thirty days after the House convenes. I cannot see any objection to that. It would appear to me to be an excellent means of keeping the country in touch with what is being done with its railway property.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no objection to that, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is entirely unnecessary, because all important Orders in Council are brought down and laid upon the Table of the House. If any hon. member should ask for an Order in Council relating to so important a subject as this it would be brought down without question. But the section is easily amended, and there is no reason why it should not be if hon. gentlemen think the matter important.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: During the debate this afternoon it became apparent that when you apply the rule of Order in Council you do not altogether cover the case, because the directors would have power to make by-laws that are not approved by Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: But this is the important clause that deals with the handling of property—such orders to be deposited upon

the table of the House within thirty days of the opening of each session.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Under this clause as at present drafted would the Government have the right to acquire any further branch lines, such, for instance, as the Quebec and Oriental Railway and the Atlantic and Western Railway that the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) spoke of this afternoon? These railways are more or less a continuation of the Intercolonial, and all their traffic is practically the traffic of the Intercolonial. Some time ago I had occasion, in the Special Committee considering the Railway Act, to submit a communication regarding the present condition of these railways, and although I hold no brief for the companies, I think they would be willing to enter into negotiations with the Government for sale of their properties.

Mr. J. D. REID: No, Parliament would have to acquire the roads first, and then the Governor in Council would have the right to entrust their management to this corporation.

Mr. CANNON: Several of the companies enumerated in the schedule have names that indicate they are situated partly or wholly in the United States. It is an altogether new situation, and I would like the minister to give information to the House as to exactly the relation that would arise between a sovereign country like Canada owning and running railroads in another sovereign country.

Mr. J. D. REID: The stock of these roads is owned by the Canadian Northern System, and therefore by the Government. The American Government are now operating those portions that run through the United States. The hon. member will of course understand that the American Government are also operating some of our Canadian roads. The Michigan Central is an American-owned road. Two or three roads that go through Ontario are part of an American system.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But they are not owned by the Government of the United States.

Mr. J. D. REID: The United States Government is operating them; it is hard to say whether they will be taken over permanently by the Government. The Canadian Pacific runs through a portion of the State of Maine.

Mr. CANNON: Are the legal advisers of the Government of the opinion that the Government has the right to own and operate railroads in a foreign country? I do not think it has.

Mr. J. D. REID: The company have a right to operate in a foreign country; the Government is only a shareholder of the company. From this point of view, the legal advisers of the Government inform me that we have a perfect right to do as we are doing.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: To meet what my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) has in mind, I move that the following words be added to section 11:

> Any such Order in Council shall be laid before Parliament within ten days after the opening of the next ensuing session, or, if Parliament be sitting at the time such Order in Council is passed, then within ten days of the date of such Order in Council.

Amendment agreed to, and sections 10 and 11 agreed to.

On section 12—power to transfer to company the stock or controlling interest of His Majesty in any railway company:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does this section mean that the directors of the Canadian National Railway Company may, without getting leave, purchase additional stock in railway companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, their powers are covered by section 21. This section merely gives the Government the power to transfer shares to them.

Mr. BUREAU: I have an objection to this clause. We know and feel the nefarious effects of that transaction in connection with the Canadian Northern, when we got forty per cent of the stock. If His Majesty is to acquire an interest in any company, he ought to acquire the majority of the stock so as to be able to have his own board of directors, his own administration and operation. I do not think that His Majesty ought to hold minority stock in any company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The acquirement of minority stock is not contemplated here. The section says: "acquire the stock or the controlling interest."

Mr. BUREAU: If that means "acquire all the stock," why not say so? The wording is not very clear.

Mr. McMASTER: It may be true that the reference is to the acquirement of the entire stock, but it might be held that the words "the stock" meant part of the stock. If the word "entire" is inserted before the

word "stock" on line 2, the meaning will be made perfectly clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: This section seems to contemplate the continuation of these companies in their respective entities. I understand that the purpose of this legislation is to get clear of these outside companies. The Act contemplates that meetings of companies are to be held at which the Government will be represented. I am entirely opposed to that, and I would like some assurance from the minister that it is his intention to get clear of these companies. When will the Canadian National Railway Company be doing business absolutely on its own footing? When will it be absolutely controlling this government property?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I had made that clear. As to the constituent companies named in the schedule of the Bill, the policy is to amalgamate all except those in which there is minority stock outstanding, thus getting rid of the separate entities and of the names. Where there is minority stock outstanding it would not be in the public interest to amalgamate, because other stock would have to be given to take care of the minority stock. That applies only to very few companies. The subsidiary companies do not own or operate railways; consequently, it would not be good business to amalgamate them; they are better as they are. As to the constituent companies, two at least are American companies and cannot be amalgamated; the policy is to amalgamate the others.

Mr. POWER: This section says:

> The Governor in Council may transfer, or cause to be transferred, such capital stock or any part thereof to the company, or may by proxies or otherwise enable the company or any nominee of the Governor in Council to exercise the voting power thereof at any meeting of shareholders.

Why should the words "or any nominee of the Governor in Council" be inserted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The transferee of the stock could be our proxy to vote the stocks. That could be done, of course, but power is taken to have the stock voted in an alternative way by naming a separate nominee. For example, the Minister of Railways might be named, or the most immediate Government representative on the board, where there is one.

Mr. POWER: If it is the intention of the Government to give such power to the minister or to any other person whom they may designate, I do not see why that should come into this particular Bill which is a Bill to incorporate the Canadian National Railway Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only way to have the power is by this Bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 13, subsection (1)—application of Railway Act and Expropriation Act to undertakings of company:

Mr. BUREAU: I move that the three subsections of section 13 be considered separately.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What Act is meant by "The Railway Act?" Is it the existing Act or the new Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It means at present the existing law. When the new Bill passes, it will mean that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why not say the Railway Act, 1919?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Interpretation Act covers that.

Mr. FIELDING: Has it been found impossible or too difficult to designate by numbers the provisions of the Railway Act which are not to apply? This form of legislation may be unavoidable, but it is open to criticism. When it is stated that certain portions of an Act are not to apply, it is desirable that those portions should be indicated by the numbers of the sections. When the section states in general terms "all the provisions of the Railway Act excepting those provisions which are inconsistent with this Act" and so forth, that leaves it an open question as to what portions of the law are inconsistent. Further on the Government seem to have anticipated that very point, because they provide in subsection 2:

> In case of doubt, the Governor in Council may declare what provisions and to what extent the provisions of the respective Acts are applicable to the company under this section.

The determining of what sections are consistent and what are not seems to be rather a judicial function. I suppose the matter has been considered, and there may be difficulties in designating the sections by numbers, but if they could be so designated, that would be very desirable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the present Act was to continue or if the new Act was already passed, they could be designated without

any difficulty, but inasmuch as both Acts are to apply each in turn, it is difficult to designate; that is to say, the designation which one might now make would not apply when the new Act passes.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a very easy way out of the difficulty, unless there are grave reasons why this section should be worded as it is. This Bill is being passed for the purpose of putting the Canadian Government railways as nearly as possible, the interest of the people being protected, on the same footing as all privately-owned railways. Why should the Canadian Government railways, when they require any land for the construction of railways, follow the Expropriation Act and go before the Exchequer Court instead of following the ordinary provisions of the statute? The Canadian Northern railway, before it was turned into the Government, if it wanted to expropriate, went before the courts of the province wherein the land was situated and got the land, and I do not see why these provisions of the Railway Act should not apply to the Canadian Government Railway System. If there are any objections, I am willing to consider and discuss them. But this would avoid confusion and it would be fairer to prevent the people from following His Majesty the King, who controls the Canadian Government railways on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, before the Exchequer Court. Why should not in this case the interpretation of the law by a judge of the superior court be as good for the Canadian Government as it is for privately-owned Canadian railway companies operating under the General Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no intention of going before any tribunal different from the tribunal other railways go before, namely, a board of arbitrators, to determine the arbitration. The provisions of the Expropriation Act in that regard do not apply by reason of subsection (c) of this section which says:

> The compensation payable in respect of the taking of any lands so vested in the company, or of interests therein, or injuriously affected by the construction of the undertaking or works shall be ascertained in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Act, beginning with notice of expropriation to the opposite party.

So that the provisions of the Railway Act as regards the fixing of compensation apply. That was done with the idea that persons whose lands, usually farm lands, are taken are given the right of having the values determined by arbitrators, just as under the Railway Act, instead of being compelled to go to the Exchequer Court. The difference is this, that if the Railway Act altogether applied and no power of the Exchequer Act were invoked, then we would have to file plans with the Railway Commission, and furthermore, title would not vest with the filing of the plans in accordance with this clause, but taking the powers of the Expropriation Act and embodying them here, we get title on the filing of the plans and thereby avoid the intervention of intermediary parties purchasing lands ahead of us by reason of knowledge of the filing of plans in advance. That is all the difference.

Mr. BUREAU Clause (c) says:

> The compensation payable in respect of the taking of any lands so vested in the company, or of interests therein, or injuriously affected by the construction of the undertaking or works shall be ascertained in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Act, beginning with notice of expropriation to the opposite party.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is when the plans are filed.

Mr. BUREAU: There is something wrong here. The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) says that expropriation and the filing of plans with the registrar gives title. That I think is very summary and autocratic, and it is unfair. I may be wrong, but I think that under the Railway Act we have to serve notice to the respondent in which you must offer him the amount which the engineer or surveyor who signs the notice swears is the value of the land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That must be done now, too.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the use of doing it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the first step towards getting at the value.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not dispose of the whole matter and say that in the case of the Canadian Government Railway System the deposit of the plan will vest title in the company, and that the proceeding of expropriation shall be the same as under the general Railway Act. That would cover the ground and obviate all confusion that might result from this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where information is given out as to where your route lies an opportunity for intervention by intermediaries arises. The danger time is between the time the information gets out by taking your plan to the Railway Commission and the time of filing the plan.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should that not apply to the general Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another question. I am not prepared to argue now that it should not apply.

Mr. BUREAU: My whole object is to avoid having two laws regulating railways, whether the Canadian Government Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would be well if we could eliminate the confusion as to what clauses should apply and what should not and would relieve the Governor in Council of the trouble and responsibility of determining this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no difficulty in saying what clauses apply and what do not apply, as soon as the Railway Act passes. I am advised there is very little need for subsection (2).

Mr. BUREAU: The Government will not build roads unless they have a charter, and they generally fairly well indicate where they are going to run. I see there is a section seeking to revive certain charters. The public will know exactly what roads they are and where they lie. I do not see why there should be such a long provision, which is liable to create confusion. If my hon. friend would give me five minutes I would submit a draft amendment to cover the ground.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to giving the hon. member five minutes.

Mr. BUREAU: Of course, if my hon. friend will not accept it I will not go to the trouble of doing it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We could not accept any clause compelling us to disclose the exact right of way prior to the acquirement of title, because that would give an opportunity to others to come in and buy ahead of us. The charter generally indicates the direction of the road, but it does not give the line. So long as only the general direction is known we have nothing to fear, but we do not want to be in the position of having to disclose the exact right of way.

Mr. BUREAU: That point is open to discussion. The other railways have to have their plans approved by the Minister of Railways and have to submit them to the Railway Commission. Why should the Government have an advantage over other people who want to build a railway? I do not believe that men who would seek to dispose of their land at fancy prices would be given any consideration by the courts. I have known arbitration cases in which land was valued, say, at $400 and was sold for $4,000, but the court, realizing that it was only a hold-up, endorsed the valuation of the arbitration.

Mr. KEEFER: I know cases where plans have been submitted to the Railway Board for consideration and several parties have at once commenced buying lands on the proposed route. They made two or three turnovers amongst themselves and the result was that the railway had to pay considerably more than they should have paid.

Mr. BUREAU: Was it because it was held several months before the Railway Board?

Mr. KEEFER: There is the usual delay. I think the same principle should be adopted in regard to all railways, and when the Railway Bill comes up we ought to see to that. There is no reason why railways should be held up by speculators as they have been in the past in many instances. In this clause we are trying to avoid that so far as the Government is concerned, and if the companies are wise they will protect themselves.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not a question of wisdom on the part of companies, but whether private companies shall have the same right as the Government.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: According to the proposed Railway Act, the notice which is to be served upon the owner refers him to the book of reference and plan which has to be filed with the registrar. You say that the notice for expropriation will give him that information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It gives him the information that the plan is there filed, and from that he can get the exact area taken. It also tells him what is proposed to be paid for it.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Are we, by this clause, to do away with the filing of plans and the book of reference up to a certain point? He may get information from the plans and book of reference after it becomes impossible, as you say, for speculators to step in? In the meantime he gets notice of the expropriation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Afterwards.

On paragraph 2—power to decide cases in doubt:

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think this paragraph should pass in its present form. It is not right that the Governor in Council should be at one and the same time a party to a case and the judge in the matter.

Some independent authority should be selected. I would suggest that the paragraph be changed to read:

In case of doubt the Exchequer Court may declare what provisions and to what extent the provisions of the respective Acts are applicable to the company under this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Speaking at the moment, I rather think that is the law now. A case in conflict would necessarily be decided by the Exchequer Court. If my hon. friend's amendment were accepted, it would be equivalent to removing the sub-clause. If the sub-clause is removed it will have the same effect as if my hon. friend's amendment carries. I do not see that sub-clause 2 need be invoked at all. I would consent to striking it out. I therefore move:

That sub-clause 2 of clause 13 be struck from the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

On paragraph 3 (now paragraph 2)—(a) signatures to plans deposited; (b) lands vested in the company; (c) ascertaining amount of compensation.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any provision by which we have a president and vice-president?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The provision in the Railway Act provides for a president and vice-president.

Mr. McKENZIE: Under this Bill we have the directors on the one hand and the company on the other. The president of an ordinary company, is usually appointed at a general meeting of the shareholders. I do not see what the Railway Act has to do with the appointing of a president when there are no shareholders to appoint him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The directors elect the president. Clause 13 of the Bill provides that the Railway Act, except as to certain clauses, shall apply. One of the non-excepted clauses provides that the directors shall elect the president and vice-president. Consequently that clause applies. Our directors will elect the president and vice-president. Section 13 comes in there and its application is clear.

On section 15—actions, suits or other proceedings:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does this change the existing law in any way?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. In one sentence it makes the new corporation liable at law and vests in the new corporation the rights at law of a corporation rather than putting it in the position of the Crown. A man now to sue in respect to anything done to him on the Intercolonial must have a fiat, hereafter he can sue the Canadian National Railway Company without a fiat. Similarly, the company itself can sue without a fiat, it can act as a corporation not subject to the restrictions or to the enjoyment of the privileges of the Crown.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any provision for the liquidation of a judgment that may be obtained against the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The clause provides that:

Any defence available to the respective corporations (including His Majesty) in respect of whose undertaking the cause of action arose shall be available to the company, and any expense incurred in connection with any action taken or judgment rendered against the company in respect of its operation or management of any lines of railway or properties, other than its own lines of railway or properties, may be charged to and collected from the corporation in respect of whose undertaking such action arose.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I do not understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any expense in relation to an undertaking is charged against the operation of that undertaking or any judgment recorded in relation to an undertaking is charged against that undertaking. If the undertaking out of which the action arises is in connection with the Intercolonial, the expense is charged against the operation of the Intercolonial and a judgment is charged in the same way.

Mr. McMASTER: That is, supposing that the company will keep a special record showing how each undertaking is charged?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: And it is really only a matter of bookkeeping as between different departments of the same railway. The other party will have nothing to do with that. The other party would levy against the property of the whole company if it obtained judgment and, that judgment was unsatisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not understand that this company are to own anything at all. They will not own the railway, they will not own the rolling stock as an ordinary company would, they are a sort of holding concern and are simply operating the railway system which is really owned by the King, as represented here by the Governor in Council. Now when a per-

son has a judgment against this company, and sends the sheriff to execute it, what is he going to levy upon? This company do not own anything so far as I can see.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in his statement. The company is more than a holding company. It is a holding company, but when the power of amalgamation provided for in section 21 takes place the Canadian Northern itself will be amalgamated in this company and will cease to exist as a separate entity. Therefore it is more than a holding company. But even if it is a holding company it has the stock which may be levied on for judgment.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Finance holds the stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The stock is to be transferred under section 12. The company has to pay its debts, that is manifest, and its debts in respect of a judgment will be chargeable against the undertaking it is operating in regard to which the accident, or whatever it may be that gave rise to the judgment, occurs.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is perfectly clear, but I want to detain the minister for just a moment longer. Suppose that to-morrow Johnston gets judgment from the Supreme Court of Canada against this company, and they refuse to pay it, and he puts an execution in the sheriff's hands, what can he levy on?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He could not levy on anything until the assets are placed in the hands of the company; there could not be any judgment until such assets are in their possession. But immediately this Bill passes, the stock the Government owns is placed in the hands of the company, and could be levied on. Subsequently roads will be amalgamated with the existing system, and the physical assets of those roads will be the property of this company and may be levied against.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a new phase of the matter. I did not think the company were going to be the owners of these properties, and I do not think the House understood that the ownership was vested in this company as such. Then we are to understand the directors are to own these properties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Upon amalgamation the company will own the direct physical assets.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It is generally understood that there are a great many unsettled claims against the Canadian Northern Railway Company. I would like to have the opinion of the Acting Minister of Justice as to whether a creditor of that company could bring action against these directors in respect of any unsatisfied claim against the Canadian Northern, and if so, whether judgment could be obtained against the directors in respect of it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is in error in stating that there are a great number of unsatisfied claims against the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The claims are pretty well settled up, in fact I do not know that there are any outstanding. But if there were, the judgment now would be obtained against the company, and would be collectable from it. But upon amalgamation the company that absorbs the others is then the company liable and will have to pay any judgment rendered.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am glad to hear the minister say there are no outstanding claims against the Canadian Northern, because it has been frequently stated in the House that there were numerous such claims.

Section agreed to.

On Section 16—Expenses to be paid out of receipts and revenues.

Mr. FIELDING: Some of the clauses that we have been discussing have perhaps not been of the utmost importance, but here is a clause that is worth reflecting on, because I doubt if its gravity has been fully understood by the Committee; certainly its gravity is not understood by the outside public. If there is one principle clearer than another in relation to our financial affairs, it is that every penny of revenue that is collected in any form for the purposes of the Dominion of Canada shall be paid into the Consolidated Fund. Once in that fund not one dollar of the money can be paid out until it has been appropriated by the House of Commons. That is the basic principle of our system of finance. Yet we are gravely and deliberately proposing to depart from it. We are proposing, as respects the management of one of the greatest of our departments—a department that is a great one now and will be even greater by virtue of the passage of this Bill—to repeal the Consolidated Revenue Act. We are proposing that this company shall be allowed to take into their treasury every dollar that they earn and use it for

the purposes of the railway system as they think best. There was a discussion, at an earlier stage, concerning one portion of this question. I was not present on that occasion, but I find from a perusal of Hansard that there was a discussion on the question of the deficit, as to whether or not that should be paid without an appropriation. But that is only a part of the issue involved. The broader question is that while every other department of the Government will be held under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue Act, this great department will not be so held. The Minister of Customs, the Minister of Inland Revenue, the Postmaster General, and all the other ministers who collect revenue will be obliged to pay it into the treasury and to await an appropriation by this House; but as respects the collections of this department—and they will run into many millions—they are not to go into the consolidated revenue but into the treasury of this company at whatever point it may have its head office. We shall be told that it is very inconvenient to have any other arrangement. Of course, it is inconvenient. It would be most convenient for the ministers, and I have been one, if they did not have to be bothered by appropriations. The truth is that Parliament is rather an inconvenience to ministers at times. But it is necessary in the transaction of public affairs that we shall have a Parliament. I hope that before the Bill is finally passed my hon. friends on the treasury benches will reconsider this matter and see if they cannot, instead of setting the Consolidated Revenue Act at defiance, bring this measure into harmony with it. It was said in the discussion to which I have referred, that you could not make estimates of the probable cost of operating this railway. The answer to that is that for fifty years we have been making estimates for the cost of operating the Intercolonial Railway. I have no doubt it was an embarrassment at times to the Minister of Railways. It was a year ago that he tried to do for that department what he is now proposing to do in the case of a larger scheme. After some reflection and discussion the minister did not press the matter. I do not intend to make any motion on the subject, but I do hope that before this Bill passes the Government will reconsider this matter and see that provision is made for this department complying with the Consolidated Revenue Act as is done by every other department of the Government.

There is nothing in the argument that you cannot make estimates. If you are able to make estimates for the Intercolonial, why cannot you do so for these other roads? I remember some reference was made to the difficulty of making estimates because of the great crop in the Northwest. Surely we all hope that the crop will be a great one, and the wise Minister in making his estimates will show that he is hoping there will be a great crop. But I do think that the setting aside of the Consolidated Act in reference to this Department is not wise, and in all seriousness I would suggest to my honourable friends on the Treasury benches that before the matter is disposed of finally they reconsider that aspect of it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Needless to say I always pay very great attention and am disposed to give great weight to any observations from my honourable friend (Mr. Fielding) with respect to matters of financial administration in which he has had very wide experience as Minister of Finance. He has pointed out that it may be inconvenient to adopt the method which he suggests, namely, of making an estimate and having all expenditures vouched for in the usual way as is done in the case of Departments of the Government. It seems to me that it is not a matter of inconvenience so much as of practical impossibility. I do not say that lightly, because I agree with my honourable friend that if a thing should be done the fact that there is some inconvenience involved should not prevent its being done. But I would submit, without concluding myself as to the position which the Government will take—because we will be very glad to give my honourable friend's views full consideration—that this railway company of which the Government is the virtual proprietor notwithstanding the corporate from in which its assets are held is not a department of the Government in the same sense that the Railway or Customs or Inland Revenue is a department of the Government. As I pointed out last evening when I spoke upon this matter, there are two ways in which the Dominion Government could administer this great railway system which has now come into our hands and such other systems as may be acquired in the future. One way would be to attempt to administer them as the Intercolonial Railway was administered, by the Railway Department of the Government, which, as the Committee knows, is under the direct control of the Minister of Railways. The other way, both for practicability of administration and for divesting the Government as far

as possible of control in order that no question of political patronage may enter, is to administer them through the medium of a joint stock company or companies. Take the situation as it exists to-day. The various departments of the Government, including the Railway Department in respect of the Canadian Northern Railway, make their Estimates, and all expenditures are audited by the Auditor General, as my hon. friend has indicated. But in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, whose stock is held by the Government—just as the stock of this company which we are now creating will be held for the Government—the administration being under a corporation is carried out as corporations carry out their enterprises. The corporation, as such, receives all revenue, and all expenditures are made under the authority of the board of directors, who are directly responsible to the Dominion Government. That is the situation existing to-day with regard to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, which is owned by the Dominion Government as I have pointed out.

10 p.m.

Now, if we had given effect to the suggestion of my hon. friend, the Government during the past year or more that it has owned the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company would have made an estimate showing the entire amount of expenditure which in the opinion of the board of directors and the Government would be necessary, and all expenditures of every kind whatsoever, great or small, throughout the entire system would have to be checked by the proper officers of the Government and vouched by the Auditor General. That would be a very great undertaking. It is a large undertaking as it is. The officers of the company, acting under the authority of the board, receive all the revenue and pay it out under a system of audit established by the company. No doubt a very thorough system of audit should be established, and we have endeavoured to establish such a system. I remember that two years ago we appointed, in addition to the auditors of the company, the well-known firm of Marwick, Mitchell, Peat & Co., a firm of very high standing, and they have been auditing the accounts. In a sense while the Canadian Northern Railway is not a department of the Government, the directors and those under them and the auditors are Government officials. They are not Government officials in the sense of officials in the several departments, but nevertheless in substance and in fact, as the Government of Canada owns all the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, its board of directors and their subordinates are Government officers.

I am the first to admit the necessity of the strictest kind of check upon receipts and expenditures, because if there is one thing that we should have learned in connection with public affairs it is that the strictest check is necessary to prevent abuse of power in the control of money. But I submit that in the present situation, in view of the fact that we hold the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway System, it would be very difficult indeed for the officials of the Government to supervise all the receipts and expenditures of the system. And that has not been done; the company has carried on its business as the Canadian Pacific Railway Companies carries on its business, and as the Grand Trunk Railway System carries on its business—through its officers, and subject to audit, which is continuous and is carried on with great care. The system which we have in contemplation, and which has necessitated the creation of this company, in accordance with the terms of this Act is a much larger one than the Canadian Northern Railway Company, because we have looked forward to the probable acquisition of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and of the Grand Trunk Railway System itself.

If that should happen, the Government would find itself in possession of an exceedingly large railway system, twenty thousand miles or more, consisting of the Intercolonial, the National Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and, in all probability, the Grand Trunk. These being brought into one incorporation, there would be in Canada two great systems, the Canadian Pacific Railway System, and the Canadian National Railway System of which the proprietor would be the Dominion Government. If you have competent directors in whom the people have the utmost confidence; if you have officers of the same standing and integrity as those of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; if you have a proper system of audit and very full annual reports, you have surrounded the system with all reasonable safeguards. The alternative suggested by my hon. friend is that the Government make its estimates in respect of all the expenditures of that vast system and that all the items of expenditure, great and small, be checked as items of Government expendi-

ture in the various departments are now checked, and audited by the Auditor General. I do not say that that is impossible, but it seems to me to be impracticable. I have very great respect for my hon. friend's opinion on a matter of this kind, but it would seem to be advisable that, if possible, the public interest be safeguarded by the organization of the company and by the checks which are in use in connection with railway systems rather than in the way that we now make estimates and check expenditures of departments of the Government, in the strict sense of the term. I think there is a perfect system of accounts in connection with the administration of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; it would seem to be quite as efficient as that which we have established under legislation of Parliament respecting receipts and expenditures of public money. I entirely sympathize with the view that the strictest supervision of expenditures should be exercised in connection with this system, for this reason, among others: The board of directors in whom this great trust and confidence is to be reposed will receive all moneys through the officials whom they name; will make all disbursements through their organization, and then come to the Government and to Parliament for any deficit. Parliament, therefore, is immediately interested in every expenditure made by that system. The sole question seems to be one of expediency and of the proper safeguarding of the public interest. If we could be satisfied that this company would carry on its operations as honestly and efficiently as other great railway systems carry on theirs, it would be unnecessary to insist upon a further check and audit on the part of the officials of the Government and the Auditor General. If, on the other hand, the conclusion should be reached that what I put forward is impracticable and that public loss would ensue, then there is a great deal to be said for the view put forward by the hon. member. I have given the matter careful consideration, and it seems to me that the suggestion, while it should be weighed with great deliberation, is impracticable; and that we can accomplish the result which the hon. member has in mind by a proper system of administration and of audit and by an annual report which would furnish to the Government and to Parliament the fullest possible details of expenditure. I am not concluding, either myself or the Government, with respect to the attitude which we shall take upon this very important matter, but I submit these observations for the consideration of the hon. member and of the Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: I take part in the discussion of this point with some diffidence, because I cannot bring to bear upon it the years of experience in financial matters that may be claimed by the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) and by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). We are face to face with a difficult situation. We are endeavouring so to organize the publicly-owned railway properties of this country that they shall be removed from that partisan influence which has long been the curse of Government-owned railroads in Canada as in other countries. At the same time, we have to retain the control which our fiduciary position towards the taxpayers imposes upon us. Yesterday I proposed a scheme for the first appointment of directors. The argument offered by the Prime Minister in opposition to the proposal was strong enough to convince me that possibly I was mistaken; that there was no way in which the Government could avoid its final and ultimate responsibility, and that, therefore, it had the right to name the entire board of directors. Can we, then, afford to throw aside the safeguards which British constitutional tradition has placed around the expenditure of public moneys? I do not think we can.

Two points were made by the Acting Prime Minister. First, there was the difficulty of estimating what it would cost to run this great railway system. I grant the difficulty, but I do not believe that it is insurmountable. At the beginning the directors will have to administer a certain number of roads which are now in operation, and the expenditures of last year, with increases or decreases, as the case may be, will form a pretty safe indication of what will have to be spent in the next fiscal year. I believe that the estimates can be made. True, they will run into appalling figures, but it is just as well that the people should be brought face to face with the importance of this undertaking. The second point is in relation to the audit. I do not see any difficulty in connection with the matter of an audit.

The Acting Prime Minister has told us that an audit will have to be made; that an audit is made now of Canadian Northern Railway operations. Instead of having an auditor chosen in the manner in which this firm of auditors which he speaks about was chosen, the auditor will be the Auditor General, and his staff will make the audit.

I understand the Acting Prime Minister does not do more this evening than express his doubt as to his ability to meet the desires of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), which, I think, are the desires of a large number of the members of this House. I would join with the hon. member in asking the Government to reconsider very carefully this question, and I think I can say, with those who think with me, that we shall not depart from sound traditional usage which has grown up from generation to generation without the clearest proof and the soundest argument that this tradition can be departed from with safety to the public interest.

Mr. FIELDING: I appreciate the very good spirit in which the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has met my suggestion. All that I could ask is that he should, at a more convenient opportunity, give it further consideration. But if he does not mind, I will offer one or two observations upon his argument. His first argument is that this expenditure should not be controlled by Parliament because it is so big. To my mind that is the very reason why Parliament should deal with the matter. If the funds involved should, as is likely, run into enormous figures, that is not a reason why we should depart from all the rules and customs of our financial system —it is only an additional reason why we should adhere to the established practice of the past. The minister has suggested that the audit of the Canadian Northern is a very good one, and nothing I say has the slightest reflection upon any gentleman connected with that enterprise. But he says: If they have capable men, and they have an audit and a report is made, what more do we want? Let us apply that to some other cases. The Post Office Department is generally and, I may say, is at present, presided over by an estimable gentleman in whose integrity we have every confidence. There is a staff of auditors and there are deputies, assistants, inspectors—a large organization. The department makes reports to Parliament and complies with every condition the minister has mentioned. Yet, we do not allow the Post Office Department to disregard the Consolidated Revenue Act; we make the Postmaster General come to this Parliament for his appropriation. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) is absent, but his place is filled by his predecessor, the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid). We do not for a moment, question that gentleman's zeal or integrity. He has a deputy minister in whose zeal and integrity we all have confidence; he has a large staff, and every condition the minister has mentioned with regard to examination and checks and audit will be found in the Customs Department. Yet, we do not let the Minister of Customs control one penny of that revenue; he is bound to turn it all into the public treasury Therefore, I think the fact that the gentlemen connected with the Canadian Northern and those who will be connected with that enterprise, are men of good repute and that they will have an ample audit and so forth, is not a sufficient reason for us to disregard all the checks that Parliament has imposed in the past. The minister has drawn a distinction—I do not think he would like to say it is a very good one—between the department and this company. The public are not technical; they get at the essence of a thing, and the essence of this is that we have a Government railway system which is going to be enlarged to 20,000 or 30,000 miles of railway. Whatever you may call it, a company or anything else, it is the Government railway; the Government has to pay the piper; the Government has to provide the money.

There is, in the Bill, a provision that the surplus shall be paid into the treasury. That is pleasant to think of, but I do not think the Minister of Finance is looking for very much addition to his funds from that source. There is, however, going to be a tremendous operation conducted by this company. I do not want to say that term is camouflage, because that is a word used in another sense; but at all events, the company is only the Government in another form. Instead of having Smith, Brown and Jones acting for the Government, we have Robinson, Thompson and some other people. But it is the Government from beginning to end. I sympathize with my hon. friends on the treasury benches in their efforts to get rid of patronage. I am endeavouring to believe they are sincere and earnest in the matter, and I should like to help them; but we might as well have this fact clearly understood, that the people who talk about divorcing these railways from politics, from the control of Parliament, are simply cherishing a delusion. There can be no divorce of a public work from the people's Parliament so long as the people's Parliament pay the piper. Get rid of patronage if possible; I am not asking that you shall go back to the patronage system. The minister spoke of the two railways, the Intercolonial and this other system. I do not think all the criticisms regarding the Intercolonial man-

agement in the past are at all correct or justified; but whether there were defects in the management of the Intercolonial or not, we are not asking that any defects should be perpetuated. We should however, recognize the fact that, while the people of Canada have to pay the bill, they will, in one form or another, hold the Government responsible, and politics will be involved. I do not see any escape from that situation.

On the question of making the Estimates, I cannot see any reason why it is not practicable to make Estimates for 20,000 miles of railway as well as for 2,000 miles. The principle is the same; you are taking simply a bigger job and needing more money for it; and if it should turn out that at any time an exceptional case has arisen for which no provision has been made, we have in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act a provision by which the Governor in Council may grant money for unforeseen expenditures. I think the reasons given for departing from an established custom are not wise. The words of the Revenue and Audit Act are very plain; they are in the most emphatic terms, namely, that every penny of public money coming into the possession of any official of the Government of Canada must be paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and that penny can get out of that treasury only after Parliament has so voted. I believe that principle is sound, and what we are now doing, instead of being a reason for departing from it, seems to be a reason why we should adhere to it more firmly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the first place, I think there is a misconception as to the effect of this section which has reference merely to moneys received and paid out in respect of the operation of the Canadian Government railways. It has not reference to moneys received and paid out in respect of the operation of the Canadian Northern railway system. It is because it has reference to moneys received and paid out in respect of the Canadian Government railways that we have to use the term:—

Notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.

Those two Acts never did provide that money received in respect of the Canadian Northern railway system by the Canadian National Railway Company should come into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and be paid out of that fund.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the minister think it should not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that in a moment. What I mean to say is that we are not in any way setting aside the provisions of the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act in respect of moneys that are received from the Canadian Northern railway system at all, only in respect of the Intercolonial. Apparently my hon. friend is asking that as respects all moneys received by this corporation they should go right into the Consolidated Revenue of Canada and should be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue as departmental moneys. Does not this Bill mean that we are attempting to set up a system of corporate management divorced from direct government interference or control, of this great railway system—corporate as distinguished from departmental management? Can you have corporate management of the road and departmental financing? Or corporate management and departmental auditing? Immediately you commence departmental audit through the Auditor General to that extent you have entirely disintegrated the system of corporate management. I would not for a moment contend that an exact, careful, thorough and responsible system of audit, for which we should be responsible, should not apply to the accounts of the Canadian National Railways as constituted by this Bill. It is not a question of thoroughness or propriety of audit, one system should be just as thorough and rigid as the other; but it is a question of whether you are going to have a system of corporate or departmental audit. Can you have management by corporation and departmental audit? To me it does not seem possible. If all the moneys of the Canadian Northern system are to go right into the Consolidated Revenue, and to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue, how can that be consistent with corporate management of the roads? It appears to be a manifest anomaly.

Mr. McMASTER: May I suggest that your whole company is really an anomaly. It is not a real company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems to me to be a very real company. We want to make it a real company, but it will be a very unreal company if one-half is to be departmental and the other half corporate. I do think that while it is true that this is in reality a Government enterprise, it is equally true that we are trying to operate it as a business concern under corporate management; and every argument that would go to show that we ought to have direct departmental audit would be just as

forcible to show that we should directly manage the road as well. There is nothing to show that corporate audit by the system now in vogue in that company, upon which we super-impose an audit of our own to ensure that their audit is correct, should not be just as thorough as any audit through the Auditor General's Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Mr. McMASTER: I understand, Mr. Chairman, and I think correctly, that the Acting Prime Minister acceded to the request of the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) to let this stand.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no reason why it should not stand for consideration. The system is so large, and is likely to be so much larger, that it seems to me to be a needless duplication of work even if it were practicable. It is a question of safeguarding the public interest, and the real point is whether the public interest can be safeguarded through corporate administration under which these railways are to be operated. It would appear to me that it can be so safeguarded, but I think the strictest attention should be given to that point. The system should be under the most competent audit from time to time and the Government should be closely in touch with its general finance. I admit that the situation is anomalous, but it is necessarily so. I agree with what my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) said, and I have said the same thing many times myself, though not in the same words, namely, that no matter how the Government or Parliament might try to get rid of responsibility the fact is that this railway system, belonging to the Government and the people, must be administered by the Government subject to Parliament; and it is not possible, nor, in my view, is it proper that the Government should escape responsibility. If it were not for this question of the intrusion of patronage, about which both Parliament and the public hold strong views, whether well founded or not, it seems to me that the logical position would be for the Government to administer the system directly, just as the Intercolonial was administered. We have been seeking to get away from that position, which is the logical one, in order to avoid the influencing of administration in a particular political interest; and to do that we have the expedient not of a commission—which we might have if no question of corporation securities and franchise arose—but of corporation machinery.

Mr. McMASTER: But these men are practically commissioners.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am coming to that; I agree with my hon. friend and the point he raises strengthens my argument. We have adopted corporate administration. If it were a commission the Government would appoint the commissioners just as it appoints the board of directors of this system. These men are responsible to the Government in their administration, but we seek to give them independence of action to avoid the evils which I have mentioned. If we have capable men—and I said the other night and say now that the whole success of government ownership is necessarily dependent upon the obtaining of men of the highest integrity in whom the people will have continuing confidence—and if there is a railway administration similar to that of the great systems like the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, with a continuous audit and the check again upon that audit such as we have in connection with the Canadian Northern, I submit, the public interest is protected although the machinery is different. The Auditor General would audit the accounts to, let us say, an unlimited degree; so can the auditors of a railway system. The system is spread over an entire continent and the audit system would be a very extensive one. If I believed we could not safeguard the public interest in the way the Canadian Pacific Railway Company safeguards the interests of its shareholders by a thorough audit, I would be disposed to give more weight to the view put forward than I do. But we can safeguard the situation. If we were tempted to introduce departmental finance into this corporate system we should be doing what the Acting Minister of Justice suggested a few moments ago—we should be essentially changing the basis of our administration, and should be carrying on a partly departmental and a partly corporate administration. It seems to me that the essence of the question is this: Can the public interest be protected in connection with this system through officials and through a proper system of audit? I think it can. I am entirely willing that this clause should stand until to-morrow if hon. gentlemen so desire.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt): The clause has been declared carried and it

cannot stand without the unanimous consent of the Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: I would certainly have jumped up before but I understood from the Acting Prime Minister that he had acceded to the request of the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) for further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee consent that the clause shall stand?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the Bill can be finished to-night, I would suggest that the clause be carried now, or later on,—although we would not be disposed to change the Bill in that respect.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that there is not only the public interest to be safeguarded but there is also the control by Parliament of the expenditure of public money? During the war the British Government conducted a great insurance department at a very handsome profit, the figures running into millions of pounds. It would be interesting to know whether the premiums that were collected by this department from the shipowners—I think it was a system of marine insurance—were paid into the Consolidated Fund and whether the losses were paid out of that fund.

The CHAIRMAN: I must insist upon knowing whether this is to stand now or whether it is to be taken as carried.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As I stated, the Government would be glad to give it consideration. Let it stand for the present at all events. I think it very desirable that this legislation should be got through as soon as possible consistently with full discussion. If the Bill is to be finished this evening perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite would be willing that this should go through. I may say that we are not disposed to change our view in respect of it.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are still considering this clause, are we?

The CHAIRMAN: No; it stands.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Stands.

Section stands.

On section 17—fiscal year, January 1 to December 31:

Mr. FIELDING: What is the object of having a different fiscal year from that of the other departments of Government or the other business of Canada?

Mr. J. D. REID: This is to comply with the provision of the general Railway Act.

Mr. FIELDING: That is hardly a sufficient reason.

Mr. BUREAU: If it were to conform with the fiscal year of Canada, Parliament would be able to get fuller information. My hon. friend says that it is to conform with the general Railway Act. Here is a particular instance in which we should differ from the general Railway Act. It would be better to have the fiscal year of the Canadian Railways conform with the Government fiscal year so that we would know exactly how much we had run behind in any one year. If the Government are going to pay the deficits we want to know each year what is going to be chargeable to it.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Railway Act provides:

> Such returns shall be made for the period beginning from the date to which the then last yearly returns made by the company or carrier by water extend, or, if no such returns have been previously made, from the commencement of the operation of the railway, or other works, or undertaking, and ending with the last day of December in the year, or other interval, for which the returns are to be made, or with such other date as the minister may direct.

Mr. BUREAU: If there is any case in which we ought to make an exception to the general Railway Act it is this, because of all the departments of government this is the one that ought to conform to the fiscal year of the Government so that we would know exactly where to charge the deficits at the end of the year.

Mr. McKENZIE: When the Minister of Railways is making his report for the year he will certainly be supposed to report upon this system, notwithstanding that it is under the operation of a company. It is admitted that this system is a part of Government ownership under a different name and the minister will report to Parliament on the operations of this company. Are we going to have two reports instead of one? It is impossible to have a full statement of the operations during the year if one report ends on the last day of December and the other on the last day of March. I submit that the railway year should be uniform with the financial year in the departments of Government. We have nothing as a Parliament to do with the general Railway Act. These companies are not bound to report to this House, and that should not regulate the business at all.

Mr. BUREAU: Referring to the schedule to the Railway Act railway companies have to make returns.

—for the year ending June 30, 19—, required by the Minister of Railways and Canals, showing the conditions of the capital and revenue account of the railways in the Dominion of Canada.

Together with the location and general description of the railways, etc. Those returns, unless the law has been amended, are for the year ending June 30.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Railway Act now applies to the Canadian Northern System, but it does not apply to the Government Railways. The fiscal year now, therefore, under the Railway Act, is the calendar year. It appears as well that this is the fiscal year for all railways, American as well as Canadian, and that returns have to be made. Indeed, this company, must make returns in respect to a part of its system for the fiscal year to the Inter-State Commerce Commission of the United States. It is compelled to do so. Therefore, the company will require to have two fiscal years if you compel it now to change to the 31st March. There does not seem to be any particular object to be served, because the annual returns would come to Parliament in any event.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the fiscal year of the American companies correspond with the fiscal year of their national finance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood that in the United States the fiscal year is the calendar year.

Mr. FIELDING: Is their national fiscal year the calendar year?

Mr. DAVIS: It ends the 30th June.

Mr. FIELDING: The same as our own.

Mr. DAVIS Ours ends the 31st March.

Mr. FIELDING: I could understand that the American railways might be obliged to conform to the national fiscal year. If so, that would be an argument why our railways should conform to our fiscal year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand our statistics are given for the calendar year. The calendar year is required in the United States and my information is that it is not their fiscal year. It is their railway year. This company has to comply with that requirement as to its American lines. It would need to have two years, which would be very complicated indeed.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like the minister to explain how this change would affect the Auditor General's Report. At the present time we have the expenditure on railways given in the Auditor General's Report up to 31st March. I conclude that the expenditure on the Canadian National Railways will be given in that report. Am I right? In that case, will not some confusion arise in the Auditor General's Report by making the fiscal year conform to the calendar year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should think not. The Auditor General's Report would, of course, embody a statement of the payments made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or out of the Dominion treasury, to this company. Such payments made, we will say at the end of the company's railway year, thirty-first of December, will appear as of that date in the Auditor General's Report covering the fiscal year up to 31st March.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Expenditures between 31st December and 31st March following will not appear in the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They will appear if any are made. If there was a deficit the payments would not be made at once, but payments made any number of times, as long as they were in the fiscal year of Canada, would appear in the Auditor General's Report of that year.

Mr. FIELDING: The disadvantage of that will be that the books and returns of the Canadian Government Railways are not going to correspond with those of the other departments, and for all purposes of investigation, examination and comparison, the situation will be very embarrassing.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—Works declared to be for the general advantage of Canada:

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that all the railways and companies that form part of the Canadian Northern system are enumerated in the list that is printed at the end of the Bill, entitled "Constituent and Subsidiary Companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System." What does this clause mean? Are there any other companies which the Government has acquired, or any companies whose stock is invested in the Minister of Finance for His Majesty, which are not enumerated in the schedule?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I understand, there are now two companies comprised in the

Canadian Northern System which have not as yet been declared works for the general advantage of Canada. This clause declares them works for the general advantage of Canada, and consequently makes them Dominion railways. Then the clause goes on to say that any companies hereafter included within this Canadian National Railway System, by virtue of the authority contained in Clause 11, if my memory serves me right, are now in advance declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, so that the whole can be considered national railways.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all right, but it is the last part of the clause that I am alluding to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The clause does what I have explained.

Mr. BUREAU: No, what it says is this:

The works of any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System which have not heretofore been declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and the works of any company or companies hereafter from time to time declared by the Governor in Council to be comprised in the Canadian Northern System are hereby declared from and after the date of the making of such declaration by the Governor in Council to be works for the general alvantage of Canada.

Now what are the companies that have not been declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, what are the companies that are not known to the Government as being part of the Canadian Northern System? My question is, are there any other companies which ought to belong, or which it is the intention of the Government to declare to belong, to the Canadian Northern System, which are not enumerated in the schedule at the end of this Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are two now belonging to the system not declared, but we declare them. There is no other at the present time that it is intended to declare, but there may be at any time, because clause 11 contemplates that any road hereafter acquired by the Crown may be entrusted to the management of this company. Then in section 18 we declare that from the time it is so entrusted, under section 11, it shall be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: A question occurs to me, although a layman should not set himself up as a legal authority. There is no doubt that under the British North America Act the Parliament of Canada has the power to declare any railway or other work a work for the general advantage of Canada. But is Parliament to delegate that power to the Governor in Council? That is a legal proposition and I only mention it for the consideration of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen). He is proposing not only that certain roads shall be declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, but that any roads which may hereafter be acquired by the Government may be declared works for the general advantage of Canada by the Governor in Council. That is too fine a legal proposition for me to do more than mention it to my hon. friend. That is not my main point, however. I quite admit the difficulty of operating this large railway system unless all the roads shall be brought under a common control, but is there not a possibility, or more than a possibility, of some trouble arising with the provincial governments? For example, one of the roads which, according to my recollection, is under the authority of the local legislature of Nova Scotia, is the Halifax and South Western. I know that originally it was under the control of the local legislature, but it may since have been brought under the general railway system. Has it been?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that was done in 1914.

Mr. FIELDING: What are the two roads to which the Acting Minister of Justice referred a few minutes ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The St. Charles and Huron, and the Toronto Suburban.

Mr. FIELDING: Both Ontario roads?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One is a Quebec road.

Mr. FIELDING: Have these roads been aided by the provincial government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: The thought in my mind is this: If there are cases where a road, having been aided largely by provincial funds, is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, some people may say Canada should reimburse the local government. As my hon. friend says that in this case the roads were not aided from the provincial treasury that point cannot be raised.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is that the St. Charles and Huron may have got a land grant, but that is all the assistance that was given to either of these two roads. As to the first point that my hon. friend

(Mr. Fielding) raises, it really is very well taken, but I fancy that he is a little wrong in this regard: power is not given to the Governor in Council to declare any road a work for the general advantage of Canada. What is done by this Bill is to declare any road a work for the general advantage of Canada which hereafter the Governor in Council entrusts to this company.

Mr. FIELDING: That is practically giving the power to the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In effect it might be, but still from a legal standpoint the result is different. We do not say to the Governor in Council: "You may declare any road a work for the general advantage of Canada." We say to the Governor in Council: "If the Dominion acquires a road you may then, under section 11, entrust it to this company for operation." Then under section 18 we say: "Since it is so entrusted we here and now declare it is for the general advantage of Canada." I would not like to take the responsibility of saying that even that is within our powers. I do not think I should be called upon to express an opinion on it; it would appear to me at least to admit of some doubt.

Mr. BUREAU: This clause does not say that the roads that will be entrusted to the Canadian National Railway Company shall be for the general advantage of Canada, but it provides that the Governor in Council may from time to time declare any road comprised in the Canadian Northern System to be for the general advantage of Canada. What I want to know from my hon. friend is if there are any roads, in addition to those enumerated in the schedule, which the Government may declare to be part of the Canadian Northern railway. As I understand it, the roads which now form part of the Canadian Northern Railway System are divided into constituent and subsidiary companies and are all enumerated in this schedule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are no others that we now have that are contemplated to be turned over at all, but if we should acquire, for example, one of the roads mentioned this afternoon, and turn it into the system, then this clause immediately applies to it and makes it a road for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not turn it over to the Canadian Government Railway instead of to the Canadian Northern Railway System? The clause sets forth:

> —and the works of any company or companies hereafter from time to time declared by the Governor in Council to be comprised in the Canadian Northern System are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

I understand that the object of this Bill is to do away with the Canadian Northern System and have all the roads consolidated and operated under the name of the Canadian National Railways System.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right; but immediately it is in the Canadian Northern Railway System, unless there is some outstanding stock, it may be and will be amalgamated under the provisions of section 14. So it all comes out the same.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think it does. If anything is to be done you are reserving power to do it. After this Bill becomes law, according to the minister's statement, there will be no roads belonging to the Canadian Northern Railway System beyond those enumerated in the schedule. If you acquire a new road why not bring it under the provisions of this Act, and transfer it to the company direct, instead of attaching it to one particular road or the other?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Supposing there was some outstanding stock, it would not be wise to amalgamate until that stock was under our control, but it would be wise to put the road in the Canadian Northern System.

Mr. BUREAU: You are going to keep the Canadian Northern Railway System as a separate entity, and the roads will not be consolidated for the purpose of general administration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just for convenience until it itself is amalgamated.

Section agreed to.

On section 19—Power to abandon line, and dismantle—Or dispose thereof by consent—Consent of security holders.

Mr. FIELDING: Would a majority of the stockholders mean a majority in number or in amount?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Majority in amount.

Mr. FIELDING: If it means amount there may be something in the Railway Act which defines it; but it strikes me that it is open to debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My impression is that an amendment to cover that point should be made. It should read "a majority in amount."

Mr. BUREAU: In value.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A majority in value.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What becomes of the securities if a road is abandoned? Are they worthless? It strikes me that we are giving very large powers to the Governor in Council and the Railway Commission to abandon branch lines without the consideration of Parliament. As I understand the clause, it empowers the Governor in Council, with the consent of the Railway Commission and the directors of this new system, to close up any railway branch that may be connected with the system, if they think it is not a paying proposition or for some other reason. I submit that that should be referred to Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In so far as the security holders are concerned, their consent is obtained, but their security is not lost. This would only be a small part of their security that would be dismantled and abandoned, and they would see the wisdom of adopting that course and would consent accordingly. Inasmuch as the whole idea of this measure is the joining together for operating purposes of lines that were formerly under several managements, there will presumably be cases of duplication that may be cut out without injury to the public, and the intention of this section is to provide that that may be done. The Board of Railway Commissioners is entrusted from the point of view of public convenience and safety with deciding what is necessary and what is not in the way of service. Consequently that is the tribunal, it seems to me, to which resort should be had to determine whether any small part or branch is a duplication or for other reasons may be abandoned.

11 p.m.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Are not some of those securities guaranteed by the provincial governments of Western Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If so I presume their consent would be needed also.

Mr. DAVIS: Does section 19 govern the last four lines of section 11?

—such management and operation to continue during the pleasure of the Governor in Council and to be subject to termination or variation from time to time in whole or in part by the Governor in Council.

That is as to roads that come under the operation of the board subsequent to the incorporation of this company?

Mr. Meighen moved to amend section 19 as follows:

By adding after the word "majority" in the seventh line on page 6, and after the word "majority" in the tenth line on page 6, and after the word "majority" in the sixteenth line on page 6 the words "in value."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. POWER: The amendment is "majority in value of the registered security holders;" that is how it will read in the third last line?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that is quite the proper wording.

On section 20—extension of time for commencement and completion of lines of railway:

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think this section should pass now; it requires a great deal of consideration. It is a further revival of the old conditions against which I wish to protest in the most strenuous manner. We are here authorizing those defunct companies, of which we have heard so much, to start building railways and to get their old machinery in operation again, and presumably we are to furnish funds for such building. Is that the idea? What is the good of talking consolidation if those companies, all of which are hopelessly insolvent, are to be given authority by us to go on building railroads? Why should we sit down here solemnly with all the wisdom we can bring to bear on a question of this kind to perpetuate that state of affairs? I certainly expect this clause to stand over until tomorrow.

Progress reported.

NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): With the consent of the House, I move:

That pursuant to the resolution passed by this House on April 16th inst., the matter of the development in Canada of scientific research be referred for consideration to a Special Committee consisting of the following members: Messrs. Beland, Cronyn, Elkin, Keefer, Kennedy, Lemieux, McCrea, McCurdy, McGibbon, Maclean (Halifax), Nickle, Nicholson (East Algoma), Reid (Mackenzie), Ross, Sheard, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.), Stevens, Thompson (Yukon), Tweedie, Whidden, with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

EFFICIENCY IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Hon. J. D. REID: With the consent of the House, I move:

That pursuant to the resolution passed by this House on April 16th inst., the matter of an

inquiry into the Inside Civil Service be referred to a Special Committee consisting of the following members: Messrs. Andrews, Archambault, Boys, Charters, Douglas (Cape Breton South, and Richmond), Jacobs, Loggie, Long, McCrea, Mowat, Pacaud, Redman, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough) Steele, Stevens, with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Friday, April 25, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE—RAILWAY ACT CONSOLIDATION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (E. Lambton) moved:

That the Special Committee to whom was referred Bill No. 19, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, have leave to sit while the House is in session, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the first report of the said committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can be put only by leave of the House.

Motion stands.

PAPER PRESENTED.

Order in Council respecting allowances to be paid to soldier settlers who are taking agricultural training.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 78, to amend the Criminal Code (sexual offences).

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill is the same Bill as was introduced into and passed by this House last session respecting seduction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HORSE RACING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ALFRED E. FRIPP (Ottawa): Is it the intention of the Government to repeal Order in Council dated June 7, 1917, which prohibits for the period of the war and for six months thereafter betting, pool selling and book-making upon race-courses, in order that the spring meets may take place under the conditions prevailing before the war.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Has the Government in contemplation the enactment of any legislation respecting the matter of betting upon race-courses in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. member was good enough to give me notice of his question and I am, therefore, enabled to make formal reply.

It is not the intention of the Government to repeal the Order in Council referred to.

It has been drawn to the attention of the Government that horse racing has been extended beyond the limits in contemplation by Parliament when legislation respecting the subject was enacted in 1912, and that conditions connected with betting upon race-courses in certain sections of Canada have been such as to cause grave public offence to the communities concerned. With a view to remedying these conditions and dealing generally with the question of betting at race meetings in Canada the Government intends before the next session of Parliament to make an inquiry with a view to the enactment of such legislation as may be deemed advisable in the public interest.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—VOUCHERS FOR OVERSEAS PAYMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JAMES ALEXANDER ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I desire to draw to the attention of the Acting Prime Minister the following entry on page 218 ZZ of the Auditor General's Report,

Overseas Department of Militia and Defence.

Expenditure by the Chief Paymaster on account of pay and other expenses of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, vouchers for which have not been received.	$119,546,597.93
Less refunds deposited to the credit of the Receiver General by the Chief Paymaster	4,165,354.22
	$115,381,243.71

This leaves a balance of $115,381,243.71 paid out for which vouchers have not been received. Since the publication of the Auditor General's Report, has the Government taken any steps to secure vouchers for this expenditure of $115,381,243.71 by the Paymaster of the Overseas Department of Militia and Defence, and may the House expect details of this expenditure, none of

which are given in the Auditor General's Report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The vouchers for the expenditure in question would be amongst the records of the Overseas Ministry of Militia. My hon. friend will recall that the Auditor General of Canada, the late Mr. Fraser, with the concurrence of the Government, visited London and spent some considerable time there, examining the audit system which was in effect. He returned, expressing himself as entirely satisfied, and since that date, the Auditor General's department has been in close touch with the Overseas Ministry. No question, therefore, arises as to audit. With regard to the publication of the items, I have not had notice until this moment of my hon. friend's question, and I shall be glad to make inquiry with a view to seeing what, if any, information of a detailed character is available here which might be brought down to the House. I shall endeavour to answer my hon. friend's question more fully when we have under consideration the War Appropriation Bill.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: While the Transatlantic mails are actually conveyed by steamer direct from Liverpool to Halifax with the soldiers, unfortunately, whilst the soldiers are landed at Halifax, the mails are taken off only at New York whither the steamers proceed from Halifax. A few days ago the Halifax Chronicle had this item:

> During the past few weeks the Adriatic, the Lapland, the Baltic, the Royal George, the Cedric and the Caronia, arrived at Halifax with Canadian troops and carrying the Canadian mails in every case. The mails, instead of being landed at Halifax, were carried on to New York. So far as the province of Nova Scotia was concerned, this involved a delay of from four to five days in the delivery of overseas mail, and in the case of the rest of Canada there was, of course, corresponding delay all around.

Would my hon. friend who represents the Postmaster General in this House kindly explain how it is that steamers which are subsidized for the very purpose of carrying Canadian mails ignore Canadian ports in this way and deliver the mail at American ports?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL (Acting Postmaster General): This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention. I shall make inquiries and be prepared to give my hon. friend an answer on Monday.

DISCHARGE OR LEAVE FOR SOLDIERS AT HALIFAX.

On the Orders of the Day:

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Yesterday the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Sinclair) asked a question regarding an item that had appeared in a Charlottetown paper advertising that Premier Arsenault would meet a delegation in connection with the release of certain soldiers from the Halifax district. I have received a telegram from Mr. Arsenault which I shall read in order to correct any mistaken impression that may have gone abroad:

> Reference Sinclair statement in the House, presume he referred to following advertisement in Patriot newspaper reading as follows: "Premier Arsenault will meet a delegation of farmers having sons in the military at Halifax and who desire to have them granted home leave or discharge, on Friday 25th inst. at 1.30 p.m., in the Y.M.C.A." Permit me to say that this advertisement was inserted without my knowledge or consent, and I have given no statement to newspapers or to any one else with reference to discharge of men. Kindly correct impression given by Mr. Sinclair. I am making a statement in the House here this morning.

I think it is only fair I should make this known.

THE MARKET FOR WHEAT.

RULING ON WHAT QUESTIONS MAY BE PUT ON CALLING THE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. I. E. PEDLOW (South Renfrew): I should like to read a letter I have received from a farmer in the riding of South Renfrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would certainly not be in order, at this stage, in reading such a letter. It would be in order, on calling on the Orders of the Day, for the hon. member to put a question to the Government with respect to a matter of extreme urgency. Let me say just here that I have noticed a growing tendency in the last few days to ask various questions on the Orders of the Day which properly ought to be put formally upon the Order Paper. In the nature of things, the Government cannot be expected to answer offhand questions of which no notice has been given. Every latitude will, of course, be afforded to hon. gentlemen in asking questions having to do with matters of policy or of great importance, in which the element of urgency is present; but questions of but ordinary importance should be put on the Order Paper, and in no instance

ought correspondence to be read. If the hon. member will summarize his question, if it is of sufficient importance, it may be put—but I hope it will come within the proper bounds.

Mr. PEDLOW: This is a question undoubtedly of great importance not only to the riding of South Renfrew but to the whole Dominion. It has to do with the sale of wheat. This farmer writes that he has on hand 500 bushels of wheat for which he cannot obtain a market in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: That, in my judgment, is not a question which should be asked upon the Orders of the Day. It should either be put on the Order Paper or be raised when the Estimates come up.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): I think the question is of great public interest. A price has been fixed for wheat, and here is a man who says that as he cannot sell the crop he raised last year, he does not know whether he will put in a crop this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the matter is of such urgency that injustice would be done by requiring this question to be placed on the Order Paper in the ordinary course. I think it is purely a local question, but if it has a wider aspect, the hon. gentleman may put it.

Mr. PEDLOW: The kernel of it is this: As this man is unable to dispose of his last year's crop, he has decided not to sow any wheat this year. He claims he has on hand 500 bushels of wheat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member put his question?

Mr. PEDLOW: The question this man asks is, where can he obtain a market for his wheat? The price of wheat has been fixed, I understand.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I concur in the view expressed by His Honour the Speaker, that it is very desirable hon. members should give the Government notice of questions of this character. However, it chances that I am able to answer the question. I may say to my hon. friend that although I have had to do with providing the finances, either directly or indirectly, connected with the crop movements of the last two years, this is the first instance that has been brought to my attention of any one being unable to sell wheat. The Government of Canada did give a guarantee to the banks and to the purchasers of wheat in order that the sale of last year's crop might be facilitated. My understanding with the Wheat Export Company of Canada which buys the exportable surplus of the crop of last year, is that our exportable surplus of wheat and flour will be purchased provided the Dominion Government is able to find the necessary credits. In order that my hon. friend may understand the magnitude of the undertaking of the Dominion Government in this regard, I may say to him that up to date the Government has paid out over $80,000,000 by way of advances to the Imperial Government for the purpose of facilitating the purchase of Canada's exportable surplus of wheat and flour of last year's crop and that within the last month we have undertaken to provide a sum which may aggregate $90,000,000 more for the purpose of taking care of the entire situation. My hon. friend asks where his constituent will find a market. Not knowing the local situation, I am unable to answer that question, but if the wheat is of the proper grade, it would seem to me that he should have no difficulty in finding a market. Beyond that I am unable to make a statement.

DATE OF THE BUDGET SPEECH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I should like to put a question to the Acting Prime Minister to which he may give a Yes or No answer. In view of the unrest which exists throughout the country, due to the high cost of living, no doubt, will the Acting Prime Minister state when he intends to deliver the Budget Speech?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, many novel suggestions are put forward in this House, but this is the first time I have heard it suggested that the unrest in the community was due to the non-delivery of the Budget Speech. I stated some time ago that, following the usual practice, I should be glad to give the House a week or ten days' notice of the date of the Budget Speech, which I hope will not be unduly delayed. I am not aware that public interests are in any way suffering through the Budget not having yet been brought down. To give my hon. friend as reasonable an answer as I can, my expectation is that the Budget may be expected about the middle of May.

INTERNED ALIENS IN CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): In view of certain correspondence I have received from interned civilians in Canada, who appear to be British subjects of German

origin, may I ask if the Government has reached any decision regarding the eventual deportation of these people? They naturally address themselves to me, because I have been an interned civilian in Germany. They claim to be British subjects.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): If there are interned civilians in Canada who are British subjects, I am not aware of it. I should not like to say, without investigation, that it may not be the fact in individual cases. As to deportation, the matter stands exactly where it stood when discussed in this House about two weeks ago. It is impossible to secure deportation now to any enemy country.

Mr. BELAND: Is it the intention of the Government eventually to deport all interned civilians of enemy origin?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The policy of the Government is set out in an Order in Council which has been laid on the Table—namely, to deport all who from any standpoint are undesirable. That applies, I think, to the great body of the present interned aliens.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 70, to incorporate the Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 20—extension of time for commencement and completion of lines of railway:

Mr. LEMIEUX: This is a very important clause and I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) if he has a statement showing how many lines, or portions of lines, are not yet constructed, what are their respective mileages and their approximate cost.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not a list of all the lines before me. There are a lot of them whose charters have been kept in existence but which will not be proceeded with. There has been some money—probably very little—expended upon them. It might only be the expenditure for surveying and so on. I thought it would be well, until we really understood the situation, to renew them all. They all belong to the Government now. The common stock is now all part of the Canadian National Railway system. It struck me that it would be no harm to renew them in this way for the present instead of coming to Parliament with a Bill to revive or extend every one of these charters. There are a large number of lines that have charters. There were two ways of doing this. We could have had a general clause such as we find in this Bill keeping these charters alive until we can take them up with the Railway Committee in the future. Or, we could have a schedule attached to the Bill giving a list of the charters that we were renewing by this clause. I had asked the solicitor of the company to give me a list of those lines that we are really doing work on and whose charters it is necessary to renew at once. We can do either one of these two things; that is renew all the charters, or just have a schedule attached and take those that we must have renewed this year. If we do that, of course, the others lapse and would have to be revived by Parliament at a future time. The list that the solicitor has prepared gives all that we will require to do any work on during the present year as far as he knows. The list is quite a long one. I can read it. If the Committee thinks it better to have a schedule attached to the Bill enumerating the companies, we, of course, can do that. I could not see any harm in simply renewing the charters that the Canadian Northern Railway Company has had for a number of years for the reason that they are now all owned by the Dominion Government and work under them cannot go on without the knowledge of Parliament. We must ask Parliament for the money to proceed with construction work. A list of the railways whose construction will be proceeded with will be given when the Estimate for that purpose is reached.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Is it the intention of the Government to complete this year the branch line from Oliver to St. Paul de Metis and the St. Guido line?

Mr. J. D. REID: The two lines that the hon. member asks about are two that we are renewing the charters for. We are proceeding with work on these two lines. As to the number of miles, or as to the completion of these lines this year, I could not give the hon. member an answer just at the moment, for the reason that I did not expect that a question of that kind would be asked on this Bill. When the Estimates are reached I will be glad to give the hon. member the details he asks for—as to whether we intend to complete the lines or how many miles we will construct.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The minister will recollect that one of the lines was provincially guaranteed, but the Canadian

Northern appropriated the money to other purposes than its construction. A large number of people have left the district through which the proposed line was projected, and the minister ought to be in a position to say whether it will be completed this year or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think the Minister of Railways is not giving this question the serious attention which he should. We are conferring large powers on this company, and the method of financing the affairs of the Canadian National Railway System is, in my judgment, rather lax. At all events, the company is made practically free of Parliamentary control, as was clearly established last evening in the remarks of both the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Therefore I think the country is entitled to know what line, or lines, the company intend to build, so that we may have some idea of the amount which will be involved in that construction. The Minister of Railways has a list, but he does not say if it is a list of all the companies which formerly belonged to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. J. D. REID: The list to which the hon. gentleman refers does not include, by a long way, the charters of all the companies that were obtained, and whose stock is held by, the Canadian Northern Railway Company. A large number of such charters were taken out, but allowed to expire on account of the war. If I were to change this clause in the manner proposed it would have to read something like this:—

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule of this Act, which certain of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

Then the schedule would only comprise the railways that we really are going to operate and which it is necessary to keep alive. If we were to do that we should have to leave out of consideration a large number of charters that really should form a part of the Government's system, but are not being proceeded with during the coming year, and would therefore lapse until again revived by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Railways should understand that there is such a tremendous expenditure involved in connection with the operation of this whole system that we must be very chary of the powers that we now propose to grant to this company, as regards the railways and the branch lines which formed part of the original Canadian Northern System. The least Parliament should exact from my hon. friend is a list of such railways and branch lines; and I think that in view of the novel institution that we are creating in this country a limit should be imposed upon the board of directors, at least for the next four or five years, so that they should not proceed immediately with the huge programme of construction originally proposed to be carried out by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Some of the branch lines, and possibly some of the sections of the main lines, should be completed, but in all these cases Parliament should be called upon to pronounce upon the policy of the company. I would not leave the company entirely free of control. We are giving sufficient powers to the company; we are practically surrendering all our rights to them, and we are handing to them one, and possibly two, transcontinental railways. Now, by means of this little clause the Minister of Railways will add enormously to the power to spend money which the board already possesses. That is why I say the branch lines, and the other subsidiary lines, of the Canadian Northern with the construction of which the Government intends to proceed, should be clearly set forth in the Bill. Otherwise we shall be entering upon a real carnival of expenditure which the country cannot afford. An hon. member (Mr. Richardson) spoke very disparagingly in a previous discussion of what Lord Shaughnessy, had said on this subject. Well, I am not by any means a corporation man, I am above all a Canadian, and I am afraid of the terrible burden that we are assuming at the present moment; and we must see to it, by a system of checks and safeguards, that the powers given to this board will not in the long run bring us to the verge of bankruptcy. I fear, from my reading of the provisions of this clause, that the board will feel that it is empowered to construct railways and branch lines right and left. This, of course, means that the Canadian people will have to pay the piper, and all that, mind you, Mr. Chairman, without the appropriations first coming before Parliament for sanction. If we give a blank collective charter to the board it may, by virtue of the powers conferred by Clause 17, undertake to build railways right and left. This is a serious danger and Parliament should guard against such a contingency. That is why I say to my hon. friend (Mr. J. D.

Reid) and I am in earnest, that he should state positively and explicitly what are the branch lines and subsidiary lines which this board, or the Government, intend to build, as well as the expenditure which that construction will involve. I notice by the morning papers that my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) intends to electrify part of the system of the Canadian Northern Railway. I do not wish to switch here on to the hydro question, which has of late set all Ontario aflame, but in that news we have an idea, or a hint, of what is in the mind of my hon. friend.

Mr. J. D. REID Oh, no, in the mind of Adam Beck.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, let us hear from my hon. friend on the subject. As for Sir Adam Beck, he is not afraid to express his views. It is strange, however, that such a prominent advocate of Government ownership as my friend should be so much opposed to Sir Adam Beck, who is supposed to be the pioneer and the leader of public ownership in the province of Ontario. Let me ask my hon. friend what he intends to do. Is it true that my hon. friend intends to electrify either the main line or the branch lines of the Canadian National system? And does he know what expenditure that will entail? The Government should give the Committee all the information it has on the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section under discussion merely provides for the extension of certain charters that are now owned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. It provides no power to build. The power to build would, of course, be controlled by the power to get the money to build, and that power is entirely in the hands of the Governor in Council, not in the hands of the company; the company cannot issue a bond without that authority, and consequently it cannot build.

Mr. CAHILL: Did you say the authority of the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Governor in Council must ratify the by-law which provides for the bond issue, but Parliament itself must give the initial authority; so that question really is not under review in this section at all. What the hon. gentleman specifically asks for is that instead of a general revival there should be a revival as to certain definite construction powers that have been granted. That request we can meet in full, and to meet it I move:

To strike out all the words after "construction" in the second line of clause 20 and replace them by the following:

"of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act which certain of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act."

The schedule which will be printed will give the lines. The work on some of those lines is under way now and will be gone on with this year, and Estimates for that purpose will be brought down. They are branch lines into districts that had been languishing for railways for some time before the war.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meighen moves to strike out clause 20 and replace—

Mr. McMASTER: Before that motion is put, Mr. Chairman, should not we have the schedule before us?

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to allow me to put the question; then it can be discussed:

Mr. Meighen moves:

To strike out all the words after "construction" in the second line of clause 20 and replace them by the following:

"of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act which certain of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act."

Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the amendment?

Mr. McMASTER: We all appreciate the desire of the minister to meet our reasonable views in connection with this clause, but should the amendment not stand until he brings down the schedule?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The schedule has been brought down.

Mr. J. D. REID: It was laid upon the Table with the amendment.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not know that.

Mr. BUREAU: These are companies which previously belonged to the Canadian Northern System, and which will now be under the Canadian National Railways. We know that some of those charters were very contentious, and were very fully discussed when extensions of time were asked for. I remember one of the rare occasions upon which I had to fight on the same side as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was in regard to the extension of a charter to the

Canadian Northern Railway—it had slipped from my memory entirely. The minister spoke of Sir Adam Beck; there was quite a lively fight and hon. members were intensely interested, so much so, that Sir Adam Beck wanted to exclude the people from Quebec from taking part in the deliberations of the committee. It is not right that we should pass en bloc the extension of charters to which some people may have objection. We force any other company to come before Parliament and give the people who may suffer from the extension a chance to discuss the matter before the Railway Committee, and they leave that committee to judge whether or not the reasons then advanced are sufficient to justify refusal of the extension asked for. I know I will be met with the answer that the Government had these railways loaded on to it; therefore, it has to protect itself. I am willing that the Government should protect itself to any reasonable extent, provided that it is not at the expense of other interests. But I repeat, it would not be fair to grant any private corporation, say the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, an extension of time on all charters which may have expired at the commencement of the war without knowing what those charters are. The members here do not know anything about the local conditions; there may be reasons existing in certain parts of the country that would justify our refusing any extension of these charters. For instance, there may be rival companies who would be ready and willing to undertake the work the same as in the case of—I forget for the moment a certain charter which had expired and the renewal of which was asked for at the time Sir Adam Beck opposed the Canadian Northern project. I do not believe it is fair to the country to grant an extension of time just by giving the names of a lot of railways the charters of which had expired because the works in some cases had not been commenced within the two years, and in other cases because the works having been commenced were not concluded within the five years. I think it would be fairer that those charters on which the work could not be prosecuted on account of the war should be granted an extension of four or five years in order that the work may be finished.

Mr. CAHILL: Go to the Railway Committee?

Mr. BUREAU: No, by this Act. When work has been commenced on any of these lines which are the property of the Canadian Northern, and which will become the property of this company when this Bill is enacted, and such work on account of the war had to be suspended, I do not see so much objection to an extension of time if the five years had expired; but I do take exception to the granting of two year extensions from the date of this Bill for the commencement of work under charters which had expired for the reasons I have just stated.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is the usual clause in the Railway Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I know; but under the Railway Act they have to give notice in the newspapers and in the official Gazette that they will come before the Railway Committee, and any person having any conflicting interest has a right to appear before the Railway Committee and argue his case. In the present instance we do not know what objections there may be to the extension of the time for the beginning of work under these charters. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways by citing the case where Sir Adam Beck opposed an extension of time brought to my attention the fight we had on that occasion. As I have said, I do not think it is fair to grant these extensions of time when interested persons have no opportunity of appearing before the Railway Committee or any other proper authority to state their objections.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the first place, the one specific instance the hon. member gives of a road in respect of which extension might be objected to is not included in the schedule. Those included in the schedule are all roads upon which work has already been done, except one, from Moosejaw to Chamberlain, which is the essential link in the line between Moosejaw and Calgary. Furthermore, all these lines in the schedule are west of Port Arthur. It is true that private companies have always had to go before the Railway Committee in order to get extensions, and certain objections have been raised from time to time which so far as my memory goes, have always been overruled. The objection invariably is that the company is seeking a charter, but not building the road. The ground of the objection is delay; it is asserted, perhaps, that the company applying for the charter is trying to forestall another line and is really not itself going on with the construction. No such objection could be urged here. The lines selected are those the construction of which it is least possible to defer. The districts affected have been without railways for years, and a serious

responsibility would rest upon any member of the committee who, if the labour, material, and money can be provided, would oppose such extensions or do anything to delay further the laying out of these lines. But even if one did object, he would have ample opportunity to state his views when the vote was before Parliament. This is merely keeping alive the opportunity for the Canadian National Railway Company to build the lines in question, the money being voted for the purpose.

Mr. NESBITT: Will any of these lines be duplications of the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. McMASTER: Forty-four branch lines are named in the schedule. If you give to the Canadian National Railway Company the right to build, say, into a district where there is a coal mine, would that be interfering with the building of a railway by those coal interests, whose business interest it would be to develop railway communication in that part of the country long before the Government might be able to find the money to construct the line?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The practice is for the coal people to go to the company to build the lines. But the primary object is to extend these lines not to coal mines, but to farmers. In every instance it is the farmers who want the roads.

Mr. CAHILL: I have not yet heard the objection to having these applications for extensions heard before the Railway Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am at a loss to know why we should go to the Railway Committee to renew charters that are virtually our own. Charters go before the Railway Committee in order that discussion may take place as to whether or not the company really intends to build. We know the intention to build in this case.

Mr. CAHILL: Are these forty-four lines to be built this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The intention is to do some work on all forty-four lines.

Mr. CAHILL: Then we should at least know where these lines are, why they are necessary, what is the mileage involved and how much their construction will cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say as to the mileage intended. On a few of the lines no work might be done, but it is hoped that some work will be done on all.

Mr. CAHILL: Why not go to the Railway Committee where we may have a map before us and have somebody there to answer questions and to explain why these extensions are asked for? If the Canadian Pacific Railway are ready to build in the same territory, Parliament might rather have the Canadian Pacific Railway build than the Canadian National Railway Company. Why should we not do this thing in the regular way, instead of gobbling up forty-four lines to-day and probably another hundred to-morrow?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is a little out in facts and altogether out in principle. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company does not have to come to the Railway Committee in respect of the construction of lines running from the main line. The time to decide in respect of what lines money should be advanced to assist in construction will be when we are in committee on the Estimates. I will try to improve on the clearness of my language, and then I would rather not be told that I have not answered my hon. friend's objection. The only reason for going to the Railway Committee in a case of this kind is to decide the bona fides of the intention to build the line. We surely would not contemplate allowing another company to come in where we have a charter and intend to build, and say: We want that charter, because you do not intend to build. It would seem to me to be an utter anomaly to go to the Railway Committee. If we intend to apply for the charter, surely that is enough; what would there be for the Railway Committee to consider? If Parliament did not wish to build the line, the matter could be discussed when all the Estimates in respect of the lines that it is proposed to go on with are laid before the committee.

4 p.m.

Mr. CAHILL: Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway being ready to build a line into a territory included in these forty-four charters, said to the Railway Committee: This charter has expired, and we do not want you to grant an extension of time that would prevent us from getting a charter for the construction of a line in that territory. Would it not be reasonable for the committee to decide what company they wanted to build the line—the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk, perhaps some American company like the Great Northern, or the Canadian National Railway Company? I cannot see any objection to going to the Railway Committee.

Mr. BUREAU: Are all the railways enumerated in schedule No. 1—

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are not railways; they are construction powers as to branches.

Mr. BUREAU: Are they not railways? They are incorporated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are not railways themselves; that is to say, they are not companies. They are construction powers or charters taken out by the companies included in schedule 1.

Mr. BUREAU: They are not lines of railways. The second schedule says "The lines of railway," and the minister says that they are not lines of railway. The second schedule says "The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Western railway was authorized to construct," and then come the lines of railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: That is what I say. Are the lines of railway enumerated in this list the railways which are being transferred to the Canadian Government railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a difference between a line of railway and a railway company. The list given in schedule 1 are companies, constituting at present the Canadian Northern system, that are being transferred to the Canadian National railways. Those companies took out charters or construction powers to construct lines, and the lines they took out charters for are mentioned in schedule 2 which the hon. gentleman holds in his hand.

Mr. BUREAU: Where did they get their powers? I see some of them got their powers from provincial legislatures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is specified in each case.

Mr. BUREAU: Then they do not yet form part of the Canadian Northern railway system?

Mr. KEEFER: Is not the difficulty easily overcome? The Canadian Northern Railway Company have several charters for roads in the West. Some of those roads have been completed, some of them are partially built and some of them are probably yet to be built. The Canadian Government has taken over all the assets of the Canadian Northern railway system. Part of those assets are those unfinished, perhaps untouched roads.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says we have only the stock; we have no assets and we are not responsible for liabilities.

Mr. KEEFER: It will be for the executive management or the board of directors to decide whether those roads will be built or not. If it is not a paying proposition to build those lines or extensions, they will not be built. If they have to be completed or entirely built, we have to come to Parliament for the money, and then will be the time to attack them.

Mr. BUREAU: No, the consideration of Estimates is a bad time to discuss those matters. When I raised my objection that, of those lines, the schedule of which is laid on the Table, one alone had not been commenced, and the others, 41 in number, had work done on them, the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) said just now that all the Bill provides for at present is an extension of five years to finish the work, and only in one case is there an extension of two years to begin the work asked for. Is that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information was that, of this list of lines, there was just one upon which no work at all was done, and for which an extension of time to commence and conclude had been asked for. My informant tells me now he may not be quite correct in that. In the great majority, in all, perhaps, but three or four work has been done.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not object so much to the extension of five years as I do to the extension of two years. The Acting Minister of Justice says that we can discuss that on the Estimates. He knows that cannot be done on Estimates the same as it can be done when a Bill is going through the various stages in the House. The minister cannot deny that when Estimates are being discussed, unless a very broad question is involved, the discussion is more of a parochial nature, every member being naturally interested in the particular matter that touches his part of the country. I seriously object to the extension of two years, and I would ask the minister to specify the companies for which he is asking an extension of time to begin operation. When operations have commenced, neither the railway nor the public is in the same position. The public cannot, through Parliament, have the work stopped. When, however, a company have not actually begun the work of construction, we can bring them before Parliament to make sure they are going to build. The big-

gest fights that take place before the Railway Committee are with regard to opposing the renewal of charters, when people doubted that the companies were in a position to carry on the construction, but often there are objections of an entirely different character, and I do not think the Government should take advantage of its present position to revive charters without going before the Railway Committee, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), and giving parties interested an opportunity to present their cases.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I understood the minister to say there was no objection to the section being passed because members would have an opportunity on the Estimates to object to anything in a charter which is being renewed by this section.

Mr. BUREAU: Not to the charter. All you can do is to object to the money being voted.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: When the Estimates are brought down for the purpose of appropriating money for the construction of a line mentioned in schedule 2, can we ask for an amendment of a charter which is renewed by this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One could not, on the Estimates, add anything to the powers contained in the charter.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I wish to make my point clear. In schedule 2, there is a proposed line from Bandeheim to Vermilion in Alberta. Personally, I object to the construction of that line as outlined in the schedule. Instead of the line going as far as Vermilion, I would like it to pass a little eastward of that town, and I would like to have an opportunity of stating my case when that line is proposed to be constructed. If this section goes through, the only remedy I have is to object to the money being voted. I understand there are forty-two cases of this nature, and I am not prepared to say whether or not every member of this House might have a similar objection to take to the building of one or another of those lines.

Mr. DEVLIN Now is the only time to discuss that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Wright knows better than that. What the hon. member (Mr. H. A. Mackie) is asking for is this: He says the charter for a certain line running as far as Vermilion does not suit him, in that it does not run far enough.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It should not touch Vermilion at all; it should go to the eastward of that town.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The charter would permit of a variation only of a mile. That possibly would not meet the objection?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Consequently, the charter, for the renewal of which provision is made in this section, is not the charter the hon. member would like to see go through. Another charter would have to be taken out for the line the hon. member wants built.

Mr. DEVLIN: The hon. member objects to the charter that is at present granted, and he wants an opportunity of stating his reasons for objecting to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has a perfect right to object to any charter or to the renewal of any charter if he wishes to take the responsibility.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The minister is simply side-tracking my point. It is not a question whether the line goes one mile east of Vermilion or not. Supposing it is a question of five miles east of Vermilion, am I justified in coming to this Parliament to ask for another charter for a line duplicating this one?

I am sure the House would not listen to me. It might not be material to Vermilion to have the line run there, but it might be very material to Vermilion to have the railway four or five miles east of there, and one charter would suit the purposes of the whole community. The minister says I can ask for another charter, but the Government would never grant it. It would be duplicating lines only three or four miles apart.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, it is quite open to the hon. gentleman to oppose the extension of this charter.

Mr. McKENZIE: This question brings us back to the difficulties involved in multiplying authority. By this legislation and the general Railway Act, we are conferring powers on a body of men, called the directors, to build railways. The point of my hon. friend (Mr. H. A. Mackie) is pertinent. Why should we encumber this new company that we are creating by any decisions, and possibly wrong decisions, that were made by Mackenzie and Mann? We are starting a new company, which will open up largely a new country. Why should we not give them a free hand to build in

such places and to such an extent as they see fit, in view of the circumstances of the country and the prospects they have in mind? Instead of giving them a free hand to build as their own judgment may direct, we are placing forty-two old charters in their hands, and saying: "I do not care what you think. Mackenzie and Mann decided some ten or twelve or fifteen years ago to build in certain places. Here are their plans and specifications and charter, and you must build there or not at all." Is not that the position we are putting this new company in? The proper course, to my mind, is this: Every one of those old charters should be wiped out. If the new company decides it is necessary to build roads in certain places, let them do it, but I cannot understand why we should undertake all the promises that Mackenzie and Mann made. I am told that they went through certain municipalities and got concessions and bonds from them on the promise that they would build certain roads. Mackenzie and Mann got the money, but did not build the roads. Why should we be bound by their promises? I do not think that we should be. I do not want in the slightest way to handicap or trammel this new company; I want it to have all the talent we can put into it; I do not want to bind it down to any old charters or any old bargains. I understand that all the powers that could conceivably be required for the building of railways are found in this Act and in the general Railway Act—if I am wrong in that, I should like to be enlightened. I say there is no necessity for these old charters at all. If these old companies have any property or have acquired any rights, I would certainly be in favour of assigning those rights to this new company, and let the new company have full control with respect to them. We have a Government-owned road already, without assuming the obligations of all these companies. I should like the Acting Minister of Justice to enlighten me why it is necessary to perpetuate these companies. Why should we pay from the Exchequer of this country a large amount of money in taxes on the properties we are creating under fictitious names—because fictitious names they are; the property will not belong to the company, but to the Government, and the law of the land is that the property of the Government does not pay taxes—why should we pay out millions of dollars all over the country which there is no necessity for us to pay, and especially now, when we should look at every dollar of our money?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

I am in favour of putting all the powers conferred on these forty-two different companies in one charter. That would simplify matters, and then when a question was asked in the House we should have only one company to deal with, instead of forty or more different concerns. It would be extremely difficult for any one to get into his head the relationship and co-operation of the forty different companies. There should be only one company, both for the sake of unity and efficiency, and I should like the minister to explain why he thinks it necessary to continue these separate companies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have tried very hard to understand the contention of the leader of the Opposition. The first thing that struck me to-day was how diametrically he was opposed to the criticism offered by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. That hon. member was appalled at the freedom this clause gave to the company; his leader complains that we are not giving them freedom enough, that we are attempting to make them construct roads on old charters. Both complaints, although diametrically opposed, are equally wrong. We are in no way seeking to impose any obligations on the company; we are simply ratifying charters of companies belonging to the Canadian National railways, which that directorate now runs; the charters must be revived or the roads could not be constructed if construction was desired. The revival of these charters is necessary before we would be in a position to recommend to Parliament an estimate to enable the company to construct. My hon. friend also desires the elimination of these separate companies, whether named in schedule 2, as some may be, or in Schedule 1, as the original constituent companies of the system. I have already assured him, and I repeat the assurance, that the intention is to amalgamate with the parent concern, the Canadian National railways, every one of these companies just as soon as the outstanding stock is got rid of. All these companies can be got rid of at once, except where there is outstanding stock not held by us, and, of course, the American lines.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think my learned and hon. friend so easily disposes of my objection. It is one thing for the Government, or the Minister of Railways, to approve the plans of a company when the company is putting up the money, taking the responsibility of building the road and financing it. It is another thing for the Government itself, or the Minister of

Railways acting for the Government, to approve a plan where they have to advance the money and where they have to take the responsibility of the venture upon which they are launching. That is a different thing altogether. These charters which we are asked to revive are charters from this House, some of them, some from other legislatures, to build roads in a certain way and at certain places. They have made their plans, I presume and laid them before the Department of Railways and received the approval of the department for forty or fifty of them. The minister tells us that it is the intention to do some work on every one of them this year but this new company that we are creating now has no choice at all as to whether these roads are to be built, where they shall be placed or to what extent they shall go. The plans are laid down, they have received the approval of the Government and they must be built in accordance with them. What I wanted to say to the minister was that I want this new company when it is starting out to handle the people's money, to have an absolutely free hand as to where these roads shall be built. When the minister puts a charter in the hands of this company, it is merely a construction company in that regard because its powers are confined within the charter that is handed over to it. They must confine themselves to the powers contained in the charter under which they are working and these are the powers that we are reviving. This is imposing a burden upon this new company, which, if they had a free hand, they never would undertake. The minister tells us that they have to take them holus bolus, forty-five or fifty of them, on which Mackenzie and Mann are making promises for the last twenty years and we are to furnish the money whether it is good business or otherwise to go on with these works. We are creating this company to build and to operate these roads and therefore they should have a free hand and should not be encumbered by the thoughts and schemes of other people for whose thoughts and schemes they are not responsible; nor is this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's speech, while he puts his position a little more clearly, is encumbered by the very same inconsistency as his last speech. He says this is a new company, and that it is not building with its own money and its own resources, but it is building with the money and resources of the country. Therefore, he says, the same rule does not apply, and from that he proceeds to argue that we should not impose upon them any special conditions of construction, but that they should have a free hand. It would appear to me that the application would be the other way. We should have some control. There should not be any imposition. There is none. But this company themselves desire the construction of all the lines included in the schedule. Indeed, they would like to construct more. Over that there must be some control exercised by this Parliament of the recommendation of the Governor in Council. There should be that control exercised as expressed in the Appropriation Act or in the Estimates. The company desires the construction of these lines. It is hoped that something may be done on nearly all of them. There may be some on which it may be impossible to do any construction, but for safety's sake it is well to include them in case it will be possible to build them all. But the company desire the construction of these roads because the people demand them. The people in many other localities want construction done there too, but this is the outside list of those we think it would be possible to do any work upon and this is to be done by the company subject to supervision by the Governor in Council and by this House.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does the minister mean by giving us the thoughts of the company? We are creating the company. It is not in existence yet. This Act is about to bring some entity into being which shall be the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: When the time comes that we shall have created the company by this Act the minister with his predestinate, his far-conceiving mind, tells us what this company will be thinking about.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was thinking about the present directorate.

Mr. McKENZIE: They are not the company. I have a little keenness of mind, I have been under the tutorship of the minister for a good many years, and when he talks about a company that is not in existence, I feel that we have a right, particularly when we are dealing with a hair-splitter like the Minister of the Interior, to know what he means.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The unusual thing about a proposal such as this is that we are asked to revive charters granted

by the legislature of Alberta and Saskatchewan and not by this Parliament. That is another reason why the proposal of my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) ought to be accepted because these charters have never been before this Parliament. There may be a question as to our competence to revive a defunct charter granted by the legislature of Alberta or Saskatchewan. I question if such a proposal was ever made in the Canadian Parliament before. The minister has not given us very much information. We have been discussing this section now for a long time and we have reached the point of being told that it is proposed to build forty-two railways. We do not know the length of them or their cost. These are essential things. We know that one of these railways is 150 miles in length. The length of the others is not mentioned at all, but if they are 100 miles in length on the average, that means 4,200 miles of railway. If these railways cost $70,000 a mile, that means an expenditure of about $300,000,000. I want to enter a protest against the proposal to spend $300,000,000 more in Western Canada in railway building without any provision being made for building branch lines in Eastern Canada. It is a preposterous proposal to ask Parliament to give a blank charter of this sort to expend $300,000,000. We do not know where these railways are, we do not know their length, we do not know anything about them except that there are forty-two of them. If the minister cannot give us definite information he should not expect this section to be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid that I shall have to say to the hon. gentleman first of all that all of his assertions are wrong from the commencement of his speech to the end. In the first place we are not giving any blank authority to spend a dollar by this Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: You are paving the way for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are paving the way in this sense, that we have no powers under which to build unless these charters are renewed. We are enabling Parliament later on to say so if Parliament believes that these lines are necessary and if it desires to build them as being necessary. What objection can there be to enabling Parliament, if it sees fit, to build such lines as it thinks are necessary? The next statement the hon. gentleman made was that we did not know what lines they were or where they were.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

We know all that from the schedule. We do not know the amount of railway line to be built, but we are not asking for authority to build now, we are simply asking to enable Parliament afterwards to assist in building it. When that time comes all the information will be given that will enable Parliament to come to a conclusion. All we have to conclude now is whether to renew the charters or not. If there is any particular objection to the renewal of any specific charter, this is the time to object.

There is one thing I also wish to say to the Committee. As respects some of these lines the provincial Governments have guaranteed the bonds. Indeed, in certain cases the bonds have already been sold, and the money lies in the hands of the provincial treasurer to be paid out as construction advances. The charters must be renewed, and the lines gone on with, in order that the money which lies there for that purpose only, can be used.

Mr. VIEN: Has the minister a list of those charters which are in abeyance until the lines are constructed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could by occupying some time give the list referred to by the hon. gentleman. But as to the others, the necessity for the renewal of the charter is absolutely just as clear as in this case, so there is no reason for distinguishing either for the purpose of this section or for the purposes of this entire Blll. There may be such reasons for the purpose of the vote when Parliament is actually deciding whether we should assist the building of the line or not.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am glad to have heard the minister say that this is the time to discuss any proposed charter, because a few moments ago when the hon. member (Mr. Mackie) suggested discussing a certain charter the minister stated that the present was not the time for that, but rather when the Estimates were under consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not. I said it was the time to discuss whether the charter should be renewed or not, but it was not the time to discuss whether the renewal of a charter applicable to some other place should be taken up.

Mr. DEVLIN: As I understood the hon. member (Mr. Mackie) was offering objections to a certain charter that had been granted, and was proceeding to criticise it when the minister said to him in very clear and distinct language—in language that I

could quite understand without any difficulty—that the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity to discuss the charter when the Estimates were being considered.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Or that there could be a new charter.

Mr. BUREAU: You have got to be careful otherwise there will be a paralleling of the line of railway.

Mr. DEVLIN: In a moment or two the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackie) will have an opportunity of discussing that phase of the question in which he is more particularly interested. In the meantime I want to draw attention to one or two other questions which, if ventilated, it seems to me, will help to obviate a good deal of the discussion upon this clause. The hon. member (Mr. Keefer) stated that we owned the constructive rights spoken of a few months ago by the Acting Minister of Justice. On the other hand the latter gentleman said that we do not own them, but we "virtually" own them. I wish to ask the Acting Minister of Justice, as he is in an enlightening mood, to tell the House exactly what the country has purchased from the Canadian Northern Railway Company. We have had statements made by the Acting Prime Minister in the past, but we never could really understand, and we do not understand to-day, just what properties the Government have acquired from the Canadian Northern. We know that they have acquired the common stock of the company. We are told to-day by one hon. member well versed in the subject that we own certain lines of railway and the constructive rights that go with those lines. Again we hear the Acting Minister of Justice say: No, we only virtually own these constructive rights. The word "virtually" caught my ear, and that word does not convey to those of us who perhaps do not understand the fine language of the Acting Minister of Justice whether we have both hands, or only one hand, upon these lines. Perhaps if the Acting Minister of Justice cannot do it, the Minister of Railways will tell us just what we own and what we do not own. Do we own simply the lines of railway spoken of in the schedule to this Bill, along with the constructive rights, comprised in the list that has been laid upon the Table? Because the Acting Minister of Justice would not allow a list of constructive rights to be placed upon the Table and lead us to believe that we own them, if we were not the owners, although he did tell us that we only virtually owned them. I know that the hon. member (Mr. Keefer) would not lead the Committee to believe, and I take it he is one of the most enlightened lawyers upon this subject in the House—

Mr. MORPHY: I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman is discussing the clause now under consideration.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the hon. member please state his point of order?

Mr. MORPHY: Certainly. We are now dealing with the commencement and completion of lines of railway comprised in the Canadian Northern system. The hon. gentleman is asking for a list of what we own. That has nothing to do with the construction of lines of railway.

Mr. DEVLIN: The hon. member cannot understand that the words contained in the clause have a direct bearing upon the question I was discussing?

Mr. MORPHY: No.

Mr. DEVLIN: We have been discussing the matter for the last half hour, so the hon. member must just have awakened.

Mr. BUREAU: He is looking at the stars.

Mr. DEVLIN: I hope that the Acting Minister of Justice will not beat about the bush, but will give us a straight and direct answer—we who represent the people and want to know what we are paying for—and that he will tell us exactly what we have bought. The minister said a few moments ago that the Government intend to build at least a portion of the roads enumerated in the schedule attached to this Bill, or at least that work would be done upon most of those roads.

Mr. BUREAU: Forty-four in number.

Mr. DEVLIN: I presume the construction rights relate to at least thirty to thirty-six out of the forty-two or forty-four enumerated. Now, upon which of these roads will the Government do work, and what will the expenditure be? Will the minister also enlighten the House as to the Government's power to go on and carry out these works when they intend to create, and are creating by this Bill, a company which will have absolute control of the construction and operation of the Government roads, and of all roads necessary to complete the system contemplated under this Bill? How will the Government go on with that building? Will they dictate to the company what roads they are to build? I trust that the minister will be in a position to enlighten the House to that extent and then we shall make

greater progress with the consideration of this clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has succeeded in the very ingenious art of confusing the issue. He first asks what the Government have bought. As the hon. gentleman voted on the question one would have thought he already understood what we have bought. We bought the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. DEVLIN: The common stock, which is worth nothing.

Mr. BUREAU: We paid ten millions for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As soon as this very interesting interlude is over I will proceed with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The ownership of the common stock, which is now entirely owned by the Government, subject to transfer of some which is pledged and still not paid for by us, means the ownership of the whole Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. BUREAU: It means control?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman already understands just as well as I can ever make him understand, and he understood before he asked me. Among the assets of the company whose stocks we own are the construction rights or charters enumerated in Schedule 2. The hon. member says that I told the Committee we are going to build. If I used the term "we," the more accurate term would be "Canadian National Railways," which of course he must have understood, because I have a high appreciation of his intelligence. The Government will not directly build any roads of the Canadian National railways.

Mr. BUREAU: Only indirectly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Canadian National railways will build their own roads; but inasmuch as assistance will in all probability be necessary, the Government must exercise supervision as to what is ventured upon in the way of construction by the company. Upon the company's recommendation it is intended to include in the renewal of charters all those contained in Schedule 2, because it is hoped that under most of them at all events some work can be done this year, and what cannot be done this year it is hoped will be done next year and then continued. I think with my limited capacity of language I have expressed as clearly as I possibly can what is intended.

Mr. BUREAU: Not so much humility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the use of the word "virtually" I really thought it was very appropriate, but with the hon. members' permission I will change it to "virtuous."

Mr. BUREAU: Change it to "scandalously."

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Will the minister allow the clause to stand in order to give us time to study Schedule No. 2?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The schedule is considered after the last clause, so it can be amended then if necessary.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BUREAU: No. The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Western railway was authorized to construct I suppose are under its control and are owned by it the same as the Canadian Government owns the Canadian Northern?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They own the powers contained in the charters.

Mr. BUREAU: Therefore the incorporators were the Canadian Northern Western Railway Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose so.

Mr. BUREAU: Will they form part of the system that is now being consolidated since the Canadian Northern Western Company is one of the constituent companies enumerated?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: These powers of the Canadian Northern Western Railway Company —which I suppose has a federal charter and is for the general advantage of Canada—are granted by the various legislatures?

Mr. J. D. REID: And declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: The legislatures cannot declare them to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did so in 1914.

Mr. BUREAU: All these lines?

Mr. J. D. REID: The charter which the hon. member mentions was a provincial charter, but in 1914 the undertaking was declared by this Parliament to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: At the time the stock was being acquired by the Federal Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, at the time the Bill went through.

Mr. BUREAU: These charters are actually part of the Canadian Government railways.

Mr. J. D. REID: Of course they are.

Mr. BUREAU: And these powers which they are now exercising are derived from the legislatures of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and some, I see, by the heading are derived from this very Parliament. Now, Mr. Chairman, as has been submitted by the hon. member for Edmonton, forty-four lines are enumerated here, there is one copy of the schedule in circulation among hon. members, and yet the minister expects us to discuss the various clauses of the Bill, and at the same time become conversant with the details of this schedule, which is practically impossible. If the hon. gentleman wishes the matter to be understood by us as well as he understands it, he must give us the same opportunity to get posted. Of course we are all aware that anything pertaining to the Canadian Northern Railway system has been the subject of special and profound study on the part of the Acting Minister of Justice, but it has not been so with us. Therefore I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton is a reasonable one, and that consideration of the second schedule ought not to take place until we have had time to study it.

The CHAIRMAN: I beg to call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the second schedule cannot be adopted at present, for according to the rules all the clauses of the Bill must first be considered, and the first schedule must be adopted before we can adopt the second schedule. We are now discussing clause 20, and the second schedule will be discussed when the clauses of the Bill have been disposed of.

Mr. BUREAU: I have always understood, Mr. Chairman, that a schedule attached to any contract formed part of it, and that when a schedule is attached to one section of a Bill it ought to form part of that section, and ought to be discussed at the same time if it is to be discussed intelligently. If the rule of the House is that any reference to a schedule in one section precludes discussion of it until the Bill has been disposed of, that means a very naked discussion and I would suggest that we form a committee to amend that rule at once.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chair was not that the schedule could not be discussed; the ruling was that the schedule could not be adopted until the Bill had been fully discussed and the other clauses adopted. May, at page 375 says:

> All the clauses of the Bill are considered before any new clauses are brought up and added to the Bill. . . . . Schedules to a Bill are considered after new clauses are disposed of. . . . . When the schedules have been considered, new schedules are offered.

Bourinot at page 522 says:

> The schedules are the parts of the Bill last considered.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not dispute that. I do not care when it is adopted, whether now, to-morrow, or Monday, but I say you cannot discuss section 20 without looking at the charters and knowing what we are dealing with. May says just what I wanted him to say, that we can consider the schedule at the same time as we consider the provisions of the law.

The CHAIRMAN: He does not say so. He says they shall be offered after.

Mr. BUREAU: We do not want the adoption now; it is just the consideration we are after. We are discussing the various items contained in schedule 2. I was proceeding to say that this is a long schedule with forty-four lines of railway enumerated. We have only one copy of it, and my hon. friend from Edmonton has requested that we postpone consideration of the second schedule until we know exactly what it is. We may agree to the renewal of the charters, except as to certain lines here as stated by him. The Acting Minister of Justice remarked just now that if the line as proposed did not suit the hon. member for Edmonton he would have to get a new charter. If so, that is a reason why the extension of this charter should not be granted. If the charter now does not suit the people to be served by the line, and they want another one a few miles south, east, north, or west, that is a reason why you should not duplicate, and if the other line would better serve the purposes of the people it would be preferable to have a new charter and not renew the old one. That is an argument in favour of not being in too great a hurry to grant wholesale extensions.

We control these railways, but we do not absolutely own them, because there is stock outstanding and the owners of that stock have a say in the administration of the

affairs of the railways. The minister says that moneys have been voted by the Provincial Legislatures in connection with these lines and that bonds have been sold the proceeds of which are to be used in their construction. I had thought that one reason why the Canadian Northern Railway system was taken over was to relieve the Provincial Legislatures from the burdens which they assumed when they granted advances or aid to that system, and to pay the bonds and the interest on the bonds which had been negotiated and guaranteed by the provinces. That the Government should now ask for aid from the provinces is not—shall I say "dignified"?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Proper.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I want a word between the two. We are saying to the provinces: We will build your roads; we will build houses for your people; we will aid your agriculture; we will give you money galore; but when it comes to such a vital matter as the construction of railways we ask you to put up your bonds, sell them and give us the money. I do not think that is sound logic. Let us hold back on the roads and let the provinces do their work. Some of these roads are in Saskatchewan. Last year twenty-five or thirty millions were loaned to Saskatchewan or Alberta; and I certainly object to the Dominion Government now asking the provinces for aid in connection with lines of railway that we intend to build.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's indignation again is wasted.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not indignation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government has not asked and does not intend to ask Provincial Governments for assistance in respect of the building of lines of railway or assistance to the Canadian National railways. But before we had anything to do with it, the Governments of the provinces guaranteed bonds for railway extensions. In some cases the bonds have been sold; the moneys are in the bank, and cannot be used for any purpose except construction. What is to be done? The Government cannot pass an Act and use the money for any other purpose. The only thing to do is to go ahead and construct, and that is what we intend to do.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Will the minister state one case in which there is money in a bank in Alberta for the construction of railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Edmonton and Calgary-Lethbridge line; there are others as well.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Not the Oliver, St. Paul and Metis? The Canadian Northern Railway got their money in that case, which is a refutation of the statement of the minister that when money is paid into a bank for the construction of a particular line it must be used only for that purpose. In the case of the Oliver, St. Paul and Metis Railway the bonds were guaranteed by the province; the money was secured and paid into the bank and Mackenzie and Mann used it for their purposes. The Government is now making an appropriation in the Estimates for the purpose of building that line. Since 1909 the people of the district affected have not been served by a railway. So that it is not always true, no matter what may be the law on the subject, that Mackenzie and Mann caused to be used for the construction of a line, money that had been deposited in the bank for that purpose. What kind of country is traversed by the lines mentioned in schedule No. 2? What is the extent of the population affected or served, and, generally, what are the advantages of the construction of the proposed lines represented by these forty-two charters? If the minister will give me that information, it will avoid my studying the schedule quite considerably.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might avoid the necessity of the hon. gentleman doing a little work, but it would impose the same work on me. When we are only getting in such a position that we can later on decide what to do, surely it is not necessary to describe the character of the land and the population along each proposed line. The necessity is not before us at the present time; when we commit ourselves to capital investment in the matter, then that will be a proper question. The hon. gentleman, being a western man, can arrive at a pretty intelligent idea by studying the schedule, but the information is not at all requisite to the consideration of this clause.

5 p.m.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The minister characterizes members of the Opposition as obtuse; I may belong to the same category. I understood the minister to say that if clause 20 goes through now I cannot at some future time, when the Estimates are under consideration, ask that the charters be amended or that the location of any of these lines be changed, and that as a private member I would not be able to introduce a new Bill, and so I would be entirely dependent on a member of the Government for a remedy to my constituents

or to my province. If I am not very obtuse, it seems to me that unless I can make my objections now on the schedule I shall have no remedy except that of asking for a new charter, and if I ask for a new charter which parallels lines or serves a country partly populated or is subject to certain disadvantages from a railway standpoint, then the Government would naturally not grant my request. I note that the minister has beside him Mr. Ruel, who must be familiar with all these lines, as he was solicitor for Mackenzie and Mann at one time. Perhaps he could give us the information we require as to the nature of the country through which these proposed lines run. I do not know why the minister is not in possession of these facts. Only forty-four charters are to be reviewed; the minister should have these things on his finger-tips.

Mr. EULER: I think there is good reason why each of these charters should be reviewed separately. The ideals of private ownership are not always the same as those of public ownership. These charters have been granted at the request of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, which, after all, had for its prime object its own advantage. Now the system passes to the possession of the public, and the prime object of public ownership is not the enrichment or the advantage of private individuals, but public service.

That being the case, in each instance in the issuing of these forty-two or forty-four charters, the lines of railway were perhaps located according to the private interests of the company that then owned them. Many interests might enter into the location, such as possibly the question of real estate and other matters which I cannot, having no knowledge of that, particularize. The location, however, of those lines may presumably have been made more with the idea of advantage to private persons than of service to the public. That is now all supposed to be changed, and as these charters have become the property of the people, it might be desirable to make some changes in the location of the roads. That has already been shown in one case by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie), and the same thing may be true in the case of many others of these roads. If this blanket power is given just by this one section to all these roads to extend their charters, there is no power in the future to make any change in the location of the roads. While it is true, as the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) stated, that complaints may be made when the Government asks Parliament for money to build a road, as the hon. member for East Edmonton stated no alteration whatever can at that time be made in the location of the road. That is my reason for saying that if people in any district desire that changes should be made in any of these projected roads, they should have an opportunity of being heard, and the changes, if approved, should be made. Therefore, every one of these charters, before they are renewed, should be considered separately, possibly before the Railway Committee, as has been suggested by other hon. members. I do not believe we can depend upon the men who are now in charge of the system to make any great variation, because nearly one-half of them are the same men who formerly were in control or in the employ of the Canadian Northern railway. When I say that, I have no reflections to make upon them, but I do not believe the mere fact that they have been taken from the management of a private road to the management of a Government road has necessarily changed their ideas very much as to what constitutes services to the public.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These charters have their routes all passed upon by the directorate, which directorate is not the old one at all, as the hon. gentleman, as a member of Parliament, knows, or ought to know. Only two out of the eleven were members of the old directorate; nine of the eleven are new. The charters have been renewed on behalf of the Government, and the Government agrees with the directorate that it would be wise to renew them. If any hon. member desires to move that any one of these charters be not renewed he is quite at liberty to do so.

Mr. EULER: Might not the people of the districts concerned wish to have some voice as to the location of the various roads and if we pass this section now they will have no opportunity whatever of making themselves heard? If each charter has to be considered separately in the Railway Committee, or some other committee of this Parliament, these people would have an opportunity of letting us know their ideas in connection with it. After all, public ownership means the service of the people. The minister's statement, that on the directorate of the Canadian National railways there are only two men of the old directorate, may be true in one sense, but I have just scanned the list of the new management,

and on that list there are at least ten gentlemen who were, if not on the old directorate of the Canadian Northern, at least in the employ of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The challenge of the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) only shows that this schedule added to the Bill is nothing other than a small, petty, picayune, political trap. This schedule reminds me of those lists of railway subsidies which before a general election, are usually put into the Estimates, many of which railways never see the light of day except on paper. Who will really believe that the Government will ever have money available to implement the Canadian Northern railway system by the construction of these forty-four lines? The country would be in the hands of a receiver if it was ever attempted to fulfil this blanket promise which, I notice, is made chiefly to western constituencies. Scanning the list of these problematical railways, I notice that the schedule published will include railway schemes for the West only. There is nothing in that list for the East; there is nothing for Quebec. Of course, the support of Quebec is not needed, but the credit of Quebec is of the highest, whilst some of the western provinces were on the verge of bankruptcy because of the guarantees they gave to Mackenzie and Mann. That explains why, before the last general election, we saw so many of those premiers wavering in their faith, because, forsooth, they were promised, if they supported Union Government, that the guarantees given by their provinces would be taken up by the Dominion Government. In fact, no provincial premier came to Ottawa during that eventful period without being met at the station by the wily gentlemen who then controlled the destinies of Union Government. I repeat again that the Government is taking a very serious responsibility in luring the people of this country and people outside of this country into the belief that these forty-four lines of railway will eventually be added to the trunk line of the Canadian Northern. Have hon. members ever thought of the credit of Canada, not only with the Canadian people themselves, but abroad? This country owes some millions of dollars in the United Kingdom and also in New York.

When the bankers of the United Kingdom and the United States take up our stock they have regard to the obligations to which we are committed. I say that the Government is lowering the credit of Canada by this political trick, because it is nothing but a political trick. It is adding to the schedule forty-four lines to be eventually built——

Mr. J. D. REID: That is not right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The adding is done at the request of the hon. member himself. He is the author of the trick.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend comes before this House with a blanket clause, which reads:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of any lines of railway which any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct, which had not expired at the beginning of the war, in August, nineteen hundred and fourteen, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

That was a notice to the country that the Government or board intended to complete the system by constructing these branch lines which originally formed part of the Canadian Northern system. I say that in fairness to the taxpayers of Canada and the creditors of Canada we should know what railways it is intended to construct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is trying to lead the committee to believe that money is to be voted this year to construct all these lines.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are only asking that the charters be renewed in order that Parliament may have the opportunity of voting such money for construction as may be required.

Mr. BUREAU: Did not the minister state that construction would go on except on three or four lines?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the intention to ask Parliament for a vote in order that work may be done upon the most of them, and if it is possible, and in so far as it is possible, on all. But that will be submitted to Parliament later. The hon. member was altogether misleading the Committee when he endeavoured to make it believe that a vote for the schedule to renew these charters, which must be renewed as all hon. members know, was a commitment on the part of Parliament to construct the whole mileage in the schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: What will the money voted be used for if not for construction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the purposes asked.

Mr. BUREAU: What purpose are you going to ask the money for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For doing work on these lines, as I have told the hon. member now for the thirteenth time.

Mr. BUREAU: Does not that mean construction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not mean construction of all the lines or complete construction of any one.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend wants to play on words. Let us get down to brass tacks. It is construction and nothing else.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not differ with the minister in his interpretation of the schedule and the clause itself. It is a notice served on the country that at some time later on the Government through the board may construct any of those lines. I protest against that. I say the country is not in the mood and has not the resources now to justify notice being served that we may build those lines. It is a crime against the credit of Canada to add to our obligations by the publication of this schedule. The expression may not be parliamentary, and if it is not I will withdraw it, but it seems to me that the Government is going to act like a drunken sailor; but I withdraw that expression. My hon. friend does not seem to realize the extent to which he is committing this country. I certainly find fault with the taking over of the Canadian Northern railway, but it was a necessity, and a necessity which the Government had considerably aggravated during the last five or six years, and God grant that the country may not suffer too much by that awful necessity! But after taking over this white elephant with its tremendous obligations, to think that in case of a general election the country may be committed to the expenditure involved in the schedule, is something which I cannot understand.

There is another point. By adopting this schedule and renewing the charters en bloc, are we not debarring private companies and the provinces from building lines in the same territory, not exactly on the same routes, but approximately so. These charters have remained dormant—simply paper charters, if I may call them so—for twenty years. Mackenzie & Mann did nothing with them except hold them for their own use; they did not build one mile of railway on any of these charters. Now we are to renew them en bloc and debar private companies and other enterprises, which might eventually wish to build these railways, from doing so.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I should like to be permitted to say a word or two on some of the points which have just been touched upon by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I must say that as one who had co-operated with him for years in political affairs and had formed an opinion highly favourable to himself, of the breadth of his mind, I was surprised to hear from him what I must describe as so pessimistic and reactionary a speech. I do not know what company my hon. friend has been keeping of late. His views of Canadian affairs and the possibility of Canada's development seem to be absolutely jaundiced. When did he get the idea that railroad building in Canada was bound to be so unprofitable an enterprise? The first two general elections that I fought in this country were on the question of railroad development in Canada, and were in support of the great project of the National road.

Then my hon. friend was an enthusiastic and optimistic young Canadian. I was imported into this country and, I partook of his enthusiasm and believed in the possibilities of Canada. I was surprised to hear such a sort of speech from him this afternoon and I was led to the question: What company has my hon. friend been keeping? Is this the new Liberalism that we are hearing to-day? I think I get some little guidance as to the answer to my question from the remark which my hon. friend made in sitting down. He was not enthusiastic over Canadian National railways, I observe. He gives us in so many words the reason, because he tells us, just as he takes his seat, that this national enterprise, this work of making a great railway in a great country, of making a Canadian national railway in Canada by Canadians, may interfere with the interests of some private corporation. He mentioned the private corporation—the Canadian Pacific. As a western Liberal who has not abated one jot or tittle of his Liberalism, and who has as much belief in Canada as he had in the years 1904 and 1908, I want to say to my hon. friend that if he is going to take the position that the interests of the Canadian Pacific are more important than the interests of Canada, then my Liberalism is not his Liberalism.

This pessimism in regard to the building of railways in Canada is not an entirely unknown mood on the part of Canadians. When this enterprise, now the Canadian Pacific, was first mooted in Canada, there were pessimists with whom, I suppose, I, along with my friend, had some sort of a traditional connection. These pessimists, I

believe, prophesied that the grass would grow between the rails of the Canadian Pacific and that it would never be a successful enterprise. My hon. friend knows that those pessimists were wrong in their day and I wonder that the reflection does not occur to him that he may be equally wrong, wide as is his knowledge of and close as is his intimacy with Canada's development and Canada's problems.

He asks what the tax-payers of the country are going to say about this business of having charters put into a schedule and projecting our minds into the future, because that is what these charters do. I submit to my hon. friend the consideration that there will only be one way of paying the taxes, there will only be one way of building up Canada, there will only be one way of making this the great nation that we all hope it will be and that will be by bringing to our civil development the same spirit which we have just brought as a young country to the doing of our share in this war. I want to assure him that the spirit that was behind westerners in the war is the spirit that is behind westerners in regard to the possibilities of Canadian development in the immediate future. We believe in Canada and in the possibilities of her development. There will only be one way of building this nation up; there will be only one way of paying taxes; that will be by doing business. Two years ago, in our western country, we had a surplus crop of 300,000,000 bushels of wheat. We use 60,000,000 bushels in this country in one year. It would just be as easy for the West to produce a billion bushels of wheat if we get the railways to carry it and, by other wise processes of development, find markets to sell that wheat in. We purpose developing that enterprise and we purpose developing Canada along these lines. We know that we shall see other commercial enterprises of all kinds grow up in similar proportion and we expect our railways to develop in the same proportion. In so far as the West is concerned we are grateful to this Government for making an honest attempt at Government ownership of a great system of railways and the West will give them a solid support upon that proposition. Do not let my hon. friend be in any doubts upon this question.

Just one more point. I want to clear my hon. friend's head of some of the cobwebs that have gotten into it, from, as I suggest, his having kept the wrong kind of company lately—these private interests about which he is so much concerned. We have in Western Canada 300,000,000 acres of splendid arable land. I am one of those, Mr. Chairman, who has never shared the opinion that the railway enterprises of the last Government were not justified by the possibilities of Canada's development. I am an optimistic Canadian and I hope to die one. There is no pessimism going to get hold of me breathing the clear air of Canada and sharing the stimulating beliefs of the Western Provinces. We have, as I say, 300,000,000 acres of splendid arable land. We have up to now tilled 25,000,000 acres, and no more, of that arable land. Along with the comparable development in other parts of Canada, the result, confining our thought for the moment to railway enterprise alone, has been to build up this very Canadian Pacific railway, about whose interests my hon. friend is at the present time so anxious, and about which other Canadians were so pessimistic, and to put it in a position in which it is rich almost beyond the dreams of avarice. If the other railways are supported with the same faith, the same energy and the same belief in the country it is a simple arithmetical proposition to foretell the possibilities of development. If we have built up one railway system from comparatively small beginnings by the development of a paltry 25,000,000 acres of land in those Western Provinces, it is an easy thing to estimate what will be the position of the Canadian system of railways when we have developed, shall I say, 100,000,000 acres? Then we shall still have 200,000,000 acres waiting to be developed by the next generation.

These are the thoughts that animate Western Canadians. This is the belief that they have in that country and I want to say to the Government and to my hon. friend that as far as the West is concerned there is no pessimism among the people out there. They believe in their country and they believe that the best way to develop its wealth is to further the scheme of developing this national railway.

I repeat that my hon. friend's speech has given me the greatest surprise. It is totally inconsistent with his attitude on railway development only a few years ago. Except in so far as he afforded an explanation in the way in which he has done to-day, I cannot understand what has produced the transformation of a very optimistic young Canadian into one who talks blue ruin in the most pessimistic and depressing fashion. I would really advise him to get back to his former views and become an enthusiastic Canadian once more.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not quite clear, Mr. Chairman, as to the connection between

the very eloquent address of the hon. member (Mr. Michael Clark) and the motion before the Chair.

Mr. BUREAU: He has to pat the Government on the back.

Mr. McKENZIE: The ink is hardly dry upon a speech made by the hon. gentleman about two days ago, upon which occasion he solemnly took off his hat, stood up in the House, and warned the Government against any undue expenditure in view of the enormous burden of debts under which the people of Canada were to-day groaning. The hon. gentleman told us then that if he had any advice to give, and if his words were heeded, it would be a warning to the Government to move cautiously and carefully in the expenditure of even ten cents out of the national treasury, except what was absolutely necessary to carry on in the most economic manner the affairs of the country.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Precisely.

Mr. McKENZIE: To-day the hon. gentleman appears in another role: Saul of Tarsus has become Paul the Apostle, and the hon. gentleman finds a great deal of fault with my friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) because he follows along the same line of caution which the hon. gentleman himself, with all his wisdom and experience, a couple of days ago suggested. If the hon. gentleman will cast his memory back a couple of days or so he will recall the incident to which I have reference. No necessity existed for his utterance at that time except that this burden was on his mind and he wanted to get from under it; he wanted to be able to tell this Government, or any other government, that if the crash should come, if the credit of Canada was no longer any good, if our bonds had sunk away down below par, he had warned the people of this country.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am perfectly sure that my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me. He should not put the words "crash" or "sinking below par" into my mouth, when I never used them. I was talking of economy in regard to non-essential expenditure, and I should like to point out to my hon. friend that if you economize on unnecessary outlays you will have all the more to devote to expenditures that are imperative.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman's position is understandable in this way: His financial training enables him to grasp the expenditure involved in the increase of a deputy minister's salary—he understands that and it brings him to his feet in protest—but when he gets to a large amount he is entirely at sea; he falls into the current and goes along with it. That is the only possible explanation that I can give of the hon. gentleman's position. If we are to be faithful servants in this world we must be faithful in small things as well as in big things, in order to possess the joy we look for in the world to come. There is no use trying to blow hot and blow cold; no use trying to be an economist in small matters and a plunger when it comes to big things. There is no use trying to get along in that way. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Clark) would be very sorry if he felt that in this House there were men who would not profit by experience; I am sure he would be the last man to find fault with them for doing as he advises. We have to-day in the hands of a receiver, some three or four thousand miles of railway in the beautiful West which we all admire, and in the advancement and prospect of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark) prides himself. So necessary in the Government's opinion was the receivership, and so great was the need for speed, owing to the gravity of the emergency, that they could not follow the ordinary course of procedure but grabbed the railway before it went to Hades and out of sight entirely.

Mr. BUREAU: By Order in Council, too.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, by Order in Council, which was entirely irregular; and now this line of railway is in the hands of a receiver who is sitting in this House to-day. Is there anything more discouraging, in connection with any enterprise, than to see that enterprise hopelessly insolvent and in the hands of a receiver? That is the condition of a great stretch of railroad which has been built in the West. Now I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Clark), as one of the custodians of the money of the people of this country, does he not think the exercise of a little care is necessary before we plunge into the expenditure of billions of money in the same territory in which the hapless railroad referred to was built, and which, as a result of its operations, has landed in the hands of a receiver? Supposing the hon. gentleman himself were an English capitalist and a man came to him from the West to ask him to aid a railway similar to the one I have been discussing, would he not say: "Are you not from the same country where a very large system of railways has already been built, and I find that

it is to-day in the hands of a receiver because it did not pay; do I not find the Government of Canada obliged to take over a railway burdened with a debt of $373,000,000 and hopelessly insolvent"? Are not those lessons, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance of Canada should take to heart? Are not those questions that the ordinary taxpayer, and we ourselves, should consider? And when we say in this House——

Mr. MORPHY: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he considered those questions before the expenditure was made on this railway, and if he did not vote for the very expenditure that made the country responsible?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is all the difference in the world between the situation now and then. My good friend (Mr. Clark) whom I am answering said that expenditure was perfectly justifiable at the time it was made. He was a conservative Englishman, conservative in the sense of being careful; it is only recently that he has become conservative in his politics. My hon. friend was in the swim, he actually believed in, and was enthusiastic for, the building of this railway, and the road went along splendidly under our management. When it was in our hands everything went along swimmingly, but when it got into the hands of hon. gentlemen who did not know how to handle the enterprise it went to smash, and that is the condition we have to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: It was knocked by them.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is why the crash took place; and that is the reason for it. It is perfectly legitimate to put money and property into the hands of men who know how to handle and operate it profitably. Unfortunately the railway fell into the hands of people who are absolutely reckless and know nothing about proper business management. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morphy) wants to know the difference between the building of railways in the days of the Laurier Government and the building of railways to-day, it is simply that in our time there was competency and capacity in the railway administration, whereas to-day there is recklessness and incompetence. That is what constitutes the difference.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Of course these forty lines of railway would be all right if my hon. friend was Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: There is such a thing as committing the unpardonable sin, and such a thing as a man getting beyond the skill of a doctor. Such a condition in the country's health has been brought about by the men who are in charge of public affairs to-day, that even the best men in the land might find it difficult to bring that health back to a proper physical state and normal pulsation.

The hon. member is not going to phase me on this question by a sneering reference to what might happen if I were Premier. I may never be Premier, but I shall be Premier before the hon. gentleman ever will.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I want to assure my hon. friend that if I seemed to sneer it was furthest from my thoughts.—

Mr. BUREAU: But it was on your face.

Mr. M. CLARK:—But if it will remove his impression that I sneered, I can say quite sincerely that he is by far the nearest approach to a Prime Minister that I can see when I am looking at his side of the House.

Mr. BUREAU: And so say we all.

Mr. M. CLARK: With regard to his prophecy that he will be Prime Minister before I am, I can only fall back upon the saying of the well-known Mrs. Malaprop, giving it, however, in proper English, that comparisons are proverbially odious.

Mr. BUREAU: To the man who makes them.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman feels the odium he had better move out from the side of the House he is sitting. I think I have made it perfectly clear that we are now at a stage in the financial history of this country when it behooves every man, particularly those in responsible positions, to be careful. And if to be cautious, to sound a note of warning to those who control the expenditures of this country, is to be treated as pessimism, as the expression of a man who has no faith in his country, then we are trying to teach in this House the doctrine that no man shall dare speak his mind at all, and that the whole proceedings from start to finish are to be regarded as a continuous camouflage, until at last the people will come to believe that we do not understand what we are talking about. The hon. member (Mr. M. Clark) wanted to fasten upon my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) the imputation of being in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of being

a corporation man, a man who was trying to deprive the people of the west of their rights in favour of some corporation.

Mr. BUREAU: Shame.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am surprised that a gentleman who is usually so fair should in so short a time be transformed into such an adept at small Tory politics.

Mr. BUREAU: Ask him what company he keeps.

Mr. VIEN: Bad company.

Mr. McKENZIE: As to fault finding and pessimism in regard to building railways. if pessimism it be, I think my hon. friend from Red Deer will be quite satisfied with the company of the Montreal Star, for instance, and perhaps Lord Atholstan might qualify for communication and communion with him.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think that paper has achieved a sufficiently high standing in this country to be read by most Conservatives, and its readers are regarded as good staunch Canadians. Let me read to the hon. gentleman what that paper says about the very subject we are discussing, under date as late as April 19, 1919:

The annual report of the Canadian Department of Railways for 1918 is a document of startling timeliness. We commend it earnestly to the apostles who preach public ownership as a panacea for present ills.

Canada operated last year a little over four thousand miles of railway—4073.76 miles to be exact.

The actual operating cost—not counting in any expenditure that could be charged to capital or any interest on the money invested in the railways, as a company would have to do—exceeded the earnings by over six million dollars—$6,159,503.58.

In addition to the operating costs the Government spent $34,699,416.96, which it charged to "capital account"—a financial camouflage in the main. It all has to be paid some day out of the public purse. So that these public ownership roads cost the public last year over $40,000,000 more than they earned.

There is no consideration in this amount of the annual interest cost which the public is paying on the money invested in these railways. Leaving out last year's charge to capital, this investment now mounts up to the huge total of $378,661,442. With interest at five per cent this means an annual charge of nearly $19,000,000. Adding this to last year's deficit and capital expenditure, the suffering taxpayer will find that his little toy cost him in 1918 close to $60,000,000 more than he got out of it.

It may be of interest to business minds to note that of the actual operating deficit the National Transcontinental contributed over three millions, the Intercolonial over two and a quarter millions, the Prince Edward Island Railway almost half a million, and the International about a quarter of a million. They all did their little bit.

Here is an interesting problem in arithmetic to wind up with:

The Government railway mileage in 1918 was 4073. Since then the taxpayer has been handed the Canadian Northern, 9433 miles and the Grand Trunk Pacific 2788 miles. The politicians are now reaching out for the old Grand Trunk which may add 4785 miles.

If it cost us sixty millions to run four thousand miles, how much will twenty-one thousand miles cost?

That is an expression of opinion by a newspaper edited by an orthodox Conservative, a gentleman well versed, no doubt, in the public affairs of this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman approve of that opinion himself?

Mr. McKENZIE: I used the word "opinion." I do not think it is so much an expression of opinion as it is a gathering together of facts. The language in which the editor expresses himself does not make so much difference; the figures are the startling and appalling part which cannot be questioned, because we have had them from the records of the various departments.

While I always want to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) and see him in line in the House, he must not find fault with anybody who advises caution in view of the fact that in the very early days of the session the Minister of Public Works,—and the building of railways may be considered as public works—told us that we are one hundred million dollars short this year, and he did not know where to look for the money.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: We are told by every one who has to do with finance that he is at his wits ends to get money. We have to-day a public debt of two billion dollars. Is it not time to pause before embarking on further expenditure to develop this country and proceed with that development only as our means will allow? That is what the Canadian people expect us to do, and there is no man in the West or elsewhere who is so unreasonable as to say that we should render this country bankrupt to build railways. In my part of the country, which has been settled for over 200 years, there are sections which are 110 miles from any railway to-day. I am not raising any hue and cry on that account. I recognize that we must wait until the finances of the country are in a better position. But that should be a sufficient reason to advance to any fair-minded man in

the West for delaying railway construction. Do not let us have any person, no matter how eloquent, tell the people of the West that some men on this side of the House do not want to give them the railway facilities they require. We gave them what they have got to-day, and their facilities would be in good condition at the present time if we had retained control of affairs.

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: But they got into the hands of the Huns and Goths and went to smash.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 72, to incorporate the Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company.—Mr. Tweedie.

Bill No. 73, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Hocken.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 70, to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National railways.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Owing to the turn which this discussion has taken, and owing particularly to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) respecting the general railway and financial policy of the Government, I think it proper that I should offer a few remarks.

For the last three days in Committee, and for some days previously, on the resolution which preceded the introduction of this Bill, we have been discussing ostensibly the corporate machinery by which the Government of Canada is to administer the railway system which has come into our possession. But this afternoon—I knew from the trend of the discussion that the stage would be reached—the real issue was revealed which is dividing the two sides of the House respecting this measure. The real issue is not the Bill before the Committee, important as its provisions are; the real issue is whether public ownership is to have a chance for success in Canada or is to leave this Chamber maimed, mutilated and deformed. What is before the Committee? A Bill incorporating a holding company of which the Dominion of Canada, through the Dominion Government, is to be the sole proprietor and shareholder. There are many important provisions in this Bill which should be fully discussed, but it is not too much to say that hours have been wasted upon sections of the Bill which are in the general railway and company Acts and which, had they been before the Committee or the House in connection with a charter of a private railway company, would not have commanded one minute of attention from hon. gentlemen opposite. Who recalls—I do not, although I have been a member of the House for eight years—in connection with any private railway charter such a discussion as we have had upon insignificant sections with regard to the provisional directors, the appointment of executive committees, or matters of that kind? What accounts for the present attitude of hon. gentlemen with regard to this measure as compared with their attitude towards measures incorporating private enterprises? Mr. Chairman, the real discussion in this Chamber has been between private railway enterprise and public ownership. Every section of this Bill has received from hon. gentlemen opposite the most critical attention, the most anxious solicitude—well simulated, I admit, but the real nature of which is obvious to all on this side of the House and to the press of this country. There has been an influence—I do not say an improper influence—behind the discussion of this Bill by hon. gentlemen opposite, and we all know what that influence has been—private ownership. I do not blame private ownership for fighting public ownership, but I am on strong ground when I blame representatives of the people in the House for espousing the cause of private ownership as against public ownership.

We might have gone through this Bill without the real issue being revealed as it was this afternoon. But during the last two days, watching the discussion in Committee, I have known that this stage would be reached. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) disclosed the issue this afternoon, and disclosed it unmistakably. There is no doubt where he stands; he is not in sympathy with public ownership of the railway systems of this country—ownership by the people, and, we hope, for the people. In order that I may do my hon. friend no injustice, I shall quote, from a Hansard extract which I have here, what he said this afternoon. The section before

the Committee was a section reviving charters which had belonged to the Canadian Northern Railway system. They are presumably of value, or they would not have been acquired; and the question is whether the Government of Canada—that is, the people of Canada—are to have these charters for the benefit of the Canadian National railway system—that is, the people—or whether they are to go to others who desire to have them. My hon. friend will not deny that he came out unmistakeably to-day against public ownership. I do not see how hon. gentlemen opposite can avoid the charge that as a party, the so-called Liberal party, they stand in this House for private railway enterprises against public ownership of the systems which this Government has to take over and has had to take over. The member for Maisonneuve said:

> By adopting this schedule—

Which contains the charters that the Government desires to preserve, not for any improper purpose, but for the people of Canada; and which this Parliament granted to private enterprises.

> By adopting this schedule and renewing the charters en bloc, are we now debarring private companies—

His interest is with the private companies.

> —are we not debarring private companies and the provinces from building lines in the same territory not exactly on the same routes but approximately so? These charters have remained dormant—simply paper charters, if I may call them so—for twenty years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If they remained dormant, they were of some value. The Dominion Government seeks to revive them, for what? For the people of Canada. My hon. friend says: No, do not preserve them for the people of Canada; private enterprise may want them. He says further:

> Mackenzie and Mann did nothing with them except hold them for their own use.

Well, if they held them for their own use, it is a fair implication that they were of value for them and for the Canadian Northern Railway system, as they will be for the people of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not for the people. The people get nothing.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They will get something; they will get a good deal out of this system before we are through with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They will get the bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend says:

> They did not build one mile of railway on any of these charters. Now we are to renew them en bloc—

A terrible thing to renew them en bloc for the enterprise owned by the people of Canada. My hon. friend suggests that they are of no value, yet he goes on to say:

> —and debar private companies and other enterprises, which might eventually wish to build these railways, from doing so.

If they are of no value, why would "private companies and other enterprises, which might eventually wish to build these railways," do so. My hon. friend says in one breath that they are of no value, that Mackenzie and Mann had them and did not make use of them; and in the next he says: Let us not take them for fear some private enterprise in competition with the Government's road might want them.

Does my hon. friend seriously stand upon that ground? As I said, private enterprise and public ownership have been contending during the debate—notwithstanding the form of the discussion in this chamber—upon the provisions of this Bill. I do not mean to say that there may not be a few members opposite with a predisposition, probably inherited from some Liberal ancestor, in favour of public ownership; but if the leader of the Opposition had to depend for support upon those on his side of the House who are sincerely in favour of public ownership, he would not command a corporal's guard.

This discussion, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, has ostensibly gone along the lines of safeguarding the public interest. Every section of this Bill must be subjected to the most minute scrutiny for fear that the people of Canada might not have adequate machinery to carry out their railway enterprise. Most specious arguments have been put forward. The voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau. Let me put it to the hon. member for Maisonneuve: Are we going to give public ownership a chance for its life, or are we going to strangle it in this chamber, where its friends ought to be, if they are anywhere in Canada? The Government brings down a measure to revive a number of charters which are valuable to-day and which will be more valuable in the days to come, not for any private railway company or enterprise, but for the people of Canada. What chance will public ownership have in this country if, in this cham-

ber, we are going to deny to our own enterprises what we are willing to concede to rival enterprises? Supposing a meeting was held of the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—an admirably managed institution, one of the best in the world, with a fine list of shareholders, a splendid executive, a wonderfully capable and loyal staff—and the general manager of the company informed the shareholders that during the war a number of valuable charters, which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had obtained from Parliament, had lapsed, but that he had succeeded in getting Parliament to revive them so that that company had now the revived charters. Can my hon. friend contend that a shareholder of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, much less a director—and he is in the position of a director, not in that of a shareholder—would rise in his place and say: "Really, Mr. General Manager, we should not ask Parliament to revive those charters, because some other railway company in opposition to us may want to obtain them." Does my hon. friend, public man as he is, and member of this House for many years and former member of a Government of this country, contend that?

What's in a name? My hon. friend has often spoken to us in this House as to the true meaning of Liberalism. He is a Liberal, he says. I believe I am understating the matter when I say there is not a row of seats on this side of the House that does not hold more progressive Liberalism than there is on the entire opposite side of this Chamber. If Liberalism means standing for the public interest and the people's rights, my hon. friend, standing here, as he does, for private enterprise as against public ownership, whatever he is, is not a Liberal. He frankly does not like public ownership. If he would express what is down in his heart, he would boldly say: I do not believe in public ownership. He has been too long in politics to do that; —he side-steps. If he had not been so long in politics he would state his conviction, which is against public ownership. If that is his opinion, it is a perfectly proper one for him to hold as a public man, if he avows it. Whether he likes public ownership of railways or not, whether the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) likes it or not, whether all hon. gentlemen opposite like it or not—and they do not like it—we have public ownership of railways in Canada, and it has come to stay. Let me make an appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite. We owned some 4,000 or 5,000 miles of railway, and we have acquired, within the last two years, nearly 10,000 miles more. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is in the hands of the Minister of Railways as receiver. We are negotiating with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to acquire their system. Hon. members know perfectly well the steps by which the Dominion of Canada has become a great railway proprietor, and will become one of the greatest in the world. The situation has been such that, by the inevitable trend of events, the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the National Transcontinental Railway Company have come into the possession of the Government; and by the inevitable and inexorable trend of events, I believe, the other systems that I have mentioned will also come into the possession of the Government—this Government did not go out years ago with a policy of taking over the railways of Canada. Having this railway system, one of the greatest in the world, full of possibilities to any one who has vision for the future, should we not, as public men, take a reasonable pride in the situation and make the best of it?

What is the continual criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite? That roads are bankrupt or in the hands of receivers. Well, that does not advance us very far, Mr. Chairman; this Government did not make them bankrupt. What has produced the railway situation in Canada that has been discussed so often in this House? The railway situation, under which taking over by the Government became inevitable, and a receivership for the Grand Trunk Pacific inevitable—what was it that brought about that situation? Was it public ownership? It was private ownership and politics Huns, Goths, and Vandals, we are called on this side of the House by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Well, "what's in a name," Mr. Chairman? What do the Huns and Goths and Vandals do? Destroy completed and productive enterprises. Has this Government destroyed completed and productive enterprise? If the roads that we took over were bankrupt who made them bankrupt? What are we trying to do with them? We are trying to make them fruitful and productive for the people of Canada. That is our clear duty, and I submit that it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to unite with us in doing it, because the railway policy of this country has been the policy both of Liberals and Conservatives. Both are responsible for the building of railways in this country, and both are responsible, in

some degree at least, for the situation which I have described. The over-building, the over-lapping, the wasteful expenditure of money—I am not going to make this a narrow party question, that water has gone over the wheel. The policy to-day, if ever there was a time when we should have such a policy, is to make this enterprise fruitful and productive for the people of Canada. What use is there in continually harping on the string that the Government has taken over bankrupt roads? What else could the Government do? I have read in the press, and I have heard in this House, endless criticism of Government ownership of railways. I have never seen in the press that puts out that criticism, nor heard from hon. members of this House who support it, any constructive scheme different from that which the Government has adopted. It was an inevitable policy that we followed, if we were to save this country and its transportation systems which are vital to it. Let me appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to take pride in public ownership, which alone can save these railway children of theirs.

I have been abused many times in this House on account of my railway policy, and I have often thought: What have I done that I am so abused? I found a couple of half-starved babies on the doorstep of the Finance Department when I went in there, puling, weakly creatures, ill-dressed, dirty. Well, we have them here to-night, and they are not bad looking children.

An hon. MEMBER: Who left them there?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will leave that to the imagination and good sense of the House. We found the babies on the doorstep; we took good care of them; and this side of the House is prepared to continue taking care of them until they grow up and become useful to the country. And all we get for it is abuse—and from unnatural parents. I appeal to the patriotism of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to their sense of loyalty to their own railway policy, not to listen longer to the promptings of private railway enterprise, but to stand with us behind the railway system owned by the people of Canada.

It is put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite that these railroads that we have taken over are bankrupt, and we hear of that same old deficit from day to day. Well, let us make them solvent; let us make them fruitful; let us make them the all-important factor that they can be made in the development of the resources of this country. That is the true, constructive, statesmanlike policy. Any other policy is merely destructive; it will not advance things one bit. I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition how long will it be before the railways of Canada that this Government has been obliged to take over become solvent?—how long will it be before the deficit is wiped out, if we adopt the stand-still policy advocated by him and other hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon? They are so afraid of the revival of charters. Why, it is a terrible thing that the Government should revive charters for its railway system. Evidently the policy is to stand still and let the deficit continue. I say that if we stand still, the deficit will increase, not diminish. There is no standing still in this world, in transportation or anything else. You must go forward or you will go backward. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) took the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to task this afternoon.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any part of Canada in which you cannot build a railway under the Act that is now before the House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I submit, that is not the point.

Mr. McKENZIE: I submit, it is.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If we can build a line in any part of Canada, then we can build five hundred lines, because there are at least five hundred different sections of Canada. All we are asking for is that forty-four charters be revived. So if my hon. friend says that we can build five hundred lines of railway, he should not object to our taking power under only forty-four charters, to go ahead if we so decide.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why duplicate?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: All that we are doing is to revive these charters to be used if we see fit, that is to say, if the Government, carrying the majority in this Parliament, thinks it in the interest of Canada. We must come to Parliament to get money to build railway extensions. The whole theory of constitutional government is based upon that, and where is the harm in the Government having these charters revived, for construction to be gone on with, if in the public interest it is thought expedient by the Government and by Parliament to do so?

I was saying that the hon. leader of the Opposition attacked the hon. member for Red Deer this afternoon. Well, he is a hard man to attack successfully; but the leader of the Opposition took him to task

for an alleged statement—I emphasize 'alleged',—that at this time, with our great national debt, we must not spend any money. Now, I never heard the hon. member for Red Deer say that we should not spend any money. I have heard him say on many occasions, both before and since the war, that we should not waste any money; but there is a great deal of difference between spending money wisely and wasting it. I think the hon. member for Red Deer this afternoon put forward a statesmanlike policy—the only policy for Canada at this time. The leader of the Opposition says: "Why, you have got a national debt of a couple of billion dollars —or you will have." He is so frightened at the national debt that he says, in effect: "Do not spend any more money; close up everything."

If this Government had adopted that policy since the 11th of last November, there would have been tens of thousands of people walking around in idleness, and there would have been civil disorders throughout Canada. What policy have we laid down, Mr. Chairman? We have laid down a policy which is unassailable—no money for unproductive undertakings but money for productive works in Canada. How are we going to meet the interest on our national debt and provide a sinking fund for its extinguishment unless we enormously increase the production of this country, rich in natural resources, one of the richest in the world? All that it requires is the application of enterprise, labour and capital. Principal among our resources are our great agricultural resources —this vast stretch of arable land not only in Eastern Canada but millions upon millions of acres in the great Prairie West extending from Winnipeg to the foothills of the Rockies. The hon. member for Red Deer spoke of hundreds of millions of acres and of the tens of millions that, by enterprise, could be brought under cultivation and made to yield a golden harvest for the people of Canada. How are they to be developed, unless we have transportation? Are there any members of this House, at this of all times, who will arise and say: You must not have railway extension in the West; you must expand no farther?

The hon. the leader of the Opposition put it forward this afternoon that in his constituency some people were—I think he said—one hundred miles from a railway. My hon. friend, evidently, by implication, was of the view that as long as railways went within a hundred miles of the farmers of the Northwest, or any other part of Canada, there was no cause for complaint. I know a little about farming. If a man has to draw a load of wheat one hundred miles to the elevators to sell it, he has not very much of the value left by the time he gets it there.

Mr. Chairman, at this of all times we must have a progressive, productive policy in this country or else we shall not overtake the effects of this war. We have, in this Government railway system, a wonderful instrument for increasing the productiveness of all parts of Canada, especially the Northwest. Do hon. gentlemen realize what a heritage we have in the West?—to say nothing of the East with its boundless resources; and there are boundless resources in the East. We have the great provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta each of them as large as modern Germany,—in fact, larger; 250,000 square miles each, and modern Germany 207,000 square miles. Have we a vision of the far future? How will it be realized? Will it be realized by a standstill policy under which we will say: No further railway extensions? Or shall we consider the situation from time to time and wisely make extensions which will multiply productiveness many fold for the benefit of the population of the West and for the general benefit of Canada? Is that not the policy that we should follow? It requires courage and imagination, and these are qualities which are necessary in this Dominion, not only for the remainder of this reconstruction period, but for many years to come.

Now, we want these charters. We want them for no improper purpose. We do not desire to give them away or sell them to any rival enterprise. We want these charters for the Canadian Government Railways; that is to say, for the people of Canada. I utterly fail to understand how any hon. member of this House, the Government being the sole proprietor of these railways, can object for one moment to the Government railway system having the benefit of the revival of these charters to be availed of as may be expedient in the public interest.

Private railway enterprise in this country is apprehensive of public ownership. There is no doubt about that. I do not blame it. But we have our duty to perform, and I submit that our first duty in this House is towards our own railway system. No man in this House will be fairer than I to any other railway enterprise in this country.

They serve a most useful purpose. The Canadian Pacific is the greatest system in the world, and most capably managed. I gladly pay them my tribute of appreciation. But as between any private railway enterprise and this publicly owned railway enterprise, I submit, it is the obvious duty of every man in this House, representative as he is of the people, to support measures designed to promote and make more productive the Government owned enterprise.

Speaking about the West, I was amazed this afternoon—in fact until I saw the extract from Hansard I could hardly believe it—at the attack made by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve upon our three western provinces. My hon. friend may have spoken as a politician, although I can scarcely see the ground upon which he might hope to gain any advantage. At all events, in the heat of his remarks he evidently expressed the deepest convictions of his heart. But to say the least, his remarks were not politic. Let us hear what he says:

> Scanning the list of these problematical railways—

So problematical that he was fearful that private enterprise might be debarred from getting them.

> —I notice that the schedule published will consist of railway schemes for the West only. There is nothing in the list for the East; there is nothing for Quebec.

Let us see what that means, Mr. Chairman. Nothing for the East and particularly nothing for Quebec! Carry that to its logical conclusion and it is that it has meant nothing, in the opinion of my hon. friend, to Ontario or Quebec that the West has had any railway facilities at all. Why, these railway facilities have made possible the immense production of the West which has enured to the advantage of the whole of Canada, and notably to the East. He says: There is nothing for Quebec. He says by implication clearly: Any development you make in the West is of no advantage to Quebec, and therefore I am against it. He says:

> Of course, the support of Quebec is not needed, but the credit of Quebec is of the highest.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am glad to agree with him. My hon. friend will look over Hansard in vain for any statement of mine reflecting against his province, so we are on common ground with regard to that.

Mr. BUREAU: He has only to look through your press if he wants to find out.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My press?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, your press, the Tory press, or, if you like it better, the Unionist press.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We practically have all the press now.

Mr. BUREAU: Because you bought it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The press of this country is above all things an intelligent press, and it is inconceivable that it should not strongly support this Unionist Government.

Mr. BUREAU: But the owners are financial men first.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) says:

> The credit of Quebec is of the highest, whilst some of the Western Provinces were on the verge of bankruptcy because of the guarantees they gave to Mackenzie and Mann.

Why drag that into a discussion of this Bill. My hon. friend seems to delight to dwell upon the fact,—as he assumes it,—but which I controvert,—that the Western Provinces are bankrupt. He says further:

> That explains why before the last general election we saw so many of these premiers wavering in their faith, because, forsooth, they were promised if they supported Union Government that the guarantees given by their provinces would be taken up by the Dominion Government.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the legislation was put through before the general election took place. We took over the Canadian Northern Railway system before the election took place. It is a slander upon those public men—the Prime Minister of Manitoba, the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, the Prime Minister of Alberta—that an hon. member of this House, the first lieutenant of the Opposition, should rise in his seat and state that they were bribed to support the Dominion Government in the last general election. That is what the hon. gentleman says, and it is a pretty serious indictment against leading public men. The hon. gentleman says:

> In fact, no provincial premier came to Ottawa during that eventful period without being met at the station by the wily gentlemen—

That is Mackenzie and Mann were waiting down here at the station——

> —who then controlled the destinies of Union Government.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I will leave it at that so far as my hon. friend from Maisonneuve is concerned.

Now, let me say one word with regard to the railway policy with which I have had something to do; with which I have been obliged against my will to have something to do since I have been Finance Minister. When we came into office we found the National Transcontinental Railway line from Moncton to Winnipeg unfinished. I was loyal to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, because Government is a continuing thing, and I felt it my duty as Minister of Finance to provide the means of completing that enterprise, and it was done faithfully and well. The appropriations were put in the Estimates. I never criticised them. I felt that that great enterprise, partly finished as it was, should be completed, although I had very great doubt indeed as to its financial success—in fact I felt certain that it would not be a business success. There is not an hon. member in this House on either side who, if he would say what is in his heart, would admit that the National Transcontinental Railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, built at a cost of $200,000,000 and over, could possibly be made productive. If you only take three per cent upon it, to say nothing of four per cent, you have got fixed charges of $6,000,000 per year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to refer to responsibility for this. That belongs to the past. I want to make the best of the situation. Since I have been minister I have endeavoured, so far as my voice was influential in the Government, to make the best of the railway situation, and the money was provided for the finishing of the Transcontinental Railway—including the Quebec bridge—from Moncton to Winnipeg. There is no man in this House or in this country who would like to see the railway succeed better than I would; because it is Canadian. I do not consider whether any mistakes have been made or not; the railway is there, let us make the best of it. Take the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. The leader of the Opposition says the Goths, and the Vandals, and the Huns—that is, myself and others—destroyed it. Well, we certainly did not destroy it, no matter what else we did. The railway was only partially built. Why, it was only taken out of the construction stage a couple of years ago. One of my first acts as Minister of Finance was to bring down a guarantee of $15,000,000, then a vote of $16,000,000, and then successive annual votes of $7,500,000, down to the present year.

Whatever charges hon. gentlemen opposite can bring against me, they cannot say that I did not faithfully, as Minister of Finance, seek to provide the means to carry out this enterprise which they initiated. Now, I am not going to follow my hon. friend in his argument as to whether the railways could have been made productive or not. My hon. friend knows the situation too well. There is nothing gained by reflecting upon your own enterprise—it is a sad kind of business to do that. There is nothing in being pessimistic. Men hate the gloom and love the sunlight. Let us be optimistic about our railways. A first condition of success in anything is to be optimistic; it spurs your courage. We need courage in this situation.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would like my hon. friend to have a little more of it.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I would need it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let us look to the future of this country despite the great debt which we have as a result of the war from which we have emerged with the utmost credit to Canada. Thanks to the sacrifices of our men and thanks to the initiative and capacity of the people and of the Government of this country since that war broke out, we have come most creditably and honourably through it. So far as I am concerned, I say that all gentlemen in this House share in that credit and honour; there is enough glory to go round. But now that we are through the war, let us set our faces to the future, and inspire our hearts with courage to meet this reconstruction period, and overcome whatever difficulties it may present. Let us not say: Now we must stop; we must spend no more money, whether productively or otherwise, let us stop. Well, if we do that we will not only stop, but we will go backward. I say to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that he will never carry the people of Canada on a destructive policy; his must be a constructive policy, and it must be an optimistic policy, looking to the larger future which this country is destined to have, and which every patriot believes it must have and will have.

We must throw our gates open to properly selected immigrants, and we must develop enterprises, so far as it is the function of the Government to do so; and provide

transportation facilities to the extent that is necessary to promote development in order that we may continually increase our production and make this country the home, not of eight million or ten million people, but of twenty-five million or thirty million people within the lifetime of those in this Chamber. There is nothing far fetched or visionary in that; I believe it is an understatement; but we can only accomplish it, Mr. Chairman, if we have faith and hope and courage and resource. In connection with our railway policy we must be progressive, we must be enterprising, and we must be able to compete with the other great railway system which is in opposition to us and whose prosperity I have very much at heart. For I believe there is room for both systems. We have heard a good many reflections on public ownership from hon. gentlemen opposite, sometimes in express terms, at other times in a veiled way and by implication or insinuation stating that the railway systems of Canada are bankrupt and consequently the Government should not have taken them over, and that we will not be able to run them or to appoint directors of standing and integrity to ensure that they shall be properly administered.

Now, let me again make an appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to help in this matter, to have a new outlook with regard to the possibilities of the Government-owned system. And if any hon. gentlemen have it in their minds that the situation could be made different, let me say this to them—and there are not many men in Canada who have devoted more attention to the railway systems of Canada than I have, because I have been obliged to do so: There are just two courses open so far as Canadian Railway systems are concerned; two and no more: One is that the Government of Canada should acquire the railways that must be acquired from time to time following the policy which we have adopted, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be the other great enterprise, in friendly and honourable competition with the Government, and prosperous, as I know it will be. The other, since the Canadian Northern Railway enterprise and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway enterprise were inaugurated, is that the

9 p.m.

Canadian Pacific Railway Company should acquire all the railway systems of Canada. Two great systems —possibly three if the Grand Trunk is not in—one owned by the Dominion Government and the other owned by the Canadian Pacific; or as an alternative, and the only alternative, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company owning and operating all the railways of Canada. That was the alternative with which the Government was confronted in 1917, and there is no other alternative to-day.

I do not mean to say for one moment that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could not operate all the railways of Canada with the highest degree of efficiency; I think they could. But when I say that I also say that the public of this country, great as is their admiration for the abilities of those who control the destinies of the Canadian Pacific Railway, would never permit any private corporation to own and operate all the railways of Canada.

I submit that that is the inevitable situation. If I am right, then let us quit harping about public ownership and reflecting upon the railway systems which we have taken over. Let us not go over all that old ground as to what the Liberals and what the Conservatives did—I am sick of it. Let us face the situation like business men and patriots, and make the best of it, with pride in our Government-owned system. I am sure that that carries the judgment of the members of this House.

I am a great believer in Canada. I believe in its inimitable resources, I believe in the enterprise, capability and patriotism of the Canadian people. We are destined to a great future; no one in this House doubts that. Well, let us set our faces to that vision and be constructive in all departments of our Government's activities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken up a good deal of time. I had not intended to say a word more in this debate upon the sections of this Bill, because we have consumed days of valuable time, part of which undoubtedly has been wasted. I am the first to say that there should be full discussion of a Bill of this kind, but I cannot overlook the fact that much of the discussion has appeared at least to be of a dilatory character. I would not have intervened except that this discussion had taken a turn in which it became necessary in the interests of the policy for which we stand on this side of the House, and in the interests of the people of Canada in connection with their publicly-owned railway system, that I should intervene and express my convictions as to the principles which should govern us in dealing with these great enterprises which have come into our possession.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister derived so little comfort from the report which he had in his hand a moment ago of what I said before six o'clock that he found himself under the dire necessity of delivering a long and emotional speech just to avoid the only point at issue. I suppose the hon. gentleman is not willingly reading into my words a meaning which he could not honestly find in them, but as he proceeded to do so by implication, at least, whilst he was reading the report, I may repeat for his benefit what was the point at issue when I rose. We were discussing clause 20 of the Bill to revive forty-four charters, which were dead and buried long ago. I said that the reviving of those charters, bearing in mind the obligations that the Government was assuming by taking over the main system of the Canadian Northern, was simply another means of deceiving the people of the Western Provinces, and preventing private corporations, if you please; preventing the provinces as well, from constructing railways where there is real need for them. Is there anything strange, anything criminal in criticising a procedure whereby the Government takes a blanket, collective charter and prevents the people of the provinces, east or west, from developing railway construction? That is the result, because the Government has not the means, has not the money, considering all its obligations, to implement that railway construction. That is what I said; that is the only meaning that can be given to my words. My hon. friend derived very little comfort, indeed, from what he read a moment ago. Sir, I am not the promoter or the advocate of private interests in this House; during the twenty-three years that I have sat in the House I have never championed private interests against public interests. My hon. friend said that we must have faith, that we must have hope. Let him have a little charity, too, and give to the words of his opponents the meaning which they obviously intended to convey.

Mr. BUREAU: Not charity, but justice.

Mr. VIEN: And fairness.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, a little Christian preaching does good under the circumstances. My hon. friend spoke a moment ago of the "legacy of dirty babies" from the Laurier Government. I notice that the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) nods his assent; he is on familiar ground. Now, this is not precisely Gladstonian language.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. EDWARDS: I beg to differ; I do not approve of dirty babies. I am very fond of clean babies but I do not care for the dirty ones.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a doctor, my hon. friend should not approve of dirty babies, and I am glad that he quickly dismisses the idea of nursing them. But in the heat of the discussion the Acting Prime Minister overlooked the compliment that he paid to those babies and to their nurses when he was fresh from the polls in 1911. When he first came to this Parliament, having served private corporations for some time with great distinction, my hon. friend spoke of the future of the country in a speech which nobody could forget. He referred to that legacy of babies which he had received from the Laurier Government. On March 13th, 1912—on the thirteenth, a very unlucky day for him, but a very lucky one for me—he had hope and faith in the future of Canada. He said:

> Despite the serious vicissitudes through which the western wheat crop has passed and the unusual heat experienced in the province of Ontario during the past summer—

Yes, there was serious heat in Ontario during that summer.

> —the field crops of Canada show a bountiful yield and with the high prices prevailing for practically all its products the great basic industry of agriculture continues in a flourishing condition. Almost every department of trade and commerce shows expansion. Our mines are wonderfully productive. Our coast fisheries, notably the Atlantic, have enjoyed a good catch and high prices. Our manufacturers are thriving and new industries are springing up throughout the whole Dominion. Railway construction, especially in the West, proceeds apace, preparing a way for settlement in districts not yet opened up and for trade with other markets than we now enjoy. Our increased bank deposits, clearings, and circulation, the amount of public and private building evidenced in municipal and business structures, extensions to manufacturing plants and residences in almost every part of the country, all attest that the general prosperity of Canada at the present time is very great.

"Railway construction proceeds apace"—the Laurier policy of railway construction for the western provinces. At that time my hon. friend was tinged with Liberalism. He remembered the day that he had been a Liberal; he could not completely forget that he had supported the railway policy of the Laurier Government for fifteen years; so he had to praise it when he delivered his first Budget speech. My hon. friend, therefore, who lauded the wisdom of the Laurier railway policy in 1911 now makes reference to the "dirty babies" of the Laurier Government. My hon. friend is apt to

change his views. Some years ago speaking in the city of Toronto when the first great fight for the hydro-electric took place, he described the supporters of public ownership as "coveting Naboth's vineyard." You see, I have a long memory. Now, behold my hon. friend extolling the men who covet Naboth's vineyard. My hon. friend will have to again alter his views on many questions as long as this Government lasts.

My hon. friend was fair to me a moment ago when he put the question squarely: Are you or are you not in favour of Government ownership? Well, I am not like my hon. friend, who was described by one of his friends the other day as living in a fool's paradise—I hope the expression is parliamentary; I will never "rush in where angels fear to tread." I have no opinion to offer with regard to the Government ownership of railways. I do not think I shall be taken to task for not at this juncture stating, ex cathedra, that Canada must adopt Government ownership of railways as against private ownership of railways. There are men who are just as well educated on this question as even the Acting Prime Minister. He referred to the Canadian Pacific railway a moment ago. Lord Shaughnessy is a man of some experience in railway matters, a man who knows whereof he speaks. Speaking in Toronto last September on the occasion of the opening of the Canadian National Exhibition—which, I must say en passant, is a great credit to Ontario—Lord Shaughnessy, though he did not commit himself as being, as my hon. friend would seem to infer, against public ownership, said:

> I have covered a great deal of ground in the quickest possible way. Much of it would stand great elaboration, but on an occasion of this kind long speeches are an abomination. I think probably that you expected me to say something on the subject of transportation. But I would prefer to postpone that until another occasion. It is beyond doubt a very live question, one in which the people of the country are taking a very great interest, but to my mind it is a question regarding which a decision should be reached only after most careful analysis and consideration. We shall, within the next short period, have an opportunity to learn the result of our neighbour's management of the railways of the country and probably have a little experience of our own. I do not wish to have it understood that I am taking an attitude opposed to nationalization of railways. When the Government is satisfied that the people of this country want nationalization, we are a democratic people and we shall have it. But whatever our policy, we should be very sure of our footing or it may become a very serious problem.

The words of Lord Shaughnessy are full of wisdom. Since he made that declaration in the city of Toronto, we have had the result of United States' public railway ownership. Not later than, I think, Monday last, Mr. Mitchell, president of the National City Company of New York, speaking before the Canadian Club at Montreal, gave in a few concise, pungent words, the experience of the United States as regards public railway ownership:

> On paper, Mr. Mitchell declared, the scheme was sound. The country was divided into seven great traffic regions, and for these regions were appointed regional directors, who were, for the most part, the presidents of leading trunk lines. The fact that these operators, however, working to a man to the height of their efficiency and power, were unable to produce satisfactory results, and service deteriorated and morale became constantly lower, is a striking commentary on the general subject of Government operation. The roads were free from hampering restrictions and yet the net earnings fell off $285,000,000, compared with the previous year, the railroads earning only 75 per cent of the amount which the Government had guaranteed them as rental. Notwithstanding the increases in rates, which were far greater than private management had ever dreamed of asking, and which produced greater gross revenue by $865,000,000, the people of our country, after suffering inferior service, were called upon as taxpayers to advance $210,000,000, the amount by which the net earnings failed to equal the guaranteed rental. In other words, the American people paid $865,000,000, more in rates for inferior service and were taxed $210,000,000, in addition, so that the true cost to the people of one year of Federal operation amounted to $1,075,000,000. With these figures before you, I need not repeat that the popular passion for Government ownership and operation has materially cooled during the past year.

Was Lord Shaughnessy not right when he said that, before adopting a policy of public railway ownership, we should be sure of our footing? For my part, I have no solution to offer. I say that we are, under present conditions, obliged to take the main line of the Canadian Northern, but my objection this afternoon and this evening to section 20 of this Bill is that not only do we assume that enormous burden of the Canadian Northern, but the Government are foisting on that system 44 wrecks—and I have some regard for the credit of my country. Let not the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) think for one moment that I have not, equally with him, the interest of my country at heart. I have the interest of my country at heart just as much as any hon. member opposite.

This afternoon, I referred to the province of Quebec. I did not do so from any desire to force the Government to give to Quebec as much as they were seemingly giving to the West, because I sincerely be-

lieve the West will get nothing out of the 44 wrecks. This is simply another way of deceiving the West on the eve of a general election, as the West will get no relief from the belated tariff policy of the Finance Minister. I referred, and I am glad to refer, to Quebec, for this reason. Out of the nine provinces of this Dominion, at least four were and are on the verge of bankruptcy because of the Mackenzie and Mann system of railways. This is a truth which I am not afraid to state on the floor of this House as I have stated it before during the session of 1917. Sir, the credit of my province on the foreign markets is higher and better than that of the Dominion Government, because the bonds of my province are sold at par, while the bonds of the Dominion Government were sold on the New York market less than three years ago at 93 cents on the dollar. I have reason, therefore, to be proud of Quebec, the only province which did not deliver itself into the hands of Mackenzie and Mann, and we of Quebec have a right to resent the increased expenditure to which we are committing this country, because my province will have to pay its share of that vast expenditure if it is ever expended. That is the reason why, this afternoon, I referred to Quebec.

Speaking again on this question of public ownership, it is a popular fancy at the present time; but really those who favour that new fancy should take the time to read some of the best authorities on the question. I do not know if the Acting Prime Minister has ever read the views of possibly the greatest authority on economics in Europe, and, I should say, in the world, Mr. Paul Leroy Beaulieu, who is absolutely opposed to public ownership. So one might well pause and ponder before committing himself to this fancy. Within a year from to-day many people will regret having committed themselves to the wild policy of the Government which is embalmed in the Bill at present before the committee. It is made to appear as if members were retrograde because they dare offer some mild criticism as regards the wisdom of this policy. Sir, I could find in the city of Toronto some of the highest financial authorities opposed to this very policy, and they are the best friends of the Government. My hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) said a moment ago that the Opposition was not a unit on this subject. Is the Government of Canada a unit on this question? Let me ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell); let me ask my good friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) if they are as keen as their colleagues for Government ownership. No, Mr. Speaker. We have at heart the interests of Canada, and we are all proud as the the hon. gentleman (Sir Thomas White) stated a moment ago, of the part that Canada and our boys have taken in this war; and the greatest homage that can be paid to those who have survived the great war is for us to serve the country to the best of our judgment and according to our conscience.

In my humble judgment and according to my conscience, the policy of the Government is a dangerous policy, and I speak having regard to the best interests of the country. It is launching the country into a gulf from which it may not emerge. To-day it is a receivership of one of our railway systems. Later on, as is predicted in many reviews and newspapers it may be a receivership for Canada. I do not care for such receivership, Mr. Chairman. I want to remain a Canadian. A country may be lost through the economic errors and fallacies of some of its statesmen as well as on the battlefield. Many of our great industrial establishments, many of our railways, many of our commercial institutions in Canada are more or less in the grip of American finance. When this country has no more credit to back its undertakings, I say to my hon. friend: God help Canada and God save Canada. It is all very well for the Acting Prime Minister to come here and deliver orations on a plain question of facts and figures. The facts and figures are staring my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) in the face. He knows that this country is debtor to-day to an inconceivable amount—nearly two billion dollars. He knows that the credit of our country stands in the balance seriously impaired. He knows that the eyes of the financial world where we have launched loan after loan are fixed on Canada. My friend invites us to have faith and hope. I have faith and I have hope, but I like to have a little common sense with my faith and hope.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I rise to a point of order, but before raising the point I wish to state my position in this matter because I feel somewhat under the lash. I took exception to clause 20 this afternoon and I propose to renew my objection until I am satisfied that I am wrong. The hon. member for Maisonneuve started something which I am sure he did not anticipate would lead to the discussion we have reached at this stage. None of the speakers up to the present time have really discussed clause 20, but they have rather

discussed the Government's policy of public ownership. So far as I am concerned, I was in favour of public ownership before private ownership forced the Government to adopt public ownership, and so expressed myself in the province of Alberta, from which I come. My address before this House last session leaves no room for doubt where I stand on that policy. I am entirely in accord with the remarks made by the Acting Prime Minister and also in accord with the remarks made by the hon. member for Red Deer, so far as the spirit of the West is concerned. But it is peculiar what different angles may arise in the discussion of this Bill, and how in one view I may be condemned by the members of the Unionist Government, and how in another view I can partially support the attitude of the Opposition. My objection to clause 20 may be exemplified by a resolution of the Railway Committee of the Edmonton Board of Trade. The territory which is to be traversed by the proposed Bruederheim-Vermilion line is threatened to be invaded by the Canadian Pacific, a private-owned company. The people of Edmonton do not want that territory to be invaded by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and consequently they desire that the location of the Canadian Northern shall be changed to such an extent as to make it impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to come into that territory at all. This is what the Railway Committee of the Edmonton Board of Trade has to say on that subject:—

> The more consideration that we give to this proposition the more convinced do we become that it is a tremendously serious menace to Edmonton's trade. The road from Cut Knife goes into territory between the C.N.R. main line and the Saskatchewan river. That country is already fairly well settled and is producing heavily in the way of live stock, and present conditions of transportation are not conducive to grain farming, and the country will probably always remain principally a live stock country. The trade of that territory properly belongs to the Government system, which should develop it by something like the old proposed Bruederheim Line, and which they should perhaps bring a little farther north than the projected route of that line, and which should possibly continue eastward instead of turning down to Vermilion.

Now, by clause 20 the Bruederheim-Vermilion charter is renewed, and I have no means of having that charter amended so that the location of the proposed Canadian Northern line can be changed, except by blocking the Estimate which the Government brings down for the purpose of constructing this branch line. My position therefore is this: The Governernment has brought down to-day, very suddenly, on the suggestion of one of the members of the Opposition a list of forty-four charters, and we are called upon suddenly to criticise each and every one of these charters without the assistance of solicitors or experienced railway men who have projected these proposed lines; and if the Bill goes through, the second schedule to the Act, which is incorporated in clause 20, will become law without the members of this House having a fair opportunity of discussing each and every one of these charters. I am willing to support the Government in everything that is reasonable, but I am not prepared to become a servile follower of the Government or of any minister of the Crown who tells me that I must follow a line of conduct which my conviction tells me I should not. We are not given a fair opportunity of discussing these various charters. If it were of any use I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are good reasons for being suspicious of the whole Bill. I might suggest, for instance, that Mr. Lash who framed the Bill was formerly a Mackenzie and Mann employee. I might suggest that the counsel, Mr. Ruel, now sitting on the floor of this House, was once in the employ of Mackenzie and Mann, and is now in the employ of the Government. To strengthen the suspicion of the Opposition and others I might suggest that the same counsel at the time he was receiving pay from Mackenzie and Mann was advisory counsel to Mr. Tilley in the investigation which awarded $10,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann.

There are circumstances, Mr. Chairman, which do justify to a certain extent our suspicions of this Bill, and particularly when we find some of the personnel of Mackenzie and Mann employed in connection with it at the present time. But I am not urging these things at all, I am urging the fact that the Government has brought about an amendment to section 20 of the Act without giving hon. members an opportunity of considering it. Now, I raise my point of order, which is that the minister, in moving the amendment to section 20, has changed the character of the Bill and that this Committee has no power to pass a Bill differing in principle from that which was adopted on the second reading.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any hon. member anything to say on the point of order before the decision of the Chair is given? The point of order raised is that the minister in introducing the amendment has completely changed the character and prin-

ciple of a Bill as adopted on the second reading. The amendment appears to be merely a restriction of clause 20. Clause 20 in the Bill as voted upon during its second reading contained the following words:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of any lines of railway which any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct, which had not expired at the beginning of the war, in August, nineteen hundred and fourteen, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

The amendment restricts clause 20 to the lines of railways specified in the second schedule to this Act. It is therefore a restriction and not a change in the principle of the Bill. May, at page 370 says:

> Amendments may be made in every part of the Bill, whether in the preamble, the clauses or the schedules; clauses may be omitted and new clauses and schedules added. . . .

On the same page, I find the only exceptions to be as follows:

> Amendments cannot be moved which are based on schedules or other provisions, the terms of which have not been placed before the Committee. Amendments are out of order if they are irrelevant to the Bill, or beyond its scope; governed by or dependent upon amendments already negatived; inconsistent with, or contradictory to, the Bill as agreed to by the Committee; inconsistent with a decision to which the Committee has come upon a former amendment or offered at a wrong place in the Bill.

Bourinot, page 523, says:

> The rules of the English Commons provide that any amendment may be made to a clause, provided the same be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, or pursuant to any instructions, and be otherwise in conformity with the Rules and Orders of the House.

In view of these authorities, I rule that the amendment is in order.

Mr. BUREAU: Would not the point of order be well taken if we raised the question of the discussion of the principle of the Bill on section 20 after the second reading has gone by?

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order concerning the scope of the discussion would be worthy of more consideration. The debate has not always been strictly relevant to clause 20 which is under discussion before the Committee. The matter has been considered by the Clerk Assistant and myself several times during the afternoon. In view of the scope of the clause and the fact that it relates to the construction of a large number of branch lines extending over the entire western portion of Canada, we have come to the conclusion that the discussion of the public or private ownership of these lines is in order.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I rise for one purpose and one purpose only. It is not my intention to go back to ancient history and relate what has taken place in this country with regard to railway construction and various other railway matters. I take part in the discussion only because of certain words uttered by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). I want to clear up, in my own way, certain misunderstandings under which some people seem to labour. There are gentlemen, the Acting Prime Minister told us in so many words to-night, who seem to believe that to be a Liberal one has to be for nationalization. Liberalism is not socialism, either state or any other kind. Liberalism stands for liberty—liberty of the subject, liberty of speech, liberty of action. liberty of commerce. Liberalism stands for freedom and competition in all lines and spheres. Those who believe that nationalization means necessarily liberty and freedom are mistaken. In many respects it is the very opposite of liberty. Its purpose is to kill competition and erect a bureaucratic state.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what they did in Germany.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That is what was done in Germany. But that is not Liberalism; that is state socialism; that is the beginning of Bolshevism—let my Tory friends on the other side not be mistaken about that. I believe that a free trader cannot consistently be in favour of the nationalization of industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: There are gentlemen who speak on certain questions who do not take the trouble to study them. Let my friends read the works of the great free-trader, Yves Guyot; he is against nationalization. Protection prevents freedom of trade and competition in trade. State nationalization prevents freedom of competition in those industries which are subject to it. Do you think that the republicans and radicals of France are lesser Liberals than my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister and the Toronto magnates who are associated with him?

Sir, the French Liberals at the present time have taken full advantage of the way in which the state has substituted itself for private enterprise and industry during

the war in all directions, and they have just formed an association called "The League of Free Men," to vindicate the rights of private citizens as against the state. Nationalism is a great problem. I do not blame anybody for advocating it, I confess to have an open mind with respect to it, but I deny to any man the right to say that a Liberal has to favour Sifton—I beg the committee's pardon, this is the word that comes naturally when we speak about it; has to favour the system—if he wants to remain true to his principles. Certain gentlemen in this country have queer ideas about Liberalism and Liberal principles, and what Liberalism stands for.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Who says "hear, hear?"

An hon. MEMBER: We all do.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: My friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) is certainly a good authority to speak for Liberalism. I read quite recently in the Toronto Globe that to be a Liberal a man must stand for prohibition. I am sure the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) as well as myself will not accept such an absurd theory. Any man has the right to advocate prohibition, but that is not Liberalism. That is the rumour which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has circulated in the province of Ontario, but it is not true. Prohibition is a restrictive policy, whereas Liberalism stands for personal liberty of the subject. A Liberal allows his fellows to differ with him on public questions. He is a queer Liberal indeed who believes that he embodies in himself the essence of Liberalism and Liberal ideals. Sir, I claim to be a Liberal in the clear sense and meaning of the word, and I deny the right of the Acting Prime Minister and those who are associated with him to give me any lecture on Liberalism. Needless to say I shall not accept such lectures from him or his associates.

Mr. ROWELL: It is not my intention to follow my hon. friend (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) in a discussion of theoretic Liberalism. The hon. gentleman has explained Liberalism as it was expounded in England some fifty years ago. At that time Liberalism was a struggle for freedom, a struggle for religious, economic, and personal liberty. But with the changes that have since come about, due to the development of modern industry, the growth of corporations, the large development of life in the cities, progressive Liberalism has felt compelled to change the point upon which it places emphasis. Progressive Liberalism in England, and in every other country where it touches the social conditions of the people, has felt compelled not to increase personal liberty, but to restrict the power of the strong for the protection of the weak. Modern legislation which the Liberal party of Great Britain placed upon the Statute Books has been legislation to curb the power of the strong, to restrict the power of the great, to control and regulate trade, industry, and commerce, in order that the individual toiler who was unequal to competition in a free, unfettered field, such as my friend (Mr. Lapointe) suggests should be granted—should be protected against the oppression of the strong, whether it be corporate power or large organizations of wealth, and that there should be thrown round him safeguards which would give him a fair chance in life under decent living conditions. So Liberalism has introduced all those great measures of social legislation which have been so characteristic of the administration of which Mr. Lloyd George was such a distinguished ornament, and of which Mr. Asquith was the Prime Minister.

What I rose to refer to was one or two observations of the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). If I rightly understood his objection to clause 20 of the Bill it was based on two grounds: First, that the proposal to grant an extension of the charters involved an expenditure of public money which Canada at the present time was not in a position to undertake, and second, he doubted the wisdom of public ownership in any case and quoted from Lord Shaughnessy and other authorities on the matter as evidence that it was not a wise policy for us to pursue. Now, first as to the question of the expenditure involved. My hon. friend knows, as all the members of the House know, for it was repeated time and again this afternoon, that this clause does not involve one dollar of public expenditure; the House may vote the money when the time comes if it sees fit to do so. All that the clause does is to extend the period during which these charters may be acted upon, and these branch lines may be built, just as the usual extension to private railways is granted by the Railway Committee of the House, and approved by the House from year to year. Therefore, my hon. friend's contention in that regard fails. He is too good, and too old, a Parliamentarian not to know that there is no just ground for opposition to the Bill on that score. But

in that connection I was surprised when my hon. friend made the statement he did with reference to the credit of Canada. I would remind him that if the situation be as he states—I am glad to think it is not—he is not rendering Canada good service when he rises here as one of the leaders of the people and suggests, on the basis of some magazine article, that the next receivership will be a receivership of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no country in the world to-day that has come through the war better than Canada has done. All the countries of the world have an enormous burden of debt to carry, but we have come through it probably better than any other country. Certainly no country, unless it be the United States, is in a better position than we are. We have borne the burden in this war in an astonishing manner. As a matter of fact, while the public debt is very heavy, while the public debt is such that we should not unnecessarily increase it, the increased wealth of the people of Canada is greater in excess of the increased public debt. The people of Canada to-day are better off than when the war broke uot.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister explain what he means by increased wealth? In what way have we accumulated more substantial wealth?

Mr. BUREAU: The physical assets of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. ROWELL: The millions of money which have come into this country and have been spent here for munitions, for all other war supplies, and for food supplies, have added to the wealth of the people of Canada —the money that has come in from the Government of Great Britain, and from other Governments also. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has not done Canada a service by making such a suggestion in reference to our financial position.

Coming to the other point to which the hon. gentleman referred, the question of public ownership, his address has simply made still clearer, if it was necessary to do that, the real situation behind the opposition to this Bill. My hon. friend has clearly stated that he is not in favour of public ownership; at least he holds that he is not bound to commit himself to it, but all of his arguments were against public ownership. And the situation, therefore is this, those who believe in private ownership as against public ownership are entirely opposed to the Bill; but the people who either believe in public ownership because there is no other course open to us—we have the railways on our hands—or who believe in public ownership because they think it is the right thing in the public interest, are in favour of the Bill, and on that issue the hon. members supporting this Government have no hesitation in taking their stand. My hon. friend quotes from the experience in the United States. How does that help us? We have the railways on our hands, as the Acting Prime Minister has pointed out, and we have either to operate them, or turn them over to another company to operate, and the only other company left to do it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I believe the only thing to do is to go forward and operate these railways and make them the greatest success possible. How are we going to operate them successfully and justify public ownership in this country? We can only do it by developing them along the same lines as a private corporation would develop them—by constructing the necessary feeders through the country so the main line may have the traffic which these feeders bring in. Everybody recognizes that there are strong and powerful interests in this country opposed to public ownership. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) expect the ex-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be in favour of public ownership? My hon. friend quotes him, and undoubtedly he is an exceedingly able man, but you would not expect him to be an authority on the question. My hon. friend quotes him against it; of course, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are opposed to public ownership.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What I quoted from Lord Shaughnessy was not an opinion opposed to public ownership, but what he said at the opening of the Canadian National Exhibition at Toronto, that before embarking on public ownership the country ought to be sure of its footing, and should wait until the experiment of the United States was known.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that Lord Shaughnessy stated his position on public ownership more diplomatically than my hon. friend did this afternoon when he referred to the western Prime Ministers.

Mr. BUREAU: There is nothing wrong about it. I am against public ownership; I have stated so.

Mr. ROWELL: There is nothing wrong about it?

10 p.m. Mr. BUREAU: Certainly not.

Mr. ROWELL: But we want to know that the issue is clear and plain: public ownership as opposed to private ownership.

Mr. BUREAU: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. ROWELL: It appears to have a great deal to do with the opposition to the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. As far as I am concerned and as far as I know it has had nothing to do with the opposition to the Bill. The minister is insinuating that members on this side are actuated by motives other than those that should actuate them—or are influenced by the Canadian Pacific Railway, to put it in plain words.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know what may be in the mind of my hon. friend from Three Rivers, but it is absolutely impossible for the Chairman to impute motives to the hon. member.

Mr. BUREAU: I say the minister is imputing improper motives to the Opposition when he says the question of public ownership as against private ownership has influenced the attitude of hon. members on this side of the House. Our criticism of the Bill is not founded upon any hostility to public ownership.

The CHAIRMAN: That is certainly not a point of order.

Mr. BUREAU: All right; go to it.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not question the right of any hon. member to oppose public ownership if he does not believe in it. It is his duty to oppose public ownership in that case and his position is perfectly consistent. On the other hand whether one believes in public ownership or not, we have the railways on our hands and we must operate them. But I go further, I believe in public ownership of this railway system, and therefore I am a hearty supporter of the Bill. I was proceeding to say that there are in the country undoubtedly influential forces opposed to public ownership. They have been opposed to the Government taking over the Grand Trunk, they have been opposed to the Government interfering with the Grand Trunk Pacific and have said we should not do so. In order to make public ownership a real success, I venture to submit, Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the Government to acquire or develop such a complete transportation system throughout this Dominion that it can fairly compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway on something like equal terms. Therefore it is not only the duty of the Government to go ahead and take authority for the construction of the necessary branch lines, but to complete and round up the system by acquiring the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk. Then we will have a system of transportation able to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The position of hon. members on this side of the House in supporting this Bill is that it is a necessary measure in order that the best results should be secured in the operation of the system of railways which the Government of Canada owns and which it must operate.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the hon. member believe that this company we are creating should be allowed to start out with a free hand? If so, why does he want to foist upon that company forty-four wrecks?

Mr. ROWELL: I am dealing with the section, which is simply for the purpose of extending the life of the existing charters which had expired during the period of the war, to enable the company to construct the roads covered by them. The company must come to the House for the money; my hon. friend knows it cannot undertake any construction in the absence of that.

Mr. McKENZIE: No, there are Orders in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: The money has not yet been granted for the construction of those roads, and the company must come to the House for it. My hon. friend referred to the position of the Western Provinces and the relation of Mackenzie and Mann to them; that is all connected with private ownership. I believe that one of the strongest reasons for public ownership in this country is the experience we have had with private ownership of railways. That is one of the reasons why I support the public ownership of these railways. One has only to travel through Western Canada and see the rival railways running side by side for hundreds of miles through territory that could only support one line, to realize that there is no justification or excuse for such a waste of public money, that it is a crime to waste public money in this way. That was all done under private ownership. I believe that private ownership of railways has helped to bedevil the public life of this country,

and that is another reason why I want to see a strong state-owned and operated railway system in this country. I am quite prepared to concede if you like, for the sake of argument, that a railway may not be run as economically and efficiently by the Government as by a private corporation, but I would rather that it should be run a little less efficiently and economically so long as it is owned by the people of Canada and operated in their interests rather than owned and operated in the interests of a private corporation.

Mr. EULER: Because hon. members on this side are not absolutely satisfied with all the clauses of this Bill, would the minister say that they are necessarily opposed to the principle of public ownership? Because, if so, I desire to protest against such an assertion I am just as much a public ownership man as any hon. member in this House, and I would go a little further—I would also acquire not only the lame ducks but the Canadian Pacific Railway as well.

Mr. ROWELL: I would not think of suggesting anything of the kind. The clauses of the Bill should be discussed on their merits, each and every one of them. The hon. member for Maisonneuve, to whom I rose to reply, based his opposition on the grounds which I am answering, and on which I say I am opposed to him and on which I join issue. I stand for public ownership and operation of this railway system, expanded and enlarged until it is made a thoroughly complete system able to compete on equal terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the hon. minister answer my question? We are putting a Bill through this Committee that empowers a body of the ablest railway men we can get to build railways anywhere in Canada. They have authority under this Act to build over every inch of the ground included in those forty-four charters. Why do we encumber this new institution with those wrecks? Because we on this side are opposed to this wreckage being thrown upon the country, we are told that we are opposed to public ownership and to any progress in the West. That assertion is nonsensical, it is without a shadow of truth, and I hurl it back into the teeth of any man who chooses to fling it across the floor of the House.

Mr. ROWELL: Which of the clauses that have been adopted gives the power suggested by my hon. friend?

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Every part of the Bill.

Mr. ROWELL: We are going through this Bill clause by clause; which clause that we have passed in Committee gives the power that my hon. friend suggests?

Mr. McKENZIE: We were given to understand by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) that this Bill, together with the Railway Act, confers all the power that the company and the Government require to build railways throughout the country. If that is not true, it is not my fault.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman was given to understand nothing of the sort. We come to clause 23 later—and I may add that it is proposed to offer an amendment to clause 23. That has already been made known to the Committee. No clause which has been passed gives the power the hon. gentleman describes, and he ought to know that. I think he does.

Mr. McKENZIE: This Bill gives power to expropriate lands for the purposes of the beds of railways; what is that for? Does the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), who knows so much about railways that he does not know whether he has a manager or not, or if so, what the manager's salary is,—does he tell us that we have been discussing for hours all the machinery necessary to the acquirement of rights of way from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but that the Bill does not enable us to build the roads?

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. member knows that we were discussing expropriation after the charter had been granted by this Parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: This Bill must be taken as a whole; we cannot read one clause and put another aside. Section 23 gives the company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, power to construct and operate railway lines.

Mr. J. D. REID: I said yesterday that when we came to that clause I intended to amend it.

Mr. BUREAU: But the clause is in the Bill and we have to consider the Bill as a whole.

Mr. ROWELL: We have not reached it yet.

Mr. BUREAU: We have not reached it, but must we pass all the preceding sections without giving consideration to the power conferred by section 23? When we consider a given section we may go beyond

it to see what the Bill says; we do not have to accept the dictum of the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell). I will not do it, anyway.

Mr. McKENZIE: Read section 23, so that the Committee may know what it contains.

Mr. BUREAU: This is section 23:

With the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines, branches and extensions, or railway facilities or properties of any description. A copy of any plan and profile made in respect of any completed railway shall be deposited with the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada.

The Acting Prime Minister, in his remarks this evening, either departed from his usual custom or tried to put up a little bluff on the Committee and to scare us from discussing this Bill. I resent the imputation cast upon members on this side that they were opposing the Bill because they were opposed to public ownership. So far as I am concerned, that is absolutely false. I happen to be against public ownership. I stated on the second reading that I was against it; that I was in favour of private ownership and public control. I am just as good a patriot as the Acting Prime Minister and I am as loyal as the President of the Council. My loyalty is not on my lips alone and is not for political purposes alone. I am loyal because I have no other country but this country, because I have no love to send across the ocean or to give to any other part of the world than Canada, where I stand the eighth generation. It makes me sick when I hear the Acting Prime Minister appeal to our loyalty to pass this Bill. Are we to sit here as dummies to prove our loyalty? Are we to take for granted everything that comes from the Government? No, not when we remember the fight of 1917; not when we think of how this Government came to power and how it is holding itself in power. Instead of being rebuked because we criticize legislation that is brought down, we should be congratulated. No men who can be influenced by outside interests when they discuss public measures here should accuse others of being prompted by any other interest than the interest of their fellow-countrymen. When I get up to speak in this House I get up to speak my mind and discuss questions as I conceive them, and no power on earth shall prevent me from doing so; it is the only liberty left to us on this side of the House. We may be mistaken, but when we are mistaken we are honestly mistaken, we are not mistaken as the result of calculations or as the result of machinations which might bring to us some benefit or even the hope of benefit. I am not going to discuss the relative values of public ownership and private ownership. The Acting Prime Minister tried this afternoon to describe those who did not share his opinions as private ownership people, as people dangerous to the country, as disloyal people. But I have stated my position, and am not ashamed of it. When men in Parliament have no more right to think for themselves and to express their views, it is high time we dissolved Parliament. We shall be on the eve of Bolshevism when that comes.

The Acting Prime Minister tried to besmirch the policy of his predecessor. He said that when he came to power he found on the door-step of the Department of Finance two dirty babies. That may have been.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: We find more than that.

Mr. BUREAU: If he had been logical he would have fired the nurse who had not taken care of those babies. He would have said: I am going to change this; I want clean ones; let us clean this baby and make it as it ought to be. But what does he do? He tips the nurse and says: I am going to do better; I am going to give you better treatment; I am going to increase your wages—but I do not care about the dirty baby; let him rot in his dirt. If I came home and found my children not properly taken care of by the nurse, I would fire the nurse and get a better one. Now, I will be candid:

This was, I think, only a bluff on the part of the Acting Prime Minister—pulling the wool over the eyes of the people. The Government know that they have before the committe a poor Bill, a Bill that they cannot explain, a Bill that contradicts itself in a good many clauses—I will not say in every clause—a Bill that we did not oppose because it was vesting in a company power to administer Canadian Government railways but which, ever since it was brought before the House, we have been trying to word so that the company can be properly administered. This is not a question of deciding policies. We are saddled with these railways; they have to be administered, and we have given the best of our time and ability to framing a Bill which will give the best results in administering and operating those roads. What we have been afraid of, and rightly so, has been that

politics will not be taken out of the Bill. What we have been fighting for is to vest in Parliament a little more power and to take from the Governor in Council some of the powers which are proposed to be granted by this Bill. I do not think we can be reproached on that account. Some hon. members on your right, Mr. Chairman, may think it is proper that the Governor in Council should run the country, and that Parliament should be convened simply to ratify Orders in Council. We on this side of the House do not think so; we think this country should be run by Parliament and that the administrative part delegated by Parliament to the Government should be taken care of by the Government. Surely we can differ on those questions without its being said that one side possesses all the ignorance and the know-nothings and that the other side is all-powerful and all-knowing, able to do everything. I do not believe that; I think God has been kind enough and good enough to endow every man in this world with a little something called brains, and that all the brains are not on the other side of the House. Thanks be to God, there are some brains on this side of the House, and outside of this House also.

On the second reading, I stated that I was against public ownership, my reason being, concisely, experience both with the Intercolonial and in the United States. Last year we were taking our cues from the United States—we had to change our standard of cement; we had to change our standard of weights and measures, because the United States were changing theirs. If those cues were good enough last year, prudence ought to teach us to follow the example of the United States when they have had the experience they have had with public ownership.

I hope to-night, whatever our opinions may be as regards public or private ownership, we shall continue to devote our time to the consideration of the clauses of the Bill. Again I repeat, every time I have risen from my seat has been not for the purpose of opposing the Bill because I am against public ownership, but for the purpose of endeavouring, if possible, to improve the Bill and to protect the interest of the people, and so much so, that one of my amendments has been adopted by the Acting Prime Minister who thought it was better, although before he thought it was of no importance. Since then I have met people outside of this House who also thought it was better.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Section 20 provides that all the roads mentioned in Schedule 2, whose charters have expired because they have not been commenced or completed within the time fixed, shall, in some cases, have their charters extended, but mostly revived. What I said was that I had no objection to reviving a charter or to granting an extension of five years for those roads upon which work had been commenced. I also stated that it was not just to grant a revival of a charter without the parties interested or the residents of the territory through which the railway was proposed to be run having an opportunity of being heard before the Railway Committee, or the parties granting the extension. My objection was immediately corroborated by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) stating that there was a road, the location of which ought, in his opinion, to be changed. The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) replied to him: If you want to change the location of the road, you will have to get a new charter. I replied to that: If you should get a new charter for a road to run in the same territory, would it not be fair to cancel the original charter? As the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) said just now there would then be none of the duplication of railways, two roads running side by side spoken of by the President of the Council. Is there anything unfair in that? Supposing public opinion and public necessity in the part of the country where a deviation of the road was required further than is allowed by the Railway Act without permission being received from Parliament or new plans being filed—or a new charter, being obtained—if you will and some persons applied for a new charter and showed that they were ready to build the road in a part of the country where it would be required, would it not be fair to cancel the old charter, or let it expire, let it die a natural death, and give an opportunity for building, under the new charter, a road which would be promoted by private interests to serve the better, more populous and richer part of the country? I do not see any disloyalty in that. That is how the whole discussion arose this afternoon.

The ministers say: We cannot go on with the construction of those roads without getting permission from Parliament, and when the estimates are brought down to the House, honourable members can voice their objections. The honourable member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) objected to that, because there were in

those charters certain points which would require changes; and when an item is put into the estimates, the charter cannot be discussed or changed; all one can do is to say: I vote against the estimate because the construction of a line in that particular locality is not required. The better way to serve the public interest and that of the people in the West would be to give them an opportunity to say what lines are of most imperative and immediate necessity and to make any objections or suggestions they wish. Other companies have to make an application to Parliament, to come before the Railway Committee and to go through the usual routine, and anybody who has an objection to offer may cite it. This afternoon I cited a case which brought about the biggest fight there ever was in the Railway Committee. I refer to the Canadian Northern, this very company, and Mr.—Sir Adam Beck, I ought to say, because titles are still under the consideration of the committee—that makes the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) smile, I suppose before we get through with this session or before the Committee reports, I shall have the pleasure of calling him "Sir" also.

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid the hon. member will be disappointed.

Mr. BUREAU: The question was, if I remember rightly, whether the Canadian Northern or the Hydro-Electric Company, should have priority of right of way on a piece of land. The Hydro-Electric declared: We will give the Canadian Northern right of way if we have priority, and the Canadian Northern said: We will give the Hydro-Electric right of way if we have priority. Such things may happen at any time, and it is unfair to revive a charter which is extinct, when no work has been done on the line, without giving an opportunity to the parties interested and the people in the district through which the line is to pass, an opportunity of voicing their opinions. I am willing, however, to grant an extension of five years for any line that has been commenced. We should not be asked to grant this extension of time without having seen the plans, not knowing where the railway runs, having just one copy of the list of lines which are supposed to have out-lived their charters and for which a renewal or resurrection is granted. It is not fair that we should vote on such things without having an opportunity of discussing in this committee the merits of each line, and of knowing when work has been commenced, how much has been done on the line, what has been the expenditure per mile, what the line is going to cost and how far we should engage the credit of the country.

The Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon that if the directors of the Canadian Pacific asked the stockholders to approve the renewal of valuable charters of that road, they would not hesitate to do so. But the cases are not parallel. That is a private enterprise, with private money invested; but in this case it is the people's money that is being invested. I do not want any of these lines in the province of Quebec. All I ask the Government to do, if they undertake public ownership. is to give us better service. I would suggest for one thing that the Minister of Railways see the manager of the National system, if he wants it to compete with the Canadian Pacific, and have a train start from Montreal and go right up to La Tuque, instead of from Montreal to Garneau Junction, and then to Hérvey Junction. The present service means that the industries at La Tuque and above that point have to wait a week for their freight and two or three days for their express. I would ask the minister to give me an opportunity of meeting him and the general manager on Monday to discuss this matter.

Mr. J. D. REID: The president will be here on Tuesday, and I shall be very glad to arrange for a meeting on that day.

Mr. BUREAU: I have received instructions from certain parties in La Tuque to ask for a hearing before the Railway Commission. If the minister will agree to have these people meet the president and myself on Tuesday or Wednesday, I will telephone them to come to Ottawa.

Mr. J. D. REID: I shall be glad to arrange for that, and if the president is too busy on Tuesday I will arrange for a meeting on Wednesday.

Mr. BUREAU: I want my good friends to see that in spite of my opposition to public ownership I want to help the system as much as I can. I think if we were to scratch hon. gentlemen opposite we should find that in some of them the principles of public ownership are not very deep-rooted; but every man of course is entitled to his opinion, and we should not impute motives.

Would it not be well for the minister to let us know how much has been expended on the line from a point on the constructed line of the Canadian Northern railway at or near Edmonton, thence in a northeasterly

and easterly direction on the north side of the North Saskatchewan river to St. Paul de Metis, and thence to the eastern boundary of the province of Alberta. We were told this afternoon by the hon. member for Edmonton that certain subsidies were granted to that road and that the subsidies had not been used, or that bonds had been issued and the proceeds not used for the construction of the road. Is that correct?

Mr. J. D. REID The bonds were guaranteed and part of them, if not all, were sold. The money is in the bank and will not be expended except on the certificate of the engineer. Part of the road has been built, and it is necessary to have the charter renewed.

Mr. BUREAU I am willing that the extension should be granted.

Mr. J. D. REID: In the case of almost all the charters that have been mentioned some work has actually been done, and if we do not renew the charters an asset of the Canadian Railway system will be lost.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: When was this money deposited in the bank?

Mr. J. D. REID: I cannot say exactly.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: My information is that it was deposited in the bank in 1912, and if that is the case, why has not the line been constructed?

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly the money should have been expended by this time.

Mr. J. D. REID They have not gone on with railway construction during the war.

Mr. BUREAU The money was deposited apparently two years before the war.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am prepared to give all the details the House wants when the Estimates come up, but I have not the information here to-night. We simply wish to have these charters renewed.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing that every charter on which work has been commenced should be renewed.

Mr. KEEFER: There are only about four on which work has not been commenced.

Mr. BUREAU: It is not fair to revive a charter when no work has been done, without giving the public a chance to make any objections they may have. It may be in the public interest that those objections should be heard.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. KEEFER: I think it would be eminently fair to revive them, and why? The very clause says that it is only those charters which but for the war would not have expired.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. KEEFER: Yes, that is one way of expressing it. Section 20 says:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of any lines of railway . . . . which had not expired at the beginning of the war.

These only are the ones we are renewing. If we did not have that clause any one could take advantage of the existing condition of affairs during the war. We do not allow all that in mortgages and so forth, because we have a moratorium. Why not apply the same principle here? The Government is thoroughly honest in the matter. We are taking over these assets under the stock of this company, and the leader of the Opposition says: "Why not give this company a free hand?" The answer is, if you do not give them the assets they have not a free hand—which is what we are seeking to give them.

Mr. BUREAU: I am willing to give them all the chances where work has been commenced.

Mr. KEEFER: Did my hon. friend notice what the clause says about the war?

Mr. BUREAU: Let me read the amendment:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act which any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System were authorized to construct are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

Some of these charters that are being extended were dead before the war. In some cases extensions were granted by Federal statutes, which allowed one year in which construction was to begin and three years in which to finish. Now the Canadian Pacific, when they asked for extensions during the same period, were granted two years in which to commence and five years in which to finish; the Federal statutes show that. So there must have been some reason why the Canadian Pacific was given two and five years, whereas the Canadian Northern was given only one and three. I do not know whether the reason for specifying one and three years in the case of the Canadian Northern was that no work had been done, but there

must have been some reason. So why not, in reviving these charters, if there are only four of them, give the people a chance to present their objections?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I dislike very much at this late hour on Friday night to take up even a few moments of the time of the House, but the discussion that arose this afternoon and which has continued this evening is so vastly important that I believe it my duty to present a few points which I think have been overlooked.

In regard to these charters, even if there are forty-two of them, like my hon. friend Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) I cannot understand why there should be any opposition on the part of members of this House to their renewal. Renewal is being asked in the interest of the people. These roads have passed into the control of the people and the people are merely asking that these charters be renewed and that the time for construction be extended. Every member on the opposite side of the House who has had any experience whatever in the Railway Committee during the last twenty or twenty-five years knows that the policy had been adopted of free trade in railway charters. Hundreds, if not thousands of times, railway charters have been renewed in the interest of private corporations. One of the evils of the renewal of these charters has been that it has prevented the construction of railways. I am happy to say that the Railway Committee has adopted a new policy and that most of the members of that committee are now of the opinion, and they have enforced that opinion, that charters should not be renewed.

But there was never any opposition, as a rule, to the renewal of these charters and here, I repeat, the renewal of these charters is in the interest of the country. In some cases the work has been started on these branches, and it would seem inexplicable that any opposition should be offered to them. Let me give a summary of these charters. In Alberta there are twelve or thirteen. This is not, as has been suggested by speakers on the other side, the construction of new railways. These are only little branch lines designed to accommodate settlers here and there, feeders for the nationally owned railway. In Saskatchewan there are twenty-three; in Manitoba, four; and in British Columbia four. These are not new railway systems but they are merely feeders. Why should they not be granted?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am perfectly in accord with my hon. friend in saying that these railways should be built wherever they can be usefully built. My position is that we have the authority in this new Act and in the Government Railway Act which might be made applicable to build these roads absolutely in the same places, on the same lines and more quickly for the advantage of the people under this legislation than by bothering with these old charters. That is why I am opposed to this section.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Even if you had that power under the General Railway Act, is there any harm in giving them this authority? The company that obtained these charters must have considered them of great importance, and the Government, acting in the interest of the country and in the interest of the nationally owned railway, asks that these charters be renewed. Surely that is a reasonable and fair proposition. I cannot understand why there should be any opposition. I think my hon. friend from Maisonneuve raised the point that it might prevent the construction of railways. He knows, because he is an intelligent man and because he has been in this House for twenty-four years, that henceforth there will only be two systems of railway in this country, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National. No company is going to build a little line from nowhere to some other indefinite locality, because it will not pay. From now on the policy will be to build feeders for these two railways. Then, why raise any objection? The Canadian Pacific will be knocking at the door of this Parliament very soon asking for feeders for their great system. It will be interesting to watch the position which hon. gentlemen on the other side will take in regard to that application.

I remember—and I am not a very old man—when the Canadian Pacific applied to this House for a blanket charter to build lines indefinitely all over the Northwest. I sat on the Liberal side at that time and I opposed the application with all the force at my command. But I was as the voice of one crying in the wilderness. The old Liberal party just swept me aside and this blanket charter was granted in order that the Canadian Pacific might fasten its monopoly on that country.

As a young man I learned some of my politics at the feet of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the namesake of the present leader of the Opposition. Alexander Mackenzie's policy, and the historic Liberal policy in those days, was public owner-

ship. Well would it have been for this country—it would have saved this country, I believe, two billion dollars and I could not tell how much more in rates—had the historic Liberal policy that was adopted by Alexander Mackenzie been followed. But Alexander Mackenzie's Government was defeated, Sir John Macdonald's Government came into office and they made the Canadian Pacific contract which Sir John Willison declared was the most insane contract ever entered into by a free people. I have not time to discuss that contract to-night.

I remember that the prophet from Brome, (Mr. McMaster) the other night invited us up to Mount Carmel and in a subsequent speech he also invited us up to Mount Delectable so that we on this side might have a view of the Promised Land. I was one of the simpletons who, twenty-five years ago, with the Liberal party of those days, went up Mount Delectable to have a view of the Promised Land believing that we were to have free trade and public ownership of railways. But I was led back to the wilderness; the Liberals went asleep for fifteen years and I got lost.

An hon. MEMBER: You are still lost.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I had to find my way out; I had to blaze my own trail. I now find myself in fairly good company, because I am happy to be able to agree with the declarations of the Acting Prime Minister this afternoon that there is more Liberalism in one tier of seats on this side of the House than there is on the other side altogether. It is disappointing to me, as it is to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), to hear member after member on the other side repudiating the idea of public ownership and going back on the policy made, I might say, almost sacred by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the honoured leader of the Liberal party. What can we expect? Take our intelligent, able and cordial friend the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I divine from his statement to-night, to which I listened with mixed pleasure, that he is not in favour of public ownership because he says, public ownership is really opposed to Liberalism.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. member allow me——?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Do not interrupt me at present. I do not want to put my hon. friend in a wrong position because I personally like him very much. But I say that the impression that he has made on my mind, and I am afraid on the minds of other hon. members on this side, is that he is opposed to public ownership.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I said I had an open mind on the question, but that no man has the right to chase away from Liberalism one who is opposed to the public ownership of railways.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am delighted to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, so I will leave his case and pass on to that of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), another old friend of mine. Now I challenged that hon. gentleman on several occasions in this House, when he was denouncing the policy that the Government was pursuing, to state what policy he would adopt; but, like the old Presbyterian minister, he looked the difficulty squarely in the face and passed on; he would not tell, and he will not tell yet. I wager that even if I sit down the hon. gentleman will not tell us where he stands on this question. However, I think I can fairly draw the inference that he is opposed to public ownership, because he said a few moments ago that it was a dangerous policy. Moreover hon. gentlemen know how he fulminated against the policy in the House this afternoon; and now he quotes approvingly from Lord Shaughnessy. No wonder when the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) chased the Ethiopian out of the wood-pile this afternoon there was a row. Because hon. gentlemen opposite must see—they call themselves Liberals, but they must see—they are adopting a reactionary policy that is not Liberalism at all. I say that a man—particularly a member of this House, an ex-minister, and one of the chief leaders from Quebec—who denounces the policy of the Government is in duty bound to state what policy he would follow. But this shifting and shirking of responsibility, what are reasonable Liberals to think of it? What is the country to think of that policy? I like very much better the position of my old friend—a friend of mine for more years than I would like to tell, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. BUREAU: Do not give me away, I am only twenty-five.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I like much better his position; he comes out with perfect frankness and says: I am opposed to public ownership.

Mr. BUREAU: Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I told the hon. gentleman the other day, that if he would give me half an hour I would be able to

convince him that public ownership is all right.

Mr. BUREAU: You could not convert me.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I hope the hon. gentleman will be converted, because he has been perfectly frank in this matter. Do I misrepresent the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie)—do I place that hon. gentleman in an improper position, when I say that by implication he also is opposed to public ownership? I pause for a reply.

Mr. McKENZIE: All I can say to my hon. friend is that if he will read the Hansard of last session at page 2191 he will see exactly where I stand. There is no mistake about my attitude.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I will look it up later, because I certainly would not wish to state the hon. gentleman's position incorrectly. But what impression must this House and the country gather when leading member after leading member on the Opposition side impliedly takes a stand against public ownership, and, as an hon. gentleman sitting near me suggests, raises every possible obstacle to the passage of this Bill? I am not disposed to criticise the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) for requiring the Bill to be amended in every proper way, but I think I am not going too far in concluding that the Opposition as a body are unfriendly to public ownership, and I want to warn them that if they hope to secure the confidence of this country, and to gain the treasury benches it will not be by means of the policy that they are pursuing on this question.

Now I have been an advocate of public ownership for thirty years. That is a long time, and if I had to offer an excuse for rising to discuss this question to-night, it would be because I listened with pardonable pride and very great satisfaction to the speeches which the leader of the Government and the President of the Privy Council delivered. To me it was a great satisfaction, because it means that the Acting Prime Minister and the party with which he is identified are now declared supporters of the policy of public ownership—in fact those gentlemen told us that a study of the question has brought them to that view. It was estimated, I think by the Minister of Railways, that the surplus on the operation of the Government-owned railways would not be less than $3,000,000. It is not a large amount but at least it is something and it is no wonder that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is looking askance at the policy of public ownership. It seems to me that any member who desires to serve his constituents and the people as a whole must range himself as a supporter of this policy. The leader of the Opposition spoke of the policy of the Laurier party as one of competence and capacity. Let me deal with that claim. When the Liberal party came into office it was on a pledge to wipe out protection from the tariff and to settle satisfactorily the railway question. The West had groaned under the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific and the Liberals for years and years had denounced that company and wanted competition.

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. I think my good friend is drifting from the subject.

Mr. VIEN: Let the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) sit down.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman is going to enter upon a discussion of the tariff we shall never conclude the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My reference to it is only incidental, I spoke to the Chairman about the matter, and he said that so much latitude had already been given—the leader of the Opposition himself read a long extract from the Montreal Star, and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) also quoted extensively—that he would give me every facility. I am really dealing with the railway question. The Liberal party promised reforms with regard to the construction of railroads, but that party spent a billion of dollars of the people's money in constructing a transcontinental railway which in the general opinion of everybody was an entirely unnecessary and superfluous undertaking. It was promised that that road would cost the country in the neighourhood of $13,000,000; it has actually cost Canada $200,000,000—such an enormous amount that I do not think the railway ever possibly can pay. With regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we listened to the words of the President of the Privy Council this evening, who said that it was a melancholy spectacle to travel through the Northwest Territories—in fact, I called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to it the other day—and see the duplication of railroads that exists. Now, if that is a policy of competence and capacity, it certainly does not appeal to me as such. However I am not anxious to blame one party more than another. I think there is

no doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman who has considered the question at all that the representatives of the people, sanctioned by the people, have made appalling mistakes in railroad policy. Both sides are to blame, and we can probably fairly dismiss the subject with that statement. But we have entered upon a new era. The "babies" that the Acting Prime Minister referred to have not come to the country because the country desired them—that is a point I have tried to drive home a number of times in this House and I want to repeat it.

We are not going to have ideal public ownership at all. If we had started as the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie endeavoured to start, and had had public ownership from the first, we should have ideal public ownership and this country would be many hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars better off. But that time has passed and we have these babies thrust upon us. I think therefore that hon. members of the Opposition are in duty bound to assume their share of the responsibility for dealing with these children, inasmuch as they are equally responsible for bringing them into existence.

I have been struck, when reading the press of this country, to find papers like the Montreal Gazette and Montreal Star denouncing public ownership day after day, when it must be apparent to every hon. member and every citizen that there is no other policy to be pursued. Lord Atholstan, the proprietor of the Star, took a hurried trip through the Western provinces last fall, and he announced that he was studying the railway question. Of course the Star is strongly against public ownership. Do these newspapers and do hon. members of the opposition desire that this country shall hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company all these railways that we have acquired, including the Grand Trunk, which doubtless soon will fall into our hands? Because if they adopt that policy the probabilities are that the country will be called upon to make good any deficits that may arise in connection with these roads.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve talks of private ownership. Private ownership has been the curse of the whole business. Private ownership has driven the great Canadian Northern System—hundreds and hundreds of miles of which never should have been constructed—into the hands of the country; we cannot help ourselves. The same thing has happened in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I interrupt my hon. friend? Assuming that private ownership is somewhat dangerous, does he not think that the Railway Commission can curb any predatory instincts inherent in private ownership by controlling freight rates?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not think so, and I will tell my hon. friend the reason why. I hold in my hands—I would like to read it, but I must hurry along—a copy of the Montreal Gazette, one of those papers that backs up Lord Shaughnessy in denouncing public ownership, and which follows the lead of the Montreal Star in that direction.

11 p.m.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no harm in that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Montreal Gazette says that when these railways come into the hands of the country the Government must see to it that rates sufficiently high are charged to pay operating expenses, upkeep and interest at 5 per cent on the capital invested. The capital cost of the Grand Trunk Railway is $127,000 a mile. In my judgment, it will be impossible, until Gabriel blows his trumpet, to pay 5 per cent on such a cost per mile.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is not so optimistic as some of his colleagues.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The capital cost of the Canadian Pacific railway is $68,000 a mile. Now, you see how these newspapers play into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because if the Government compels these railroads to charge rates to give a return of 5 per cent on the enormous capitalization, we cannot compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, and that is where public ownership would get a black eye at the outset.

Here is the only remedy—and I want my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, to follow me. I believe the party to which he belongs is a little more responsible than any other party for the great mistakes that have been made in the construction of these railroads. The Grand Trunk Pacific cost something like $97,000 a mile, and the Transcontinental cost an enormous sum per mile—I cannot give the exact figure. If the country has to take over these roads and set rates to pay operating expenses, upkeep and interest at 5 per cent on this vast over-capitalization, public ownership is a failure from the start. We must take our medicine. Both parties are equally responsible for the colossal mis-

takes that have been made. When we get the Grand Trunk system, as we shall in all probability, we will have to co-ordinate the entire public-owned system, and hundreds, if not thousands, of miles of railroad will be useless, because, owing to the folly of the people's own representatives, those useless lines were built. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern parallel each other for hundreds of miles through the Yellow Head Pass; you could throw a snowball from one line to the other. The Canadian Northern has many hundreds of useless miles of railway. I believe in the policy of the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) when Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced his policy to construct the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific —although I believe my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, if he were to make a frank confession, would say that that was a tremendous blunder. The right hon. gentleman's (Sir Robert Borden's) policy, as leader of the Opposition at that time, was that those roads should not be built, but that the Canadian Pacific railway should be double tracked around the north shore and the new railway system given running powers over the Canadian Pacific railway. That would have been the ideal policy and it would have saved a billion of dollars; but at that time we had in the West that prince of political cracksmen, Hon. Clifford Sifton, driving the thing through, and when he ran for Brandon he had a gang of railway engineers locating branch lines almost to the backyard of every Liberal who was recalcitrant and of every Tory who, he thought, might be influenced to vote for him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend seems surprised.

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend seems pleased. That is where thousands of miles of unnecessary railway were unloaded on the country. I have not spoken to any individual members of the Government, but the only sane system to be adopted, and the only system under which public ownership can possibly be made a success, is to co-ordinate the whole system, abolish every mile of unnecessary railway, and, after you have that done, let a commission state what shall be accounted the fair cost for the system, and what rates ought to be set to pay operating expenses, up-keep and, say, 5 per cent on the capitalization so ascertained. It would mean writing off from the public ledger probably half a billion dollars, but that is the only possible way in which public ownership can be made a success. And it is the just way, because both parties, I repeat, have been equally responsible for what has happened, and so have the people, because they have backed both parties in pursuing such an insane policy. So, let them take the consequences.

I was struck with the position taken by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve this afternoon when he said that Quebec did not get its share of these forty-two charters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Forty-four.

Mr. RICHARDSON: But the Acting Prime Minister dealt with that phase of the question so ably and so satisfactorily that I hesitate to refer to it again. It indicated, however, the trend of the hon. gentleman's mind: the West is getting a lot; why should not the East? Why should not Quebec get its share? He indicated that the construction of these railroads might be used for political purposes.

Mr. BUREAU Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON Well, that shows that in the mind of the hon. gentleman and perhaps in other gentlemen's minds—possibly in my good friend's (Mr. Bureau's) mind, in view of his "hear, hear"—there is the idea that the construction of railroads should be used for political purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: That is against my idea.

Mr. RICHARDSON; Now, in God's name —and I take His name on my lips with reverence—surely the time has come when that kind of thing should be eliminated from the life of the country. Surely a new era is dawning. Surely the idea of service must take the place of the idea of political patronage or political power. At any rate, if that is not in the minds of members of the House, it is in the minds of the people. The people are beginning to understand the significance of the railway question. The member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) said that he had grown tired of hearing about this railroad question.

Mr. CANNON: I did not say that I was tired; I said that the people were tired of the way this Government was handling the question.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am prepared to accept my hon. friend's statement, although if he refers to Hansard I think he will find that he used that language. However, I do not wish to attribute to him anything that

he did not say. But my point is that the people that he refers to will be a great deal more tired before they are through with this railway question. It is the most important issue so far as the economic interests of the country are concerned. I scarcely think that it takes second place to the tariff—though possibly the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) will not agree with me on that. The railway question affects in a vital sense the interests of the people; it affects them to the extent of millions yearly. If you increase the rates, just see what it costs. The Canadian Pacific has built up an enormous surplus. Why was it able to do so? As Sir John Willison said, what the country did for the Canadian Pacific was the most insane bargain ever entered into by a free people. We gave them sufficient subsidies to build and equip the line two or three times over; no wonder they are in a specially good position to take care of themselves. The Canadian Pacific was endowed in oriental fashion and the Government is blamed if it deals with the publicly-owned system in a reasonably generous way. In my judgment, there is only one way in which this matter can be dealt with and that is by the method that the Government have adopted. As I sat here to-night, having advocated public ownership for thirty years, it was an inspiring incident to me to find that at last the chief members of the Government were strongly in favour of that principle. Public ownership is nothing new, as might be inferred from the words of the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe). It is successful in the glorious country from which his ancestors come—France. I hesitate to quote Germany, but there the Government-owned railway system pays five per cent on the capital invested, and according to an article which I read in a magazine some time ago, four-fifths of the people travel at half-a-cent a mile because they have first, second, third and fourth classes. The Australasian colonies own all their railways. Switzerland, the most progressive republic in Europe, owns its railroads; Hungary owns its railroads, why should not Canada own its own railroads? Public ownership is the only system that can be followed; it has been forced upon the people. Such regulations must be enforced and the capitalization must be so limited that failure will be impossible. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company know that an efficient system can be created by the co-ordination of services, and that the people will be very friendly to their own system. I admire as much as does the Acting Prime Minister the way that the Canadian Pacific is managed and operated, and the ability of its staff. We must make of the Canadian National railways a system which will appeal to the people just as strongly as does the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister willing to act upon the agreement which we have had all along to adjourn at eleven o'clock?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not at all anxious that we sit late, but I do not think it is unreasonable to ask that we pass this one clause which we have been discussing all day, and take the Bill up again on Monday.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister must not forget that the Acting Prime Minister took up an hour and a quarter of the time of the Committee, the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) a few minutes and the member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) some little time also. The question of public ownership has been discussed and during that time we have been unable to deal with this particular clause. We did not, therefore, take up all the time of the Committee

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not finding fault with any one. We cannot get away from extending these charters; work has been done on them, and so on. I am not asking that we pass the schedule this evening, but why not pass this clause?

Mr. McKENZIE: I suggest that this section be left out of the Bill; that we go on with the Bill and incorporate the company, and that after the company is incorporated, which I hope will be within a short time, my hon. friend can come back to the House with a separate Bill asking for the revival of these charters. That Bill can then go to the Railway Committee; the officers of the company can be there and explain which of these forty-four charters they want extended or renewed. They may want them all; they may not want any of them. I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be about as effective obstruction as the ingenuity of the human mind could devise. We have discussed all day the renewal of charters that were the possession of companies that are now the property of the Dominion. We have asked now to pass the rest of the Bill, then come to Parliament with the proposal to renew these charters, then go over the resolution, with four or five discussions on that; then have the discussion in committee again; then the third reading—the whole thing duplicated. In a word, we are asked

to start back to-night, in so far as all this routine goes, just where we commenced some weeks ago. That is considered a fair proposition by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BUREAU: This is the first intimation we have had of these new roads. I would ask also that the second schedule be printed in Hansard so that we shall have copies of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be printed to-night.

Mr. BUREAU: Is the minister going to have the Bill printed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The schedule will be printed.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What agreement does the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) refer to, that we should adjourn at eleven o'clock at night? That is an agreement we are not all acquainted with, and I should like to suggest to him that it is really only a quarter past ten by the sun. The night is therefore, quite young.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know if my hon. friend would call it an agreement. It was an arrangement between the acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) and myself that was made in the early stages of the session. It was made at his suggestion, not mine.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I suppose my hon. friend will want to get through the session this year. I am not in any hurry and we have had a rather pleasant session so far.

Mr. BUREAU: I am surprised at my hon. friend wanting to be so retrograde. He is generally quite a progressive man.

Mr. McKENZIE: It has been hurled across the floor of the House, very broadly insinuated by the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), and not insinuated at all, but stated, by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomes White), that there was on this side of the House a combination of hon. gentlemen, who represented the Canadian Pacific railway, putting up this obstruction. I can only say that such a statement is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact and is an insinuation and statement which reflects upon the honour and honesty of men on this side of the House. If the Acting Prime Minister thinks it is to his honour to be a member of a Parliament which is capable of having an Opposition of such a character as he describes, I do not think that is very much to his credit. I am sorry he is not here at present as I wish to tell him that, if my estimation of him would mean anything to him. I am very sorry to have heard him making the heated statements he made to-day. I hope when he reads them in print, he will be sorry for having allowed his passion to carry him away to the extent of branding honourable members on this side as being in the pay of any concern or influenced by any consideration except that of duty to the people. If anybody on that side thinks that was a proper position for the leader of the Government to take, I am very much surprised. A great deal has been said about where and how we stand in regard to this business. Last year there was not a word about this company or this policy, and I wish to put myself right by stating exactly what I said last year when there was not a word about what is being done now. Last year, when the Estimates of the Minister of Railways were before the House, I said, in part, as reported on page 2191 of Hansard:

Mr. McKenzie: It is important for the people that we should have some conception of what we are doing. If this were a meeting of directors it would not be a very cheerful one. The directors and shareholders would have discovered that we were spending away up in the millions in the development and working of the road, but that we have made no money. We are in debt. If we were ordinary directors and shareholders of a road we would have to put our hands down in our pockets to find money in order to make betterments and to run the road, and that would not be a cheerful prospect. However, we are new beginners in this enterprise. I was never in favour of Government ownership.

There can be no mistake about where I stood.

I am not in favour of it now; as I think private enterprise will do better in these matters. Particularly in colonization and development, will private enterprise and private energy do much better than Government ownership.

Now I want to be perfectly plain.

But, by the force of circumstances, we are in this net, and we must stay in it and make the most of it—that is the way I view it.

No mistake about that.

While a great railway like the Canadian Pacific is being conducted privately we have something to compare our works with. It would be interesting for myself as a citizen of Canada and a member of this House to know how our expenses per mile of operation, for merely running the road, compare with the expenses of the Canadian Pacific. It would be interesting to know how our expenses for betterments, for keeping the road in repair, for rolling stock and all other requirements compare with those of the Canadian Pacific. Everybody admits that

their road is well managed and that it is well equipped. It is making money. It is in the same country side by side with ours, and there is no reason why we should not have just as brainy and as capable men to run our road as they have. I would expect the Minister of Railways to come to this House and make a favourable comparison between his railway and the privately owned line and to be able to show that he is making money.

Surely hon. gentlemen will do me the credit of believing that I was stating my honest mind at that time. This Bill was not in sight; nobody was thinking about it. I am in exactly the same position now as I was then. If I had my own way, we would not have this road at all. But we have it, and my position is that we must make the most and the best of it. My best evidence is what I said before, and I have not changed one iota. I am anxious that this road should be administered in the best possible manner and not be encumbered by old things. I am sure my good friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) is one of those men who do not want to have this new enterprise loaded down with unnecessary baggage of Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am with you heartily.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is not in the West a man who wants this enterprise handicapped by enterprises of Mackenzie and Mann which were a failure from start to finish as regards making a success of railways, and I am opposed to loading down this new enterprise with 44 enterprises of Mackenzie and Mann, of which we know nothing and which may contain entanglements that are going to be an everlasting difficulty for this concern. My good friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) shakes his head. He may find nothing in it whether he shakes it or not. I know that I am safe on this ground anyhow, that we have all the machinery necessary for building a road by the Government in any part of the West or any part of Canada where they think, in their best judgment, it is advisable to build it. We have this Bill which we are putting through, section 23 of which says that we can construct railways wherever we like. We have the old Railway Act which is made applicable to this section except where it is inconsistent with this Bill. We have a distinct Government Railways Act, and all we have to do is to add two lines to this section of the Bill saying that the Government Railway Act will apply. Then, we have in the hands of the company all the powers and privileges of the Government Railways Act with all the other legislation we have. With all that machinery and all those powers, why should we go to the graveyards of the west to resurrect those old carcasses of Mackenzie and Mann enterprises? If these unwholesome, unseemly carcasses are to be resurrected and brought into this House we should have them put in a room by themselves where we should not all be compelled to inhale the unsavoury mess. I am not hampering this enterprise or the men to be appointed. I have met Mr. Hanna a few times, and I hope he will be on this new enterprise; I think he is a gentleman of large views and great capacity. But, apart from him, let me tell the Government in all honesty that the people of this country do not want to carry all the baggage of Mackenzie and Mann.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Mr. Hamilton?

Mr. McKENZIE: The Minister of Immigration will look after him. I understand that a life annuity of some kind is being provided for that gentleman, who was the minister's opponent. I think I have made perfectly clear why I am opposed to the resurrecting all these useless Acts of incorporation. Why should we tie up this new concern to a charter, with some money belonging to a province in a bank somewhere, and say that it must follow the line laid down by that charter? We do not want to take anybody's money but our own to build this railway. Some machinery can be found by which that money will go to the provinces. That will be better for the provinces. Agreements have been made with Mackenzie and Mann which were not favourable to the people, and if we take over these charters we take over the agreement with them; we take over the locations, and all the encumbrances imposed upon the people by Mackenzie and Mann. We know nothing about these charters, we have not a syllable of information about them. And we are said to be disloyal, obstructionists, and in the pay of the Canadian Pacific simply because we do not want these agreements foisted upon the Canadian people without knowing something about them. It is well known that some of these charters have been dead for ten years. Is it reasonable to suppose that we, the representatives of the people, will sit here and give our "Amen" to legislation of that kind of which we are entirely ignorant and about which hon. gentlemen opposite can tell us nothing? I say: Go on with your Bill, incorporate your

company, and get the men who know all about these things—Mr. Hanna knows all about them—to come before a special committe, and I pledge myself that there will be no opposition to putting through the legislation in the most expeditious way possible, if Mr. Hanna says it is necessary to have these charters, and that they will be in the interests of the people of the West and the national railway system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will scarcely escape or enable his party to escape from the position in which he has allowed them to be led, and indeed has led them, through the whole course of this day, by the speech which he has just delivered.

Mr. McKENZIE: The day is far spent now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And little has been done, and the hon. gentleman is responsible, and those that sit around him. He resents the imputation that the influence of private corporations is at the back of the opposition to this clause. The events will speak for themselves. The speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite speak for themselves. The speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve speaks for itself, and is doubtless well known to the country by this time. He did not take the ground that charters were encumbrances. Nobody in this Parliament or any other ever suggested that idea. Charters entail no obligations, charters are rights which may be exercised or not as the company, under the approval of Government and Parliament, determine them to be wise. To describe them as "obligations," and "carcasses," and "baggage," and "wrecks," is to assume that the hon. members are children or fools. Charters are rights. We know they are rights; we know they are not encumbrances. The country knows they are rights, and the country knows that there is some reason for this opposition to charter rights being granted to the Canadian National railway system. The hon. member for Maisonneuve was quite clear. He said that he was opposed to them for one reason, because if they were assumed by the Canadian National Railway System, which originally held them—and no one else held them—they would not be at the disposal of private corporations. Those words have a clear meaning; no one can mistake them. They would not be at the disposal of private corporations. But I do not attach so much weight to words as I do to deeds.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I never said that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member tell me what he said?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will explain for the third time what I said. When we were discussing clause 20 my hon. friend announced to the Committee that he had a list or schedule containing forty-four charters to be revived by that clause. I said: Now the Government does not intend to build those railways—my hon. friend himself said the Board did not intend to build those railways, and that he only wanted to revive the charters. I said: This is a blank collective charter that you are giving to forty-four subsidiary lines of the Canadian Northern, and when these railways are needed, the charters will prevent private corporations or the provinces from building those railways where they are needed. I blamed the Government for putting a blank collective charter in the hands of the Board when the Government did not intend to build.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has stated his position precisely as I stated it, only in a lot more words.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. Be honest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would prevent private corporations from building on charters which constituents of the Canadian National Railways own, and which we now seek to own.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose you do not build.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One sure fact is that we cannot build unless we revive the charters. If the hon. member is afraid of our not building, let him put us to the test by reviving the charters.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister say he cannot build without these charters?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do. Until these charters are revived we cannot build as this Bill will pass. Is that clear enough? I repeat, I do not attach so much weight to words as I do to deeds. Here we have sat all day asking that a clause pass which merely approves of the revival of charters fixed in a schedule, while that schedule itself awaits the consideration of this Committee and may be amended by this Committee by the striking out of any charter right embodied in it. We simply ask the Committee to affirm in general the revival of charters, leaving the specific charters to the further determination of

the Committee. While that is all we ask, we are faced all day with a stubborn opposition, and here at midnight we are told that this simple clause cannot pass after all this consideration. Is the country to draw no inference? What inference can it draw?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman does not know, but I am afraid the country knows.

Mr. BUREAU: Make allowance for the time you spent in discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will not allow one clause to pass which merely asserts that the Canadian National Railways may revive charters, when he himself knows, as do all hon. members, that the Committee is at liberty to say later on what charters may be revived.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think my hon. friend is all wrong. It is wrong to ask us to revive forty-four charters, saying that later on he is going to pare them down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that we did not say we would pare anything down. When the schedule to this clause is considered, which it must be when all the clauses are through, this Committee may take out any one of these charters or all of them, or may add to the list. In the face of that, and knowing that he commits himself to no single charter by the passing of this clause, he asserts that he cannot let this clause go through. What must be the judgment of the country on that attitude?

Mr. McKENZIE: I leave nothing to inference. I have stated absolutely and clearly what my position is this year and what my position was last year. I care not what suggestion the minister may make as to what inference the country may draw.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I take the hon. gentleman's position and I believe that it is one of opposition to Government ownership. His opinion of Government ownership might lead him to criticise this Bill. I am free to admit that he is opposed to Government ownership, and he can stand or fall before the country on that. He has not been at all equivocal on that point. But because he is opposed to Government ownership, is that any explanation of why he should refuse to let the Committee vote on a simple clause of this Bill the only intent of which is the revival of specific charters which are still awaiting the consideration of the Committee? Is that the necessary corollary of his disbelief in the principle of Government ownership? It has no relation to it whatever. I still await an explanation of why the hon. gentleman cannot allow this clause to pass after a whole day's deliberation.

Mr. BUREAU: The amendment reads:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act which any of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern system were authorized to construct, are hereby extended for two years and five years respectively after the passing of this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And we will submit these charters when the schedule is under consideration and they can then be dealt with

Mr. BUREAU: After the clause is passed you have revived for from two to five years every line of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subject to consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: There is absolutely no restriction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman knows right well that the schedule can be amended when we come to its consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not discussing that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say that the schedule cannot be amended, abbreviated or extended when we come to its consideration?

Mr. BUREAU: I am not under cross-examination; I am reading the amendment drafted by my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why will the hon. gentleman not answer the question?

Mr. BUREAU: I am not answering questions; I am putting a question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can answer it myself.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman drafted the law and has to stand by it. The section as proposed to be amended provides that:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this Act—are hereby extended.

You cannot separate the clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not need to separate the clause.

Mr. BUREAU: These extensions are all granted without being mentioned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly; when the schedule is complete the whole thing is complete, but until the schedule is complete, it is not finally settled. As long as the hon. gentleman admits that when we come to the consideration of the schedule he can decide whether any or all of those contained in the schedule shall be allowed to remain. Then the passing of this clause does not commit us finally to the adoption of the whole schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Chairman, you ruled this afternoon that the schedule was to be considered last. I claim this cannot meet the case that we are considering.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The cases are the same.

Mr. BUREAU: My contention is that we base our opinion as to whether we ought to pass this or not on the schedule itself, and we decide whether the charters mentioned therein deserve or do not deserve to be revived or extended. My hon. friend cannot argue that after we have revived all these charters by passing section 20 we can go back and strike out any from the schedule that we do not approve of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not worded any differently from any other clause that refers to a schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not care how it is worded.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say I cannot find him a case where the very same wording has been used referring to a schedule, adopting it and where the schedule has not been amended?

Mr. BUREAU And the schedule omitted?

Mr. MEIGHEN The schedule not omitted, but considered afterwards, and amended?

Mr. BUREAU: It might not be an identical case.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of the Interior seems to be very anxious about the opinions of the country on our attitude towards the Bill. If he is so anxious he might go up to North Ontario, open that constituency and see how the people of Ontario, where they have the hydro-electric—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. VIEN: We have heard from the treasury benches insinuations which are hardly in keeping with the high offices of the gentlemen who have offered them. We have heard the insinuation that the interest we take in this matter is absolutely simulated. These are the exact words used by the Acting Prime Minister—that we are not trying to safeguard the interests of the people, but that we were simulating. He made another statement which to my mind is as unfortunate—that the gentlemen on this side of the House, when speaking on this matter, were actuated only by the purpose of fostering private interests and particularly the interests of the Canadian Pacific. He also accused the Opposition of unduly delaying the enactment of this clause. The hon. member (Mr. Richardson), speaking after him, said that we were opposed to the extension of time which this clause purports to give for the construction of various branch lines. These insinuations are absolutely unwarranted. The Opposition has a right, and it is its duty, to carefully study the measures brought down by the Government, particularly when we are in Committee of the Whole. This is not the first time in which it has been said that this country had been overburdened with duplicated railway lines. In the Drayton-Acworth report attention is drawn to the fact that we had duplicated railway lines. The Acting Prime Minister in his remarks said that we had overbuilt railways in Canada and that several lines overlap. And yet in the presence of the Drayton-Acworth Report accusing both parties of having overbuilt railways in the presence of the Prime Minister's statement to the effect that lines had been duplicated and were overlapping, the Minister of Railways lays on the Table a schedule which proposes a blanket authorization for forty-four branch lines. We are not objecting to the construction of these lines; we are simply going into the matter carefully.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VIEN: Some hon. members laugh, but if they will recall what has been said in the House to-day they will realize that the discussion has not been confined to the discussion of clause 20, or of the schedule annexed to it. When the Acting Prime Minister complained that the Opposition was delaying the enactment of this clause he might better have directed his complaints to the Dominion Day patriotic and political rambling of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). But no, he only had bouquets to offer to that hon. gentleman, giving further ground for the suspicion that political action is contemplated here, and that this section is brought in only for political purposes. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very sensitive to the imputation that they are not always actuated by pub-

lic interest, and yet they have the effrontery to suggest that we are actuated by other motives. There should be no surprise at the Opposition asking quite a few questions before giving a blanket authorization to build forty-four branch lines. The members of the ministry have had ample time to peruse what that schedule contains, but we on this side have not had the same opportunity. We simply ask the Minister of Railways to allow the clause to stand until we have had a chance to discover what it actually means.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would like to make an explanation with reference to the schedule which I handed in. Originally it was contemplated to renew all the charters but hon. genlemen opposite declared that they wanted the charters specified. I therefore asked the Departmental Solicitor to give me a list of the lines on which it was necessary for us to do work this year. He complied with my request, and that in the schedule which has been so much discussed, relating to undertakings that will have to go through this year. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask for time to consider the schedule, and the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) doubts whether if this clause were passed it would not also mean the adoption of the schedule. Let me assure my hon. friends that if the clause is passed, when we come to deal with the schedule each of the forty-four railways can be considered separately if so desired. I mention that so that my hon. friends will see we are not endeavouring to force anything through. I would ask them to let the clause pass, so that we may consider we have done some business to-day. It is only one out of thirty clauses, and I ask that we be allowed to take the vote on it, with the understanding that the schedule be considered in detail when we come to take it up.

Mr. VIEN: I would point out to the minister that if we pass clause 20 we admit the principle.

Mr. CALDER: With respect to the list of charters, I can claim to know the railway situation in the province of Saskatchewan, because I was Minister of Railways there for five years. Many of these charters were originally granted by the Saskatchewan Government, and I know exactly the position in regard to them. As a matter of fact the construction of a number of these railways will be proceeding very soon, and it is absolutely necessary to have these charters renewed. The Canadian National Railway Company will actually be at work on some of them in the course of a few weeks, so that it is imperative that the principle embodied in this section should be adopted by the House. As the Minister of Railways has said, when the time comes for the consideration of the schedule there will be the fullest opportunity to discuss every one of these lines, and if it is thought necessary or advisable to strike out any of the projected railways, well and good. So far as the twenty or thirty lines in the province of Saskatchewan are concerned, I am acquainted with the situation and I can say that no single one of those charters can be dropped. I daresay the same holds true of the remaining sections.

Mr. VIEN: It is very possible that when the clause and the schedule are closely examined we might not find any cause of objection to them. If the schedule is going to be scrutinized in detail at a later date, surely there can be no objection to letting the clause itself stand until the next sitting of the House, so as to allow us to fully digest its provisions. In that way, we may save much of the Committee's time, and probably facilitate the ultimate passage of both the clause and the schedule. Both practically mean the same thing, and if we approve of one we surely approve of the other.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question.

Mr. VIEN: No. If the minister is not willing to agree to that, we are willing to go on.

Mr. J. D. REID: All right.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want anything that might appear like unreasonable delay. The Minister of Colonization and Immigration expressed himself as having personal knowledge of these charters. It must not be understood for one moment that we want to do anything that will delay the building of necessary roads, but he must give me credit for the position I take. These are local charters granted by the legislature of Saskatchewan.

Mr. CALDER: Some of them.

Mr. McKENZIE: Those with which he is particularly familiar were charters granted by the legislature of Saskatchewan. The position that I want to impress upon the minister is that the people of Saskatchewan are surer of getting their roads built when the Dominion Government undertakes to build them. Mackenzie and Mann, who are behind these charters, cannot build those roads.

Mr. CALDER: May I interrupt my hon. friend? The local company to which the charters were originally granted by the province of Saskatchewan have since been amalgamated with the Canadian Northern Railway system, and those charters do not now belong to that local company, they belong to the parent company, because amalgamation has since taken place.

Mr. J. D. REID: They belong now to us.

Mr. CALDER: And as they now belong to the parent company, practically all the charters belong to the Government itself.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is exactly the position I take and which the hon. gentleman does not seem to comprehend. Those smaller companies went into the parent company. All right, let us admit that. The parent company, nolens volens, went into the hands of the Government, and the Government is creating a piece of machinery to work the whole thing under Government control through this company that it creates. Now, I may be the dullest man in this House, but I do not see any further necessity for those old charters. I submit that we have sufficient machinery in legislation to go on with these works and do everything that is necessary to construct the railways, if we have the money to construct, and incorporate them in this company when they are built. I have not been in any way satisfied that the carrying forward of those old companies is necessary. If I were convinced to the contrary I would be only too happy to take them over. So far as I can see, by taking them over we are only binding ourselves to carry out the agreements made by those companies, about which we know nothing, and lots of complications may ensue—in fact some have already been mentioned. If we are going to build those roads under Government supervision, for the Canadian people, let us do so absolutely free from any entanglements whatsoever. That is all I want. If the Minister of Colonization can show me that it is necessary to keep alive those old concerns which are amalgamated now in the parent company—and we are replacing that parent company by this legislation—I shall be happy to accept his view; but it seems to me like a man buying a new automobile and tying his old one behind it; he cannot go anywhere in his new automobile without towing the old one. Our opposition is not in the least factious, indeed, our only desire is that this legislation shall be put through in the best possible way.

12 p.m.

Mr. CALDER: I quite realize the stand taken by the leader of the Opposition in reference to the number of these lines, and I think there should be the fullest opportunity given to the House to know exactly what the position is in the case of every one of these charters. They are not all the same. All that is asked for in this section is simply an extension of the time within which these lines shall be built. Let me give a very simple example of what the situation is with regard to one of them, and it will apply to others I know very well. We gave a charter for the building of a line from Yorkton to Craven, just north of Regina; about 46 or 47 miles of that line is now built ending out in the prairie; at the other end there is about eight miles built; bonds have been issued and much of the money has been spent; there may be some money remaining, but the only company in the world that can take up and complete that line is the Canadian Northern. There are a number of other lines in Saskatchewan in exactly the same position. I repeat again, all that is asked for at the present time is to place the railway company in a position where it can proceed with some of those lines, which must be undertaken and completed within a comparatively short time. That is the only principle involved in this section. When we come to the schedule many of the matters that have been referred to by the leader of the Opposition and other hon. members will be open for discussion, and if thought advisable, any of the lines referred to in the schedule may be struck out. But I can see no reason why the principle of this section should not be adopted.

Mr. J. D. REID: I would like to explain another matter to the leader of the Opposition. He made the statement that if this Bill passes the Government can build a railway at any place in Canada without coming to Parliament.

Mr. McKENZIE: With the approval of the Governor in Council under section 23.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; and that is one of the reasons why there is so much opposition to the Bill. I mentioned yesterday and I want to repeat again in case the hon. gentleman may have overlooked my statement, that the position is this: We cannot possibly go on with the construction of the railways we are asking for unless we have the charters renewed. I agree with the hon. member that we could strike out this clause altogether if section 23 were passed in its

present form, but I mentioned yesterday that when we come to deal with that section, I was going to amend it in a way that would change it entirely. I have the amendment here and if it would not be out of order I would like to read it and give the information now. The hon. member will then see that so far as the Canadian National railways are concerned we cannot go on with any lines other than those enumerated in the schedule without coming to Parliament and getting a charter in the regular way. The only way the Government can build railways without getting a charter is by putting an item in the Estimates; and that item must be passed before construction can be proceeded with. I intend to ask the committee to amend section 23 by inserting after the word "description" in the eighth line thereof, the following words:

> In respect of the construction whereof respectively Parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities.

That would mean that if we wanted to construct new lines we would have to put an amount in the Estimates for that purpose. Another way would be for Parliament to authorize the Government to guarantee the bonds of the new line, and to sell the bonds. But in either case we could not proceed with the construction of any new lines other than those mentioned in this schedule without coming to Parliament. With the assurance that section 23 is to be amended in this way, that these railway charters must be extended, and that each railway will be considered separately when we come to the schedule, surely it is not unfair to ask that a vote be taken on section 20 before we adjourn.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the objection to letting the section stand until we reach the schedule?

Mr. VIEN: We should have some information before this clause is adopted. How many branch lines for which charters have been given or in respect of which construction powers have been obtained from Provincial Governments are dropped from the schedule? What branch line among those mentioned have been subsidized as to construction by Provincial Governments or other governments, and in what way can we revive their charters? How can we revive them when authority for the construction has been granted by provincial statute?

Mr. CALDER: When we acquired the Canadian Northern Railway we took over those lines which were part of that system.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

The Dominion Government stands simply in the position of the Canadian Northern; the position of the provinces has not been altered. The provinces have guaranteed the principal and interest on those bonds, and if there is a default the provinces could be called upon.

Mr. VIEN: Does not the province guarantee the interest on the bonds provided the construction is commenced and finished within a certain time?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: Then how could Parliament extend the time of construction and revive a provincial charter?

Mr. CALDER: Our legislation provided for the amalgamation of these lines with the parent company. Since that amalgamation took place these lines ceased to be provincial lines and became Federal lines.

Mr. VIEN: We were led to believe this afternoon that in several instances provincial grants have been given by way either of money grant or of bond guarantee, and that unless we revived the construction power those subsidies would be lost or the guarantee of bonds become void. We are now asking ourselves: In what way can a law of this kind revive a provincial statute, even if these branch lines have been incorporated with a system which has been taken over by the Government? The fact that the Canadian Government has taken over the Canadian Northern does not give to Parliament the right to extend the time of construction mentioned in a provincial statute.

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes, it does. If the hon. member has been in the Railway Committee he will understand the situation. When a railway that has a provincial charter asks this Parliament that it be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada that makes it a Dominion charter and if the road is to be further extended, this Parliament is the only authority to grant that extension. That brings the road under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. When we took the Canadian Northern Railway system over, all those provincial lines were declared in the Act to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and, therefore, this Parliament is the only legislative assembly that can extend the time for construction.

Mr. VIEN: Will this extension, even if it is within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, have the effect of maintaining the

guarantee of bonds, or the subsidies offered by the provincial authorities?

Mr. J. D. REID: It would, but as regards the construction of roads on which provincial guarantees have been given, the only action we could take in connection with those guarantees would be to use in construction any money that is now in the banks from the sale of bonds. Bonds have not been sold for the whole construction of the roads. Supposing in the Canadian Northern Railway Company there was a charter, with the bonds guaranteed by a Provincial Government, for a hundred miles. If we have constructed 25 miles, it is not the intention of the Government to say to the Provincial Government: You have guaranteed bonds, and although we own the road, we want you to guarantee the bonds on the further 75 miles. This Government will furnish the bonds as regards any further construction of such lines.

Mr. VIEN: Would it not be fair for the Government to ask the provinces to live up to the guarantees they had given of bonds of those branch lines? Would it not also be fair to ask the provinces which are going to benefit from the construction of those lines, to give the Federal Government the same advantages that they would have given to a private corporation?

Mr. J. D. REID: The Committee might argue on that point, but I would not consider it fair. If the Canadian National railways are going to construct fifty miles of those lines that we are to complete, and are going to issue bonds in the name of the Canadian National Railways, or practically of the Dominion Government, I do not think the hon. member would suggest that we should ask the local Government to guarantee those bonds, because it is only right that they should be guaranteed by the Government that owns and constructs the railway.

Mr. VIEN: There are a number of other questions which we are going to put to the Government as to the construction of those branch lines, not with any purpose of unduly obstructing their construction or the authority to construct them, but simply to do our duty to the country, because, in view of what has already been said as to duplication of lines, we should not be asked to give a blanket authorization. It would expedite the matter if the clause were allowed to stand with the schedule, and then the whole thing will pass as soon as we have had an opportunity to go into it carefully.

Mr. J. D. REID: We cannot pass the clause and schedule together; we would have to come back and pass this clause again. When we come to the schedule there are practically 44 clauses to pass, because each railway in the schedule can be taken up separately, and I shall have officials here to give all information in connection with each one. If the Committee feels that any charter should not be extended, we can just strike it out. The passing of this clause does not pass the schedule of the 44 railways. We must, however, renew the charters, and, therefore, I think it is not unfair to ask the House to pass this clause.

Mr. VIEN: It is not logical to pass a clause which gives to the Government authorization to build the various railways mentioned in the schedule. If we are not prepared to pass the schedule, we should not be prepared to pass the clause, because the schedule is practically embodied in the clause.

Mr. BUREAU: Who owns the real estate on the townsites along those lines which are mentioned in schedule 2 and the charters of which we are asked to revive?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am informed there are no townsites yet where the railways are intended to be built.

Mr. BUREAU: There may not be towns, but have not townsites been chosen? Have the locations of the stations not been determined upon? Who owns the property round the proposed sites of the stations?

Mr. J. D. REID: Where the railways are not built, we do not own anything yet. If we decide to construct the lines, we shall have to buy whatever property we require.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not speaking about the right of way, but about the station sites. It is spoken of openly that Mackenzie and Mann own property all along that line, and that the object of reviving those particular charters, one of which is located in each of the counties of Saskatchewan and Alberta, is two-fold—first, to induce the electorate to support the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and second, to allow Mackenzie and Mann to speculate on the properties when the charters are revived. We may just as well let that cat out of the bag. The Canadian Pacific are not behind the matter in this instance.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister not answer the question?

Mr. J. D. REID: I do not know who owns the property. We would have to buy land for the right of way.

Mr. BUREAU: The committee should have that information.

Mr. J. D. REID: We shall come to it when we come to the railways in the schedule.

Mr. BUREAU: If we admit the principle of the thing, when we come to the railways in the list, as usual when we come to the end of a Bill, that will be brushed aside with a wave of the hand. If the minister will tell us how much land the Mackenzie and Mann interests own there, and how much of it is going to be traversed by these railways, we shall be able to discuss the matter in a more intelligent manner.

Mr. CAHILL: What mileage was built last year? I understand there was some construction.

Mr. J. D. REID: The solicitor tells me that there was no construction last year.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of Immigration and Colonization a few moments ago made the statement that it is absolutely necessary that charters should be extended in this way for the reason that spring was coming and in a few days, presumably, the contractors would be able to go on with construction, which was necessary. I would ask whether the Government did not expect two months ago to have this Bill before Parliament, and if so, why did not they ask for an extension of the charters before the Railway Committee in the usual way? Instead of that, they bring down a Bill prepared by Mr. Lash, and the Acting Prime Minister waxes eloquent over public ownership. Now Mr. Lash is not generally known throughout Canada or Ontario as a great advocate of public ownership; neither is Mr. Hanna, nor Mr. Wood, nor Mr. Mitchell, nor any of the other gentlemen at the head of this undertaking.

Mr. COWAN: What difference does that make?

Mr. CAHILL: All the difference in the world. It means that the Government, instead of giving public ownership a fair and honest chance, are handling it through Mackenzie and Mann, Lash, Hanna, Mitchell, Wood, and the same old gang that has been reaping the harvest from this country for years. Now that it is proposed to construct lines, I presume the Northern Construction Company will come in for some forty-odd construction contracts. Or will the Government let the contracts to the lowest bidder in the usual way, or on a cost-plus basis? The cost-plus basis seems to be the favourite plan of the Minister of Railways. The Government might also tell us whether they expect this railway will be run in a businesslike way, or whether it expects to hand out to it several million dollars a year from the treasury. The Minister of Railways stated in the House a few days ago that the surplus earnings over operating expenses were $3,000,000. Am I correct?

Mr. J. D. REID: The net earnings were $3,000,000 odd.

Mr. CAHILL: And the gross deficit $7,000,000. Would the Minister say how he arrives at his figures? There are $470,000,000 odd of bonds on which interest has to be paid, and it is a fair assumption that the rate will not be less than 4 per cent, which brings the interest to $18,800,000. Now if you deduct the surplus earnings of $3,000,000 from $18,800,000, you have a deficit of $15,800,000. Is not that correct? Where does the Government expect to get with this undertaking when they make such ridiculous statements—statements that are out of all proportion and absolutely against reason and common sense? One member of the Government tells us that we are hopelessly in debt and face a deficit of $100,000,000. Another member of the Government tells us that we have increased our national wealth since the war began. The only way in which our wealth has been increased since the war began is by the Minister of Finance grinding out with his printing press treasury bills and Dominion notes, departing in the first instance from sound finance, in order to pay the Canadian Northern Railway. Why will not the minister explain how he arrives at his figures?

Mr. ROWELL: Because it has absolutely nothing to do with the clause under discussion, and would only help you to consume more of the time of the House.

Mr. CAHILL: Why did the hon. member make the statement if it was irrelevant to the question? My question was based on his statement. Well, we are going on with this great undertaking with one member of the Government telling us one thing, and another member another. Where do we expect to get in view of that kind of thing? The minister came down here yesterday with this Bill, and the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) was opposed to changing one single letter of it; he would

not even name the head office. But suddenly, to-day, without any apparent reason, he slips in this amendment concerning forty-four branch lines. Now there are fifty seats in Western Canada, six of them in cities, and forty-four in the rural districts. I have not had an opportunity of looking at this amendment, and the minister asks us to empower the Government to build, I presume, one line of railway in every one of those forty-four rural constituencies.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the building of these branch lines in Western Canada?

Mr. CAHILL: I want to know where they are to be built. I am not as willing as my hon. friend to swallow this thing holus-bolus.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I have looked through the schedule of the lines in the province of Alberta, and six or seven of the eighteen lines are already under construction and serving the people.

Mr. CAHILL: Why does not the Government give the Committee full information? We are getting more enlightenment from the back benches than from the front, and may get somewhere if the back benchers will continue to enlighten us.

Mr. BOYS: Do you not accept the word of the Minister of Railways that when the schedule is reached you will be able to discuss all these charters?

Mr. CAHILL: I never heard of it.

Mr. BOYS: It has been stated on his honour that all these charters can be discussed then.

Mr. CAHILL: When the minister is proposing a Bill he always refers to his Estimates and says: That is the place to ask questions. When we come to his Estimates, he says: Why not discuss this on the Bill?

Mr. KEEFER Did you not hear the Minister of Railways say that there will be a full opportunity to take these matters into consideration when we come to deal with the schedule, and did you not hear the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) say the same thing?

Mr. CAHILL: What is the sense of passing the section if we have to go back and discuss it again?

Mr. BOYS: What is the objection to the course suggested and guaranteed by the minister?

Mr. CAHILL: What is the question?

Mr. BOYS: He says that when you come to the schedule you will get an opportunity of discussing every one of these charters and that the officials will be here and lay before the Committee all the information the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the necessity of passing this clause if you are going to deal with the schedule later on? Why not discuss this question in the Railway Committee where it belongs and where each of us can ask the officers any questions we wish to put to them?

Mr. BOYS: In the practice of the House, I do not think a Government Bill goes to the Railway Committee.

Mr. CAHILL: This is not a Government Bill; the minister is organizing a company.

Mr. BOYS: It is a Bill introduced by the Government.

Mr. CAHILL: The Government will not even audit the accounts. They are simply handing it over to Mackenzie and Mann to look after.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Is the hon. gentleman aware that nearly every one of these charters is a provincial one and not under federal control in so far as extension is concerned?

Mr. CAHILL: That is also news to me, and I am thankful for it. If the Government will give us the information we are looking for we will find out something about the Bill eventually.

Mr. BOYS: What information do you really want?

Mr. CAHILL: I have asked the Minister of Railways several times why not go to the Railway Committee?

Mr. BOYS: The answer is that it is not the practice of this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg pardon; I was in Parliament when the National Transcontinental Railway Bill was introduced and it went direct to the Railway Committee.

Mr. BOYS: I think the hon. gentleman will agree that it is not the practice of the House to refer Government Bills to the Railway Committee. Although that may have been true on a former occasion, it has not been the practice since this Government has been in office

Mr. LEMIEUX: I gave you one instance.

Mr. CAHILL: This is in no sense a Government Bill. Are the Government going to take power to build branch lines any where they like, as they are doing by this Bill and holding it out as a bait to the western members, telling them that if they do not support this Government they will not get these roads, but if they do they will get them instead of tariff reduction? If the Government were honest with the Opposition and with their supporters they would have come down with a statement showing what these lines were and where they proposed to build them. Do you expect us to sanction the building of forty-odd railway extensions without knowing where they are?

Mr. MORPHY: They are all set out in the schedule.

Mr. CAHILL: Where is the schedule?

Mr. MORPHY: Every member of the House has it.

Mr. CAHILL: It has not even been distributed yet. You may have received one but you are closer to the treasury benches than I am.

Mr. MORPHY: The leader of the Opposition has one.

Mr. McKENZIE: I just got it now. It was not given to me but I borrowed it from somebody else.

Mr. BOYS: The hon. member for Three Rivers had it two hours ago.

Mr. CAHILL: I am afraid I will have to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to keep order. The Government are obstructing so much that we are unable to get information. I am quite willing to answer any question that any member wishes to put to me.

Mr. KEEFER: Will you answer it correctly and fairly?

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member has no business to put a question of that kind.

Mr. CAHILL: I will agree to answer any question just as honestly as any member on that side and much more honestly than my hon. friend.

Mr. KEEFER: You are not really desiring to kill time?

Mr. CAHILL: Hon. gentlemen are obstructing again. Surely these hon. gentlemen do not expect this debate to be carried on here with a number of officials around that we cannot ask questions of. The Government will have to turn to each of these officials and get them to answer the questions we put. I would like to take the schedule, go to a railway map and see where these lines are proposed to be constructed. Instead of asking us to swallow forty-four lines to be built throughout Western Canada without regard to where they are to be built or their mileage, the Government should consent to a reference of this Bill to the Railway Committee. On the first discussion of this subject the minister made the statement that the directors were temporary. He said he wanted to divorce the railway management as far as possible from politics and the Government. Now he comes back and we have a new policy laid down to build forty-four lines. The day before yesterday he said that they had no policy yet because the Government were going to appoint new directors who would be practically independent. Now he comes along and tells us that they propose to build forty-four lines all of which have apparently been sanctioned by these temporary directors. When you remember that the temporary directorate have already arranged to spend $70,000,000 what can we expect from the permanent directorate?

Because that is what is amounts to. Mr. Hanna, according to the press, made the statement the other day that they were going to spend $70,000,000 in the Western country. He may have been wrong in that statement, but the Government have admitted that they are going to build forty-four lines of railway. A few days ago, when asked to make a statement regarding the railway policy of the Government the Minister of Railways said that the present was not the time to give that information, but to wait until the Railway Estimates were being considered. Apparently, notwithstanding that, the Government have decided to build all these lines of railway, but are not willing that we should know anything about it. Therefore this afternoon they slip out a schedule of those lines and then expect us to swallow it. It seems to me that is the most unreasonable proposal that was ever drawn to my attention, I never heard anything like it. If the directors of this company are only temporary directors, and have not decided on any plans, how does the Government come to have such a policy with regard to the construction of these lines?

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Would it relieve the hon. gentleman's mind if I were to assure him that all the lines in the province

of Alberta were political lines of the present provincial Government?

Mr. VIEN: Does the hon. gentleman say they are political lines?

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: They are chartered by the Provincial Government of Alberta, which is a Liberal Government, and the elections in many cases have been run on the completion of certain of these lines. I might further say for information of the hon. gentleman—

Mr. CAHILL: Now we are getting some light.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS:—that the partner of the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) won two elections on the question of the completion of these lines.

Mr. CAHILL: Whose partner?

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: The partner of the hon. member for Three Rivers.

Mr. CAHILL: Now we are beginning to get some light on the subject. Is it the intention of this Government to supplement the promises of the Alberta Government in order to hold the influence of that Government? We are told that these roads were chartered and promised by the Alberta Government, and we know that that Government, or at least some of its members, supported the Unionist administration at the last election. Is this railway construction the price held out to the Alberta Government so that they may continue to support the present administration? There are some Liberals who have changed their minds. Is this the price held out to some of these Liberals to stand by the present administration?

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not well posted on the personnel of the Alberta Government

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend (Mr. J. M. Douglas) has given the best reason in the world why we should pause before we pass this clause, and that we should know more with regard to it than we do at present. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) stated a moment ago that it was not the custom for the Government to send any of its Bills to the Railway Committee. But that hon. gentleman fails to remember that the Transcontinental Railway Bill, in 1902 or 1903, was referred to the Railway Committee, and for days Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and Messrs. Hays and Wainwright were on the stand answering the questions of members of the Committee who were seeking the fullest information at that time. The schedule which has been so much discussed, carefully typewritten and prepared beforehand by the Government, was handed to the Committee this afternoon without their knowing one word about it. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas) has stated that the charters of these railways are provincial charters which is the best of reasons why we should seek for more information. I do not say that these charters should not be revived, on the contrary I believe they deserve to be, and that the Governments which granted them doubtless acted in good faith and in the interests of the people. But what do I know about the matter? Am I not asked, as a legislator in this House, to revive these charters, and am I not right in demanding from the Government that further details should be vouchsafed in regard to them? This afternoon I asked what mileage the forty-four charters covered, but I received no reply. This evening the Government is asked how many townsites there are along the railway lines covered by these charters, but again we obtain no answer. We now have the best of reasons for demanding more information from the Government, and we shall obtain that information from Mr. Hanna, in whose judgment I have the utmost confidence, if he is called before the Railway Committee of this House.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: Will not the hon. gentleman get more information when the schedule in connection with this Bill is being considered and the railway officials are on the floor of the House to furnish that information ?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That may be, but this clause will then have been passed.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have not occupied much time in the discussion to-day, and I take this opportunity to express some views which I entertain on the subject of this Bill. It is difficult for me to understand why the Government refuses to accept the proposition made that this clause be left over until the next sitting of the House, in order that time may be afforded to thoroughly study its provisions. I fail to see what the Government have to gain by forcing the issue to-night. If the proposition submitted from this side were accepted, all of us would gain more knowledge of the subject and understand more fully what this proposition really involves. Furthermore, the Government might then be disposed to give the information which we have been vainly trying to extract from

them since three o'clock yesterday afternoon. I must confess to being astonished at the feeling displayed by the Acting Prime Minister in this discussion. It seems scandalous to me that he should hurl insinuations across the floor and impute motives to His Majesty's loyal Opposition. I personally resent treatment of that kind and I decline to allow him or any one else to impugn my motives in the position that I intend to take in regard to this matter. I must state that from my experience of the Acting Prime Minister I had formed a different estimate of him, and in regard to matters of this kind expected different treatment at his hands. I condemn his unwarranted display of temper and resent it with all the force I can.

I claim that in the matter of loyalty, speaking for myself at least, I take second place to no representative in this House, not even the Acting Prime Minister. In my judgment the discussion to-night is not, as insisted upon by the Acting Prime Minister, a question of public ownership versus private ownership. The attitude assumed by members on this side of the House is an altogether different one. We have no objection whatever to the passing of this Bill, but we certainly insist on our rights in discussing the different clauses stage by stage. One thing that does impress me very forcibly is the fact that we are voting away the powers of the representatives of the people, we are delegating those powers to another body, a body that will be a law unto itself, and the representatives of the people will have absolutely no control over it. I object to this attempt at railway overlapping, overbuilding and financial waste. Although these words were used to-night by the Acting Prime Minister, who went into the subject very extensively, we are being asked to pass a blanket order for the building of forty-four lines of railroad. We have no information from the Government as to the length of those railroads or where they are to be located. We were told by the Acting Minister of Justice this afternoon that all of them were in course of construction with one exception. To my mind that is an extensive proposition for this country to undertake at the present time considering our financial condition, for, as has been stated over and over again, our public debt already amounts to the enormous sum of two billion dollars. If we continue spending money at this rate I cannot see that the prospects of this country are any too bright. We have amongst these

railroads, the halt, the lame and the blind, and we have no exact information regarding any one of them. I understand that there is an extensive tract of real estate alongside these railroads in the possession of some person or persons, of whom we have no knowledge, and I would ask the Minister of Railways for some exact information on this subject before I can deal with it intelligently. I would like to know who owns the townsites and lands adjoining these railroads that we are expected to vote on to-night without the slightest definite information.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. BUREAU: No; the hon. member is asking a question.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister going to answer it?

Mr. J. D. REID: I am not going to answer it.

Mr. PEDLOW: The Minister of Railways refuses to answer a straight question. I would have expected that in order to place hon. members in a position to vote intelligently to-night this information at least would be forthcoming. We want to know who is behind this scheme. We have found so often a nigger in the fence in matters of this kind that we want to locate him. We have been told what a splendid brand of progressive Liberalism there is to the right of the Chairman. If that is the estimate of the Acting Prime Minister of progressive Liberalism we hope it will stay there; but in my judgment it is the kind of Liberalism that is walking backward. During the speech of the Acting Prime Minister the Government supporters were very active—more active than I have seen them yet during this debate, for generally they have sat silent and have made no suggestions of a constructive nature or otherwise in respect to a problem that means so much to this country. It is claimed that it is patriotic for hon. members to support this proposition without question; that is practically the statement of the Acting Prime Minister. To my mind it is rather an unconditional surrender to this new directorate of the rights and privileges of Parliament. I for one object to endorsing any such proposition. Now, Sir, in concluding I would like again to ask the Minister of Railways for the information I have already requested from him, so that we will be able to deal with the subject more intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move: that the further consideration of this section be postponed. We will proceed to the consideration of the next section.

Motion agreed to.

On section 21—Agreements with other lines:

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, this evening the leader of the Opposition stated that he and the Acting Prime Minister had reached an understanding that the House would adjourn each night at 11 o'clock. It is now 1 o'clock Saturday morning, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that we on this side have not taken up any more time than hon. gentlemen supporting the Government. Any information that we have had regarding the contentious clause has been given to us, not by the ministers, but by their supporters, and I appeal to whoever is leading the House to live up to the promise made by their own leader, the Acting Prime Minister, and now adjourn.

1 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 21 carry?

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister not explain this section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section has necessarily been explained during the discussion on the various other sections. It provides for the amalgamation that the leader of the Opposition is so anxious for. Sections 361 and 364 of the Railway Act, referred to in section 21, provide for the amalgamation of one road with another, and this section makes those clauses applicable, subject to the conditions mentioned. It enables the amalgamation of the roads now comprised in the system and mentioned in the schedule, or that hereafter are entrusted to the management of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. ROBB: I am not going to allow the minister who is leading the House to get away from my question whether the arrangement made between the Acting Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition is to be lived up to.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know of no arrangement of that kind. At all events, surely it is not unfair to ask that in one day we pass one clause out of thirty. The leader of the Opposition has absolutely refused to pass this clause.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not this clause.

Mr. J. D. REID: I know of no such agreement, nor has the Acting Prime Minister stated that there was such an agreement. Under the circumstances, I think we should proceed.

Mr. BUREAU: Section 361 of the Railway Act provides that the agreement of amalgamation shall be submitted to the Board of Railway Commissioners with an application for a recommendation to the Governor in Council for the sanction thereof, and that notice of the proposed application for such recommendation shall be published in the Canada Gazette. Section 21 of this Bill does away with all that, and all that is necessary is the approval of the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Why should the matter not be made public as provided by section 361 in the case of private companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amalgamation of lines comprised in this system, not of any outside lines, is what is provided for. The only reason for submission to the Railway Commission is in case there should be outside interests. There could be no such outside interest in this case, because the lines are comprised in our system.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the leader of the Government willing to adjourn if we accept section 21?

Mr. MEIGHEN Not at all, section 20 is not through.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a motion to let it stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We were compelled to make it. No thanks are due to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am looking for an adjournment, not for thanks.

Mr. CAHILL: Surely the minister will read to the Committee the section of the Act that I asked him to read. This clause refers to some other Act that we have not under our hand. If the minister would let us adjourn for an hour or two we could go to the library and look it up. The minister said to-day that the forty-four charters that he wants to put into section 20 constitute only a fraction of the total number of companies. This section will give the Governor in Council power to take over any roads that are within the so-called Canadian Northern system. That might include some branch lines that are heavily encumbered and that

we do not want at all. It is unreasonable that the Government should ask us to pass a clause that we have had no opportunity of studying.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. gentleman has had this Bill on his file for some weeks; therefore he has had an opportunity of studying it.

Mr. CAHILL: It has not been printed for some weeks. The longest-winded resolution ever brought into this or any other House was on the Order Paper for a few days. The Minister of Railways was hopelessly lost in it. He got the assistance of a number of his legal advisers and attempted to interpret the resolution, but absolutely failed; then he said: We will bring in the Bill based on the resolution.

Mr. MORPHY: The first reading of this Bill was on April 11.

Mr. CAHILL: That was a day or two before the Easter recess, and the Bill was taken up on the first day following the recess. How many hon. gentlemen opposite have read the Bill? How many know anything about it? We are asked to pass a clause based on an Act that we have no opportunity of referring to or studying.

Mr. BEST: It has been on the desk of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) for two days.

Mr. CAHILL: I have not seen it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One section the hon. gentleman refers to is a page and one-eighth long; another section is about half a page long. I have given very briefly the contents, but if the hon. member needs more time, the best way to get it is to have the clause stand, and he can read it up between now and Monday. I, therefore, move that further consideration of clause 21 be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

On section 22—power to acquire securities or make or receive advances:

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that section 3 enabling the company to acquire stocks stands. While that section stands, we can hardly consider section 22.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman prefers, I would move that we proceed to the consideration of section 3.

Mr. McKENZIE: That would be absolutely fair.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Cahill.]

On section 3—capital stock:

Mr. CAHILL: The Acting Prime Minister was to make a statement regarding the stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware of the statement the Acting Prime Minister was to make, and I can make it in his absence, namely, that for the purposes of a bond issue, particularly in a foreign market, it is sometimes, indeed, usually advisable, that there should be a stock issue of the road. It would not appear to us to be here a matter of major concern, inasmuch as doubtless the bond issue would be guaranteed. But there might possibly be an issue not guaranteed, in which event the bond investor very frequently looks to a stock issue. That is the purpose of section 3. That is the statement the Acting Prime Minister was to make.

Mr. CAHILL: Is any definite amount of stock proposed to be issued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no definite determination as to that. I would not feel myself a good judge as to what would likely be the proper amount. The determination would be made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, as circumstances might dictate.

Mr. VIEN: What is meant by the words?

Until otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council.

Would not the stock of the company be always kept in the possession of the Government? I can hardly understand what occasion would warrant the transfer of this stock to anybody else by Order in Council. I do not see much objection in issuing capital stock in this company, although I do not see much use for it, provided the stock is kept in the hands of the Governor in Council for the purposes of the people of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One reason, which would be quite sufficient, would be this. The holders of income convertible bonds have a right to take in exchange stock of the company—I believe one holder has still reserved that right—in which case the Governor in Council might feel that a share or whatever would be the proper amount of this stock, should be transferred to him, should elect to take it instead of his income convertible bonds. Is that clear to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. VIEN: Yes. Would that mean that the Government could not in some cases

buy up bonds held by other people? Would the Government be compelled to re-buy bonds issued by the company, and would those bondholders have the right to exact from the Government in exchange for their bonds shares in the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only in the Canadian Northern. The Government could not buy income convertible bonds without the authority of Parliament. This stock is kept simply for the purpose of a possible exchange. The hon. gentleman will see that it is to be held in the name of the Minister of Finance unless the Governor in Council shall otherwise order. The only contingency of which I am advised is that there might be a necessity of making an adjustment with the holder of income convertible bonds.

Mr. CAHILL: This would be new stock for this new company, the Canadian National Railway Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: So that the Government could not have any agreement with a bondholder as regards the new stock?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CAHILL: The Government would have to give him Canadian Northern stock in exchange for the bonds?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: That would have no bearing on this company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated was this: There is no agreement to give any issue of this stock to anybody. There is an agreement with the old Canadian Northern to exchange income convertible bonds for stock in that company. The Governor in Council might decide that it would be more convenient to offer a bondholder a share of the stock of this company than to have any of the shares of the Canadian Northern outstanding. I do not know whether it would be more convenient or not, because that would depend upon circumstances. This is a mere detail that necessarily should be left to the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAHILL: If it is proposed to issue stock of this company, none of that stock should be let out of the hands of the Government, because it would be a serious mistake to divide up public ownership. The section reads:

> All such stock shall, until otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council, be vested in the Minister of Finance on behalf of His Majesty.

One hundred or one thousand shares might be issued. Those shares should immediately be put into the possession of the Minister of Finance. Does the minister not think the stock should be vested there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As a general rule it should. I will bring the hon. gentleman's advice to the attention of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand the object of this company is to administer Government railways and to acquire all the stock that is outstanding so that absolute ownership will vest in His Majesty. The clause says that new stock issued by the company shall be vested in the Minister of Finance on behalf of His Majesty, and I do not object to that. The objectionable feature is the one pointed out by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). Why give stock to outsiders if the object is to acquire stock held by outsiders and have it vested in His Majesty, so that the Government will have complete ownership of all the stock issued by the various companies?

I do not think it would be good policy to issue stock and allow outsiders to have it, thereby gaining a voice, no matter how small it may be, in the administration of our Canadian National railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Generally speaking, I think the honourable member's views are right. The contingency however is not a dangerous one, and as we will have further time for the consideration of this clause when the Bill is resumed for consideration, I beg to move that its consideration be postponed for the present.

Motion agreed to.

On section 22—power to acquire securities or make or receive advances.

Mr. BUREAU: This clause gives the Company absolute power, without control either by the Governor in Council or otherwise, to acquire securities issued by or make advances to or receive advances from the Canadian Northern or any other company comprised in the system. Now section 149 of the Railway Act provides as follows:

> No company shall, either directly or indirectly, employ any of its funds in the purchase of its own stock, or in the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities, issued by any other railway company in Canada, or in the purchase or acquisition of any interest in any such stock, shares, bonds, or other securi-

ties: Provided that nothing in this section shall affect the powers or rights which any company in Canada had or possessed on the first day of February, one thousand nine hundred and four.

Here is a clause prohibiting the granting of the power which is given by section 22. The clause I have read has its sanction in section 376 of the general Railway Act which provides:

Every director of a railway company who knowingly permits the funds of any such company to be applied either directly or indirectly in the purchase of its own stock, or in the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities issued by any other railway company in Canada, or in the purchase or acquisition of any interest in any such stock, shares, bonds or other securities contrary to the provisions of this Act, shall incur a penalty of one thousand dollars for each such violation;

2. The acquisition of each share, bond or other security or interest as aforesaid shall be deemed a separate violation of this section.

Then it goes on to say how it shall be recoverable and how divided when recovered. On the contrary section 22 of the Act now before us provides that the Company may acquire any securities or make any advances. That is in absolute contradiction of the prohibitive clause 149, the sanction of which is found in clause 376. May I ask the reason for this?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The clause now under consideration is merely an adaptation, really a transcript, of section 19 of the old Canadian Northern Railway System Act of 1914, which read as follows:

No company now or hereafter comprised in the Canadian Northern system which is now or may hereafter be subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada may acquire shares in the capital stock of or securities issued by or make advances to or receive advances from any other company comprised in such system, and may take or give security for such advances.

The only addition here is enabling power to make advances on notes instead of on the regular securities. There really is no extension at all, but there seemed to be some legal doubt as to the power to use notes. It is simply a matter of internal financing of the Company.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask what was the reason for making an exception of the Canadian Northern Railway, when the law strictly prohibits such transactions and makes any director who knowingly allows any such transaction to be made liable to a penalty of one thousand dollars, and the penalty is imposed for each share or security acquired?

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The securities that can be used for the purpose of this borrowing are securities authorized by the subsidiary or constituent companies, not by the parent company; so it is merely a matter of internal financing of the Company, and we are taking no more power than we gave to the Canadian Northern itself under section 19 of the old Act.

Mr. BUREAU: But why make an exception of the Canadian Northern to the general law?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no exception made.

Mr. BUREAU: What about section 149 of the General Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section the hon. gentleman quoted forbids companies to acquire their own securities.

Mr. BUREAU: And other securities. It says:

No company shall . . . . . employ any of its funds . . . . . in the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities issued by any other railway company in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor can this company. All they are acquiring are the securities of their own constituent companies, not the stock issue of the company itself; they cannot take that. But for the purpose of borrowing they can take the securities already authorized to be issued and issued by their own subsidiary companies, which constitute their own body. That is very different from taking the securities of an outside corporation.

Mr. BUREAU: Legally it is another company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but they are all united into one, and were so united in 1914.

Mr. BUREAU: Why is not the control of the Governor in Council exercised when these transactions take place? All the other clauses provide for the control of the Governor in Council. There must be a reason for making an exception in this clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The authority that authorized the original issue of the securities by the constituent company was a statutory authority and presumably edged around with sufficient safeguards. Let me repeat, this is merely a matter of the internal financing of the company. I beg to move that the further consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

On section 23—power to construct and operate railway lines:

Mr. J. D. REID: I beg to amend this clause by inserting after the word " description " in the eighth line the following words:

In respect of the construction whereof respectively Parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities.

This ensures that nothing can be done without first coming to Parliament.

Mr. CANNON: I notice that the amendment reads "for the respective construction whereof respectively." I think that one of the "respectively" or "respectivelies" might be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister moves to add to section 23, after the word "description," the following words "in respect of the construction whereof respectively Parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities."

Mr. McKENZIE: That is very difficult to understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It means simply that with the approval of the Governor in Council, upon any location sanctioned by the minister of Railways, the company may construct and operate railway lines, branches and extensions or railway facilities or properties of any description. What is the condition upon which they may do that?—upon the condition that authority was given by this Parliament by statute or if their bonds are guaranteed by this Parliament for that purpose. The full control is still vested in Parliament. They are authorized to go ahead whenever Parliament authorizes them to do so or guarantees their bonds.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think the intention of the minister is to authorize it before construction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It says "hereafter," in fact, I do not think the word is necessary.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 24—use of name:

Mr. CANNON: Why should you not call the Canadian Railways the Canadian Government Railways instead of calling them the Canadian National Railways, and maintaining the "C.N.R." I think the sooner the "C.N.R." disappears from the public eye the better it will be not only for the public itself but also for the Government. I think it is only natural that we should call our railway "The Canadian Government Railways".

Mr. MEIGHEN: The only reason I can think of is that, "Canadian National Railways" is more plebeian, or more cosmopolitan. "Government" suggests authority. We want to suggest that this is the nation's, or the people's, property. The Canadian Northern Railway, of which no Canadian need be ashamed, will in due course be amalgamated with the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A more practical reason was given to me last fall by Mr. Hanna. He said that all the cars bore the three letters "C.N.R." and it would need a lot of painting to change the name.

On Section 25—Change of name:

Mr. BUREAU: Is there any particular reason for this reservation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a very good reason for that. It is not intended to amalgamate some of the subsidiary companies that do not own and operate railways; for instance, the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company. The Governor in Council is given power to change the name of that company. The obvious name would be the Canadian National Telegraph.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have we not made very fine progress? I think we might now be allowed to go home.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman precipitated the situation and we must go on with it or else it will mean another day lost.

Mr. McKENZIE: I precipitated nothing. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the hon. the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) precipitated everything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will retract the word "precipitated." That is rather too expeditious a term.

Mr. M. CLARK: I cannot permit the hon. gentleman's statement to go uncontradicted that I precipitated anything. I made a few remarks extending over a period of about thirteen minutes in perfectly good temper in response to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who was the real "precipitator."

On Section 26—Issue of securities:

Mr. BUREAU: Would it be well to limit the amount of securities to be issued per mile of railway constructed in each case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is limited in the trust deed.

Mr. BUREAU: But a railway may be constructed where there was no justification for issuing securities to the extent of $75,000 per mile. In the case of another road a larger amount might be necessary. You put a maximum here, but would it not be well in the case of each company to determine the amount per mile which it is to be authorized to issue. That provision must be in the general charter of each company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The trust deed, of course, contains a provision to that effect. Each specific one will necessarily be limited when the security is authorized by the company and approved by the Governor in Council, but no matter what the value may be it never can exceed $75,000. It is obviously impossible now to fix what it should be in relation to each issue.

Mr. BUREAU: When these charters were obtained, and before they were vested in the Canadian Government, the amount of the bond issue must have been limited. We always limit in the charter the amount of bonds to be issued per mile of railway constructed. This is virtually the wiping out of that limitation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The limitations contained in the charter still would stand.

Mr. BUREAU: The roads which are to be constructed under this Bill must already have charters. If so the amount of the bond issue is limited. If there is no charter how is the construction going to be carried on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This just applies to Canadian National Railway lines; that is to say, to lines the physical property of which is owned by the Canadian National Railway Company. It would apply, for example, to lines that become the property of the Canadian National Railway Company by virtue of amalgamation under clause 21; but without such amalgamation the original limitations apply.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not seem to be able to make my meaning understood. If you are going to build a line of railway, you can only do it by virtue of an Act of Parliament, whether local or Federal, which limits the bond issue per mile of railway constructed. Whether the railway is the property of the Canadian Government, or remains the property of a particular company, Parliament gives the necessary authority for the issue of the bonds. Such being the case, I want to know what the clause means?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amalgamated company has the power conferred by its charter, plus the power it secures by the amalgamation. The absorbing company can exercise either of these powers to the maximum prescribed.

Mr. BUREAU: Do I understand that an amalgamation takes places with the consent of the Governor in Council, and that the provisions of the general Railway Act —as to obtaining the consent of two-thirds of the stockholders, publication in the Official Gazette, and application for confirmation to the Board of Railway Commissioners—do not apply?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: And the Governor in Council will have the right to determine the amount of securities which is to be issued per mile?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not think that power should be left to the Governor in Council. It ought to remain with Parliament, as in the case of other railway companies which are amalgamated. Would it not be better to state that in the case of an amalgamation the amount of bonds shall not exceed per mile constructed the amount authorized by the charter which created the absorbing company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The power is being now exercised, under this clause. We are fixing the limit now, just as it is fixed in the terms of the charter of the individual company; but we provide the additional safeguard that each specific issue shall be limited also by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: I am still afraid that my question has not been understood, but I must leave it at that.

Mr. POWER: Do I understand that this clause, read in connection with clauses 23 and 16, means that the company may at any time issue bonds, securities, or debentures, for the purpose of building a railroad without coming before Parliament? If so, I think it is rather broad in its nature, and at the time of an election, or something of that nature, debentures may be issued and works started on the construction of some of these forty-four railroads in some constituency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has been brought up in the wrong school of politics. The fact is that this only authorizes a bond issue to provide money subject to the provisions and conditions therein stated. Before there could be any bond issue, there necessarily would have to be

authority to build the line. That rests on section 23 and is subject in each individual case to the authority of Parliament, which authority must come first to every line. That being the case, then section 26 applies as to the bond issue.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—Power to acquire securities of other companies.

Mr. BUREAU: The same objection exists to this clause that was raised a few minutes ago. This clause provides:

> The company may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of shares in the capital stocks, bonds, notes, securities or other contractual obligations—

and so forth. We know these may be put on the market for sale, but I think it is a wrong principle to authorize here the disposal of capital stock. The whole object we have in view now is to acquire the capital stock and to have absolute and entire ownership in the operation of these railways without the interference of any outside parties. I do not believe that this should be authorized unless for some special reason such as the Acting Minister of Justice stated a while ago, where there was an agreement with a certain party that the stock was to be exchanged for bonds. I believe those words ought to be struck out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At present the Canadian Northern Railway Company may acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of shares in the capital stocks, bonds, notes securities, or other contractual obligations whatsoever of any railway company, or of any transportation, navigation, terminal, telegraph, express, or hotel company authorized to carry on any business incidental to the working of the railway. It was thought wise to extend that, especially as the Governor in Council now has supervisory power under this clause to include any electric or power company, and accordingly the words "electric power or of any other company" were added. It appears to be not only a useful but a necessary power to acquire the stock of, say, a small subsidiary branch line company that might be a useful feeder.

Mr. BUREAU: I have no objection to granting the company power to acquire; on the contrary I say the company ought to acquire as far as possible, all outstanding stock to have absolute and exclusive ownership. But the words "dispose of shares in the capital stocks," I take exception to. I do not think that any shares in the capital stock of any company or organization which may come under the control of this company, which actually represents the country ought to be disposed of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is some reason in the hon. gentleman's objection to the use of those words. I would be prepared to move that the words "and dispose of" be stricken out at the end of the second and beginning of the third line.

Mr. VIEN: If I understand this section it means that the Government may acquire by Order in Council the shares, bonds, notes, and scurities of any railway company, or of any transportation, navigation, terminal, telegraph, express, hotel, electric, power or of any other company authorized to carry on any business incidental to the working of a railway, or any business which in the opinion of the board of directors may be carried on in the interests of the company. That means that after the enactment of this law the Government by Order in Council will have the power to acquire any railway in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is absurd to suggest that they could buy the stock of any other company. It is simply the
2 a.m. power usually exercised by companies for the acquirement of small subsidiary concerns essential to their management.

Mr. VIEN: The section does not say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN But the other sections do. If they had a surplus after paying everything, which I would be very glad to see them have, in respect of the Government railways it would go to the credit of the Receiver General, they could not use that; it would be only profits after payment of everything to the Canadian Northern. If there is any surplus, and they need it for the purchase of stock of any subsidiary company, they should have power to apply it like any other company. But if they need the money of Canada it must be voted by Parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX But why do you not say so in the section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman would not want me to say that the money of Canada must be first voted by Parliament?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is money of Canada they are disposing of?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No money of this country can be used unless it is voted by Parliament. That is the law of the land.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But you give the railway company here the right to acquire with the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Suppose, for instance, they find it convenient to acquire the Gaspé railways, and suppose they have a surplus to apply towards that purchase, surely they could not come before Parliament for the purpose? Cannot you in a line just preserve the powers of Parliament? Because here the language is very broad. I can quite understand that if it was a small line serving a particular industry the board might find it convenient to acquire it; that goes without saying, but according to this section they may acquire a railway line of one or two hundred miles, which would involve a large expenditure of money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any surplus from the Government lines they cannot use because that goes to the credit of the Receiver General by another clause. All I said was, if it was a surplus from the Canadian Northern system there is no reason why they should not have the same powers as any other company, subject, of course, to the control of the Governor in Council as given here. I suggest that if the hon. gentleman feels so strongly about it, consideration of this clause might be postponed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not ask that. You may add two or three words.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We could consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion between now and Monday, and if deemed feasible an amendment could be made accordingly on Monday.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Very well. Will you tell me if the company can acquire any transportation, navigation, etc., company outside of the Canadian Northern constituent company and subsidiary companies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They might acquire the stock of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited. That is one instance where this power might well be used.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: The clause is wide enough to enable the company to purchase the Grand Trunk Railway System.

Mr. BUREAU: Will the amendment of the Acting Minister of Justice be presented for further consideration?

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move to strike out the words " and dispose of " at the end of the second line of section 29.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend consider the line dropped?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am moving postponement of this clause, and in doing so would state between now and Monday consideration will be given to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Motion agreed to.

On section 30—consent of municipalities:

Mr. BUREAU: If an agreement cannot be arrived at between the company and the municipality, will they go before the Railway Commission as is provided by the general Railway Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a standard clause.

Mr. BUREAU: Who has the authority to decide in case they cannot reach an agreement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Railway Act would then apply.

Section agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I move that the following be added to the Bill as Section 31:

Every person who directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, gives or procures, or agrees to give or procure, or offers or promises any office, place or employment, or promises to procure or to endeavour to procure any office, place or employment to or for any voter, director, official or employee of the company, and any director, official or other employee of the company who seeks by bribe or otherwise to influence any other director, official or employee with a view to influence him or them to support a political party in Canada, shall be disqualified from further holding office in the said company, and shall be liable upon prosecution to a term of imprisonment not less than one year, and not exceeding five years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the consideration of the proposed section 31 be postponed.

Motion (Mr. Meighen) agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the following be added as section 32 of the Bill:

The Minister of Railways and Canals may appoint or direct any person to inquire into and report upon any matters or things relating to or affecting the company or its works and undertakings, including its management and operation of the Government railways, or relating to or affecting any other company and the works and undertakings thereof, owned, controlled or operated by the company, and any

person so appointed or directed may, for the purposes of and in connection with any such inquiry or report, do all such things and exercise all such powers as are referred to or mentioned in section 61 of the Railway Act.

This merely permits the Minister to make inquiry as to anything connected with the management or operation of the road under section 61 of the Railway Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is section 61 as wide as the Public Inquiries Act ?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the clause applicable peculiarly to railways. Apparently it is more appropriate to act under this provision than to appoint a commissioner under the Inquiries Act, as this is what is usually done in the management of railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister expect us to gobble up all these clauses just as he proposes them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member would like to have time to look into it, I will move that the consideration of this clause be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

On section 6—no personal responsibility of directors:

Mr. BUREAU: This section reads in connection with section 22, which authorizes a thing that is directly forbidden by section 149 of the Railway Act. The minister says that was the clause that was inserted in the Canadian Northern Railway Act. Section 6 also takes the director of a company away from the operation of section 376 of the Railway Act, which says that any director who permits the funds of the company to be applied in the purchase of its own stock or of the securities of any other company shall be liable to a fine of $1,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are really penalizing clauses. The provision is to guard against penalties already applicable to those who are managers of private roads and are directly interested in them. It would not be applicable to Government appointees whose duty it is to manage a road that belongs to the Crown. A director would not accept an appointment if he were subject to those penalties.

Mr. BUREAU: But that is in the general Railway Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There he is interested in doing these things; here he is not.

Mr. BUREAU: He is authorized to do things that are forbidden by section 149 of the Railway Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Therefore it would not be well to subject him to a penalty for doing them. Here is a clause that was in the Canadian Northern Act with reference to directors who had no interest in the road, and who consequently should not be subject to those penalties. The section reads:

No such director shall be under any responsibility to any shareholder, director, or officer of the company of which he is director, nor to any other person, in respect of any act done, or omitted to be done by him in the execution of his office.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that the original charter of the Canadian Northern Railway company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Act of 1914, when we appointed directors to represent the Dominion of Canada, the Act that was passed at the time that we guaranteed the issue of $45,000,000 worth of bonds. Those directors were given this protection, and there is the same reason for giving this protection now because all the directors represent the Dominion and have no personal interest.

Mr. BUREAU: They may have no personal interest, but they are bound to work in the interest of the country. If they do anything against the law, I do not see why they should not be subject to the same penalties as the directors of any other company.

Mr. VIEN: According to this clause a director is not subject to any penalty under the provisions of any statute, in respect of his office or any act done or omitted to be done by him in the execution thereof. If a director commits malfeasance in office, he will not be responsible, nor will he be subject to any penalty under the provisions of any statute, even the Criminal Code. This section will absolve him of all responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman omitted some very important words. As respects a director's responsibility to any shareholder, director, officer or employee of the company, or to any other person, he is entirely free. That is quite clear, but there might be statutes to which he should be liable, and he certainly should be liable to the operation of the Code. Therefore, the section continues:

Nor, except with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall be subject to any penalty under the provisions of any statute, in respect of his office, or any act done or omitted to be done by him in the execution thereof.

Therefore, he is not absolutely exempt. He may, by the Governor in Council be

rendered liable to the operation of any penalty imposed in any statute.

Mr. VIEN: Why should they not be stated?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be pretty difficult to go through all the laws and ascertain just what he should and what he should not be liable to. He should be liable to a penalty for malfeasance in office amounting to a breach of the Code. We do not want to get liabilities and penalties in that will debar good men from taking posts as directors, particularly, if the system now adopted is continued whereby men are not obliged to devote all their time, but men of high character and ability are asked to give a part of their time and a general supervision for a small sum per annum, say $2,000.

Mr. VIEN: Is it wise to give the Governor in Council the right to protect by Order in Council any man against any act. If he is liable under the Criminal Code, the Government, by Order in Council, will be able to protect him from any recourse whatever. Suppose he commits a criminal act, the approval of the Governor in Council will be required in order to prosecute him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At present the Governor in Council may remit any pecuniary penalty to which anybody is subject, and he may further remit any imprisonment.

Mr. BUREAU: He cannot prevent a man from being tried?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. Perhaps it would be better to insert the word "pecuniary" before the word "penalty." The Government should not have the power to shield a director, at least from trial. I am anxious not to have the section such that we cannot get high class men to take the posts. I move that the word "pecuniary" be placed before the word "penalty" in line 17 of section 60.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the fee of $2,000 to be continued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has not been finally decided to continue the system of having a large number of directors at say $2,000 a year.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know that for $2,000 a year very good men can be got.

Mr. KEEFER: That is rather a reflection on members of this House who get only $2,500 for watching them.

Mr. BUREAU: I think it is. If I should judge the value of members of this House by the pedigree they got this evening from various members of the Government, I think, at $2,000, we would be overpaid. Fortunately, in our constituencies we are more highly regarded than we have been this afternoon. The remark of the hon. member is absolutely justified. This is one of the reasons we ought to invoke, if we want to maintain our standing before the country, at least in places where we are not known. I do not think $2,500 is sufficient for a man who devotes his time here for six months in the year and who has to sit up until half past two in the morning to see the closure put on him.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On schedule A—constituent and subsidiary companies comprised in the Canadian Northern system.

Mr. BUREAU: We want some explanation in regard to these various companies.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the liabilities and assets of the various companies mentioned in the schedule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That really does not seem enough. These Companies have been in the system right along; they are in it now. We cannot add to or substract from their liabilities.

Mr. CAHILL: This question has been before the House before. When the $40,000,000 guarantee was given the question was raised whether it was wise to take over a number of these companies as their liabilities might be greater than their assets. It has repeatedly been asked in the House what were the assets and liabilities of the various companies. It will readily be understood that when we take over these companies the Canadian National Railways will be responsible for their liabilities. We know that in the case of the Canadian Northern some $100,000,000 of unguaranteed securities were taken over and made good by the Dominion of Canada for the benefit of the friends of the Government, Mackenzie and Mann. I think we are entitled to know what securities are outstanding against these subsidiary companies and what their assets are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is a little out in this particular—that they were taken over four years ago. They are in the system now; we cannot take them over any more.

Mr. CAHILL: They are not taken over but still stand as the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company, do they not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: But we have taken it over.

Mr. CAHILL: You have only taken over the stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all we want.

Mr. CAHILL: The Canadian National Railways will become responsible for the liabilities of these companies when taken over.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Canadian Northern is responsible in the very same sense that the Canadian National will be responsible if this Bill passes.

Mr. CAHILL: The Canadian Northern has nothing to do with them. They are separate companies, in exactly the same position as the steamship companies, and the minute you take them over you become responsible for their liabilities. Liable to whom, I do not know, but I want to know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is too late to commence as far back as the hon. gentleman would require, and I therefore move that further consideration of schedule 1 be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

Schedule stands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move that the following schedule be added to the Bill, to be known as schedule 2.

SCHEDULE 2.

The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Western Railway Company was authorized to construct, namely:—

By Section 3 of Chapter 29 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1911-12, as follows:—

From a point on the constructed line of the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Edmonton, thence on a northeasterly and easterly direction on the north side of the North Saskatchewan River to St. Paul de Metis, and thence to the eastern boundary of the province of Alberta.

From a point on the constructed line of the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Bruederheim, thence in a general easterly and southeasterly direction to a point at Vermilion, thence on a southerly direction to a point at or near Wainwright or through Medicine Hat to a point at the southerly boundary of the province of Alberta; with a branch from a point northwest of Vermilion on Townships 53 and 54 easterly to the eastern boundary of the province.

From Camrose, thence in a general southeasterly direction keeping north of the Battle River until the line reaches to or near the eastern boundary of range 12, west of the fourth meridian; thence in a southeasterly direction to the eastern boundary of the province of Alberta.

From a point where the Saskatoon-Calgary line of the Canadian Northern Railway crosses the eastern boundary of the province in a generally northerly direction to a point on the authorized line of the Canadian Northern Railway running from Strathcona to Calgary.

From a point on the constructed line between Big Valley and Stettler, southeasterly to a junction with the Saskatoon-Calgary line.

By Section 2 of Chapter 40 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1914, namely:—

From a point at the city of Medicine Hat, thence in a generally northwesterly direction to a point on the Saskatoon Calgary line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The lines of railway which the Saskatchewan Northwestern Railway Company, a predecessor by amalgamation of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, was authorized to construct, namely:—

By Section 7 of Chapter 18 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1908-09, as follows:—

From a point on the Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway to Steamboat Company's line between Aylesbury and Davidson, thence in a generally northerly and westerly direction to the provincial boundary of Saskatchewan.

The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Saskatchewan Railway Company was authorized to construct, namely:—

By Section 8 of Chapter 43 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1912, as follows:—

From a point at or near Lampman on the Maryfield extension of the Canadian Northern Railway, thence in a generally northerly direction to a junction with the Brandon-Regina branch line of the said railway.

From a point on the Delisle Branch of the Canadian Northern Railway westerly to the western boundary of the Province of Saskatchewan.

From a point at or near Chamberlain southerly to Moosejaw.

From a point at or near Craven in a general northeasterly direction to a point at or near Hudson Bay Junction, with a branch from a point thereon to a point on the Rossburn branch of Canadian Northern Railway east of Yorkton.

From a point at or near Melfort north easterly to the eastern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan.

From a point at or near Hudson Bay Junction southerly through or near the town of Moosomin to a point on the southern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan, east of the second meridian.

From a point at or near Swift Current northerly to a point at or near Battleford.

From a point at or near Chamberlain westerly to a point on the western boundary of the province of Saskatchewan at or near Township 25.

From a point at or near Prince Albert northeasterly to the eastern boundary of the province of Saskatchewan.

From a point on the Prince Albert-Denholme line of the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Shellbrook westerly to a point on the North Battleford-Jackfish line of the Canadian Northern Railway.

From a point on the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Melfort, thence in a generally southeasterly direction to a connection with the Thunder Hill extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

From a point on the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Melfort, thence in a generally westerly and southwesterly direction to a point on the main line of the Canadian Northern Railway at or near Vonda.

The lines of railway which the Saskatchewan Midland Railway Company, a predecessor by amalgamation of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, was authorized to construct, namely:

By Section 7 of Chapter 41 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1909, as follows:—

A line from a point on the Winnipeg-Edmonton branch of the Canadian Northern Railway within ranges 1 and 2 west of the third meridian running in a northeasterly direction to join with the projected extension of what is known as the Thunder Hill branch of the said railway.

A line from a point on the Brandon-Regina branch of the Canadian Northern Railway between Kaiser and Regina running in a southwesterly, westerly and northwesterly direction to the town of Swift Current and with a branch from Swift Current to a point at or near Saskatchewan Landing thence northerly and easterly to a point on the constructed line of the Canadian Northern Railway in or near township 34, range 9 west of the third meridian.

A line from a point on the Brandon-Regina branch of the Canadian Northern Railway between Lovat and Kendal, thence in a generally southwesterly direction to the international boundary.

A line from a point at or near the town of Humboldt running in a northeasterly direction to a point at or near the town of Melfort.

The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Railway Company was authorized to construct, namely:—

By Sections 2, 3, and 4, Chapter 36 of the Statutes of Canada, 1915, as follows:—

From its line at Strathcona southerly to Calgary.

From a point on the company's line at Swan River in Manitoba, thence along the Swan River northerly and in a generally westerly direction to a point on the company's authorized line at the crossing by that line of the Saskatchewan River.

From a point in Regina northwesterly and westerly to a point on the Red Deer River, in the province of Alberta.

The line of railway which the Northern Extension Railway Company (since amalgamated with the Canadian Northern Railway Company) was authorized to build by Section 3 of Chapter 77 of the Statutes of Manitoba for 1904, namely:—

A line or lines from a point at the city of Winnipeg, or from any of the lines specified in the last mentioned Act, through the Rural Municipality of Springfield to the eastern or southern boundary of the province of Manitoba.

From Calgary to the confluence of the Little Bow and Belly Rivers, thence in a southwesterly direction to a point at Lethbridge.

From a point at or near Regina northwesterly to a point at or near Elbow.

By Section 2 of Chapter 76 of the Statutes of Canada 1914, as follows:—

From a point on the Company's authorized line at or near Battleford, thence in a generally westerly direction to a point on the head waters of the Brazeau River.

From a point in or near Regina northerly to or a near to Humboldt, thence northeasterly down or near the valley of the Carrot River to a point at or near the Pas Mission on the Saskatchewan River, and from a point on the Company's line between Humboldt and the South Saskatchewan river northeasterly to a point at or near the crossing of the South Saskatchewan river by the Company's Prince Albert Branch.

By Section 2 of Chapter 94 of the Statutes of Canada, 1913, as follows:—

From its line at or near Humboldt, in the Province of Saskatchewan, in a southwesterly direction to Township 29, Range 7, west of the third meridian, thence westerly and southwesterly to the city of Calgary in the province of Alberta.

From a point on its Brandon-Regina line near the west boundary of Manitoba, thence in a generally westerly direction to the city of Lethbridge, Alberta.

From a point on its line near North Battleford, thence northwesterly to a point at or near Athabaska Landing, with a branch to a point at or near Green Lake near its outlet into the Beaver River.

By Section 2 of Chapter 77 of the Statutes of Canada, 1912, as follows:—

From a point on the company's line of railway at or near Portage la Prairie, thence in a generally southerly and easterly direction to a point on the Ridgeville section of its line of railway in or near township 2, range 7, east of the principal meridian.

From a point on the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway between Davidson and Disley, thence in a generally westerly and northwesterly direction to a point on the Saskatoon-Calgary line in or near township 30, range 14, west of the third meridian.

From a point on its constructed line near Winnipegosis, thence in a generally southerly and easterly direction to a point on its constructed line near the south end of Lake Manitoba.

The lines of railway which the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company was authorized to construct, as follows:—

By Section 3 of Chapter 4, of the Statutes of British Columbia, 1910, as follows:—

From a point in the City of Victoria to a point on or near Barclay Sound on the Island of Vancouver, a distance of approximately one hundred miles.

By Section 3 of Chapter 32 of the Statutes of British Columbia, 1912, as follows:—

A line of railway one hundred and fifty miles in length in a northerly and easterly direction from the 100-mile post on the Vancouver Island section of the Canadian Northern Pacific Company's line of railway to a point on the east coast of the Vancouver Island.

A line of railway from a point on the company's line at or near the city of Kamloops to the City of Vernon, and thence to Lumby, and a line from a point at or near the said city of Vernon to the city of Kelowna via Long Lake, and a line from a point in or near the said city of Vernon, a point on the east arm of Okanagan Lake, opposite Okanagan Landing, as shown on the map deposited in the office of the Provincial Secretary of British Columbia; an aggregate distance of one hundred and forty-five miles.

By Section 2 of Chapter 57 of the Statutes of British Columbia, 1913, as follows:—

A line of railway extending from the north end of Westminster Bridge to Steveston, a distance of fifteen miles.

The lines of railway which the Alberta Midland Railway Company (a predecessor by amalgamation of the Canadian Northern Railway Company) was authorized to construct, namely:—

By Section 6 of Chapter 45 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1909, as follows:—

From a point at or near Edmonton, thence northwesterly to a point on the Peace River.

From near the authorized crossing of the Little Bow River, southerly via Macleod to the south boundary of Alberta.

From a point on the last mentioned line, between Macleod and the Belly River, westerly to the western boundary of Alberta.

Mr. McKENZIE What section of the Bill refers to schedule 2?

Mr. MEIGHEN Section 20, on which we spent all day and all night.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Surely the minister does not propose to deal with this schedule as with the other clauses of the Bill, and apply the closure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman would like to discuss it, it will be in print to-morrow morning in Hansard, and he will have until Monday afternoon to study the schedule.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: If the hon. gentleman gives the notice which we suppose he is going to give from the procedure he has started to adopt every member will be allowed to speak not more than once and will have to confine his speech on the schedule and on the whole Bill to twenty minutes. If he asks a question, that will be enough; he will have spoken. My hon. friend might give his notice for the other clauses and leave this one. This schedule contains forty-four charters which my hon. friend asks to be extended. Ordinarily, when a company seeks an extension of its charter, a map has to be deposited so that it can be studied by the members of the Committee. But in this case nothing of the sort is done. We are asked to extend the time of construction of forty-four railways, the very names of which we have not before us until this afternoon. No map is produced and no information given, and if the procedure with which we are threatened is carried out we shall be absolutely prevented from giving this schedule and these forty-four charters the consideration which they deserve.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not so serious as if we were giving these charters to parties outside. We are, in effect, only extending this time to ourselves. The schedule will appear in Hansard to-morrow morning and will be open for discussion on Monday afternoon. It is true that a single hon. member can speak only once and for twenty minutes; but he can move an amendment. If the hon. member thinks some of these charters should be struck out he can move an amendment to that effect, and every hon. member can speak on that amendment. It no doubt would have been better if hon. gentlemen had accepted the proposal that we do a little bit to-day by passing clause 20. But now there is no other course open to us. All the clauses and the schedules must be considered together.

Mr. BUREAU: The Acting Minister of Justice says that we are not giving these charters to somebody else, but only to ourselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In effect, I said.

Mr. BUREAU: Neither in effect nor otherwise. Schedule 2 is very important. There has been deposited on the table a list of forty-four lines, the charters for which are to be revived. Now, we want to know where those lines are going, the counties they will pass through, and the owners of the land traversed by the railways. We are informed that the owners of the land are friends of the Government who have townsites, along the railway, and who want the charters revived, not so much for the purpose of having the roads built than for creating a real estate boom to make money for themselves. My hon. friend may laugh, but I think it is serious. Closure was not applied to the Conscription Bill when it was before the House, but it was applied when the Canadian Northern legislation was before the House in order to protect the friends of my friends opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No closure then.

Mr. BUREAU: I can give my hon. friend the number of hours each man spoke. The Franchise Act and the Canadian Northern Bill were passed under the closure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Canadian Northern Bill of 1914?

Mr. BUREAU: Of 1917. Here is a closure motion, and I say that schedule No. 2 in all fairness ought to be given here so that we will have an opportunity to look into it. If hon. gentlemen do not want to give me the information concerning the schedule, we will take the trouble to go through the plans, communicate with people in those ridings and ascertain who are the owners. We will get the information ourselves if you do not want to give it to the Opposition. You shoved a list of forty-four railways into our hands this afternoon, two

copies for eighty men. We have had no time to look at it. I think there is something more than land speculation in this Bill. I have an inkling that perhaps the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) has a few roads going through counties that are not strangers to him. It may have a political purpose. I understood the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) to say that an election had been won on one or two of these railways.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: On one of them.

Mr. BUREAU: I am going to ask my partner who keeps better company now and knows all about fictitious charters and perhaps he will give the information to me and we will be able to discover things that it will be to the advantage of the country to know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would need to postpone consideration for a much longer time than Monday to get the owners of the land along forty-two lines of railway. I am afraid the night is getting so late that the hon. gentleman's mental resourcefulness is waning or he could think of some better reason for wanting this postponed. Does he suggest that in the history of granting charters the Government of the day has ever come down with the names of the owners and occupiers of the lands along the line of the projected route? The suggestion really stuns one's sense of propriety. What has the hon. gentleman in his mind? If he thinks there is anything sinister behind the extension of a charter and has information, or claims that he has, to substantiate that idea, I suggest that he bring it before Parliament on Monday. If he can show anything of the nature that he has indicated to-night he will produce somewhat of a sensation in this House. If he has such evidence, it will have a very great effect in determining the vote of hon. members on the Bill before the Committee. In the meantime, although we do not seem to be on the discussion of the schedule, I do not think we should delay the House longer, and I move that the consideration of the schedule be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. McKENZIE: On the preamble I wish to point out that there is all the difference in the world between an ordinary company looking for a revival of a charter and this situation . If a company has an old charter and wants to build a road, that company has to take the responsibility of furnishing the money and of dealing with the people through whose land it is building. It is a private concern. But here are forty-four companies that the people are taking over and here are forty-four lines of railway that this House is undertaking to build and about which nobody knows the first thing whatever. Yet we are smiled at and we are called simpering idiots because we ask for information. Here are forty-four companies building forty-four lines of railway with our money, with the money of the Canadian people. We do not know what it is going to cost or how many miles of road are going to be built. We are left in a state of entire and hopeless ignorance on these points. Still we have in front of us a body of intelligent men who say that it is utterly absurd for the representatives of the Canadian people to try and find out anything about these roads. The Acting Minister of Justice says that it is the same as if an ordinary company spending their own dollars were here looking for an extension. It is nothing of the kind. It is our money, it is our business, and we should know something about it before it is forced over our heads in this way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not undertaking to build railways and therefore the remarks of the hon. gentleman mean nothing whatever.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is to build railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill provides for authority to build them after Parliament votes it, as provided in section 23.

Mr. BUREAU: This schedule gives us no information. My hon. friend says I can get the information between now and Monday. I have some more interesting and better company to keep between now and Monday than that of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I have something better to do than to find out about lands that are owned by the Canadian Northern Railway. Although my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice is endowed with immaculate nerve, he seems to have lost it. Late hours are telling on him. He knows that between now and Monday I cannot get any information. I have reason to suspect by the way they are crowding this that there is something wrong about it, and that there is some land speculation and political patronage and influence behind it. My hon. friend says that they could not procure the name of every owner. I do not think they would have to deal with

very many owners where there is a chance of any money being made all along these lines. If my hon. friend wants to apply the closure he is welcome to adopt that procedure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move that the preamble be amended by adding the word "first" before the word "schedule" in the fifth line.

Mr. CANNON: If the minister moves for further consideration on Monday I am perfectly willing to wait until then to say what I have to say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to move that further consideration of the preamble be postponed until Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the title carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg to give notice that at the next sitting of the Committee of the Whole House upon this Bill I shall move that the further consideration of clauses 2, 3, 16, 20, 21, 22, 29 and proposed clauses 31 and 32, first schedule and proposed second schedule, preamble and title of this Bill, shall be the first business of the Committee and shall not further be postponed.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 2.50 a.m.

Monday, April 28, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—VOUCHERS FOR OVERSEAS PAYMENTS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) inquired on Friday respecting the audit of the expenditures of the Overseas Department of Militia and Defence. I promised to obtain the information desired, which I now have in a letter from Major-General Fiset, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, reading as follows:

With regard to Mr. Robb's question:

Page 218zz, Auditor General's Report, 1917-18. The Auditor General has just informed me that the vouchers covering the items, Overseas Department Militia and Defence amounting to $115,381,243.71 have just begun to arrive in Canada, and there are several carloads of them. It will take the Auditor General's staff many months before the details can possibly be published, but all these accounts have been audited overseas to the satisfaction of the Auditor General.

The main part of this expenditure is for pay and allowances.

DOMINION FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 79, to amend the Dominon Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill is of a corrective character only, and involves no departure in principle. It provides among other things for confiscation of goods illegally used in the parks in violation of the regulations; also for the granting of surface rights to the province of British Columbia in the case of applications that came in before the order in council of 1890 confirming an agreement between the province and the Dominion respecting forest reserves. I do not think there is any other clause as important as those two.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CITY OF LEVIS AQUEDUCT.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What is the amount of costs paid by the Government for lawyers' fees, disbursements, and the incidental expenses of the Privy Council resulting from the lawsuit for water furnished by the aqueduct of the city of Levis to the post office?

2. What sum has been considered a fair amount by the Privy Council and which ought to be paid to the city of Levis for said water supply to said post office?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. $6,109.23.

2. Their lordships stated that they saw no reason to question the finding of the courts below that $300 did not constitute an excessive demand, but they did not themselves suggest any amount which they would consider fair.

MR. JOHN W. DAFOE.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Did the Government pay the expenses of Mr. John W. Dafoe, of Winnipeg, for his trip overseas?

2. If so, what amounts have been paid already, and what bills have been sent to the Government by Mr. Dafoe, in relation to this trip?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Dafoe received an advance of $1,000, which he advises will cover expenses. The account is now in process of adjustment.

HON. P. E. BLONDIN.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. How long was Lieut.-Colonel, the Honourable P. E. Blondin in active service with the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

2. What amounts were paid him (a) for salary, (b) travelling expenses, and (c) other expenses in connection with his position as a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Lt.-Colonel the Hon. P. E. Blondin was taken on the strength of the C.E.F., Canada, on 2nd April, 1917, and on the Overseas Military Forces of Canada on 13th October, 1917. He returned to Canada in July 1918, and has not since been actively employed with the C.E.F.

2. (a) None; (b) none; (c) $367.06; subsistence allowance from 1st April, 1917, to 30th September 1917, 183 days at $1.50 per diem, $274.50; telegrams and recruiting expenses as commanding officer of the 168th Battalion, $92.56.

LT. HALL MARSHALL.

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Is Lieutenant Hall Marshall, of Spa Springs, Annapolis, N.S., in military service at present? If so, in what capacity?

2. Was he at any time called up for service under the Military Service Act?

3. Has he been discharged from military service? If so, on what date, and for what cause?

4. Has he taken any course in training, in whole or in part, for returned soldiers?

5. If so, have the expenses of such training, if any, been paid by the Government?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. No man registered under the Military Service Act in Nova Scotia under name of Hall Marshall. One C. H. H. Marshall, Outram, Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, was registered as No. 640608 GC and ordered to report for duty on September 13, 1918, which order he obeyed.

3. Yes, on the 21st September, 1917, having been dismissed from the service by sentence of general court martial.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

MR. C. E. MAHON.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What remuneration did C. E. Mahon draw from the Dominion Government as Registration Officer for British Columbia under manpower registration?

2. What was paid Mr. Mahon for expenses in connection with this work?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $704.

2. $505.55.

EXPORTABLE WHEAT.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the approximate amount of wheat available for export to European countries from (a) Canada; (b) United States; (c) Argentine; (d) India; (e) Australia; and what is the present selling price prevailing in each of the said countries?

2. What amount of money was paid by the British Treasury during the war for the purpose of guaranteeing to the British consumer a four pound loaf of bread for 9d., and is this loaf subsidy still in force?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. The following are estimates of the quantities of wheat available for export during the current crop year for the countries mentioned, together with recent quotations of prices reduced to Canadian currency:

Country.	Available for export during current crop year. Bushels	Selling price per bushel in country. $ c.	$ c.
Canada	105,000,000	2.17½	2.21½
	(No. 1 hard and Man. Nor. No. 1,		2.24½
United States	212,000,000	2.36½	2.39
Argentine ..	176,000,000	1.37	1.43
India	Nil.	Last quotation for wheat afloat	2.43
Australia.. ..	74,000,000	1.30	1.64

2. No information available.

PENSION COMMISSIONERS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Who are the respective officers in charge, representing the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, at Montreal, Quebec and Three Rivers, and what salary is paid by the Government to each of the said officers?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The officer in charge of the Montreal District office of the Board of Pension Commissioners is Mr. S. H. Elliott. He receives a salary at the rate of $2,900 per annum.

The officer in charge of the Quebec District office of the Board of Pension Commissioners is Mr. A. J. Duchesnay. He receives a salary at the rate of $1,600 per annum.

The officer in charge of the Montreal Sub-District office of the Board of Pension Commissioners is Mr. Leon Bouchard. He receives a salary at the rate of $1,200 per annum.

The Board of Pension Commissioners has no office in Three Rivers, Que.

EMPLOYMENT AGENT, QUEBEC.

Mr. POWER:

1. Who has the position of Employment Agent for returned soldiers in the city of Quebec?
2. Has a Mr. C. Brusselmans recently resigned?
3. If so, what are the reasons for his resignation?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Mr. Charles Beauprè.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.

WAR SERVICE GRATUITY.

Mr. POWER:

Is it the Government's intention in giving War Service Gratuities to differentiate between those who have seen three years' service in France and those who have seen over four years?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

DR. MICHAEL FISET.

Mr. POWER:

1. Is Dr. Michael Fiset, of Quebec, in the employ of the Dominion Government?
2. If so, what is his position?
3. What are his duties?
4. What salary does he receive?
5. Has he been absent from his duties during the past year? If so, how often?
6. Does he still continue his private practice?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. Parcel post supervisor.
3. Defined by No. 2.
4. $2,800.
5. Not to the knowledge of the department.
6. The department has no information.

FRANKING OF PAMPHLETS.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Government aware that a pamphlet entitled, "One Year of Union Government," an address of the Honourable N. W. Rowell, at Bowmanville, Ontario, December 17, 1918, has been distributed in the country.
2. Had the Government anything to do with the preparation, printing and distribution of said pamphlet?
3. If so, what was the cost of the preparation, printing and distribution of said pamphlet?
4. Is the Government aware that the said pamphlet has been sent through the mails at the public expense, through being franked by J.H.—M.P., and H.M.M.—M.P.?
5. Who are the members of this House whose franks are J.H.—M.P., and H.M.M.—M.P.?
6. Will the Government take steps to recover the amount of postage that should have been paid on the pamphlet so distributed?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Upon inquiry the Government is informed that copies of the said address have been sent through the mails under the franks named.
5. J.H.—M.P. is the frank of Mr. John Harold, M.P., and H.M.M.—M.P., is the frank of Mr. H. M. Mowat, M.P.
6. No postage was payable on copies of the said address sent out under the said franks. Under the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chap. 66, sec. 76, members of the House are entitled, while Parliament is in session, to frank their mail matter, including any addresses or pamphlets on public questions, which they may choose to send out, and this has been the practice for years.

H. P. DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Is H. P. Duchemin, of Sydney, N.S., conducting prosecutions in Nova Scotia for violations of the War Revenue Act?
2. If so, how many prosecutions has he brought?
3. What was the gross amount of fines imposed in these transactions?
4. What are the terms of his employment?
5. Do his activities extend over the whole of Nova Scotia? If not, in what counties?
6. Who recommended his appointment?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Duchemin has not been instructed to conduct prosecutions in Nova Scotia for violations of the War Revenue Act.
2. Nil.
3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 2.

PROCEEDS FROM BUSINESS PROFITS TAX.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. How much was collected in the year 1917 from Business Profits Tax?
2. How much remains uncollected for that year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1.

Fiscal year 1916-1917 .. .. .. $12,506,516 72
Fiscal year 1917-1918 .. .. .. 21,271,083 57
Fiscal year 1918-1919 .. .. .. 32,970,061 81

2. Information cannot be supplied, as a number of returns are being held for adjustment.

STRIKES IN CANADA.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Considering the number of strikes which are constantly increasing, does the Government propose to enact some measures relating to the cost of living which will enable the citizens of Canada to meet their obligations without having to resort to strikes?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Deslauriers' question is apparently based on some misapprehension of the circumstances. It is quite true that the actual number of strikes for the calendar year 1918 was in excess of those of previous years, but, in the matter of time losses by strikes, which is the real test of losses to those concerned, the disputes of 1918 brought less injury and inconvenience to the public than in several preceding years. The record for the decade ending with 1918 shows the following time losses due to strikes counted in working days:—

Year.	Approximate time losses in working days.
1909	871,845
1910	718,635
1911	2,046,650
1912	1,099,208
1913	1,287,678
1914	430,054
1915	106,149
1916	208,277
1917	1,134,970
1918	763,341

Many of the strikes of the year 1918 were of brief duration. Time losses by strikes were materially lower than 1918 only in the worst years, industrially speaking, of the war. The figures do not suggest that cost of living has any exceptional bearing on the frequency of strikes. The whole subject is regarded, however, as of the utmost importance and is receiving special consideration. The following extract is from the Labour Gazette, March, 1919:—

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

TABLE I.—Record of Labour Disputes by years.

Year.	No. of disputes.		Disputes in existence in the year.		
	In existence in the year.	Beginning in the year.	Employers involved.	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.
1901	104	104	273	28,086	632,311
1902	121	121	420	12,264	120,940
1903	146	146	927	50,041	1,226,500
1904	99	99	575	16,482	265,004
1905	89	88	437	12,233	217,244
1906	141	141	1,015	26,050	359,797
1907	149	144	825	36,624	621,962
1908	68	65	175	25,293	708,285
1909	69	69	397	17,332	871,845
1910	84	82	1,335	21,280	718,635
1911	99	96	475	30,094	2,046,650
1912	150	148	900	40,511	1,099,208
1913	113	106	1,015	39,536	1,287,678
1914	44	40	205	8,678	430,054
1915	43	38	96	9,140	106,149
1916	75	74	271	21,157	208,277
1917	148	141	714	48,329	1,134,970
1918	196	191	766	68,489	763,341
Total.	1,938	1,892	10,910	511,609	12,818,850

MISS LAMONTAGNE.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Has Miss Lamontagne, of 91A Jeanne Mance, Montreal, received a bonus in connection with her services as an employee of the Montreal Board of Registration in 1918? If so, what amount did she receive?

2. Did any other male or female employees of said board receive a bonus?

3. Was the entire staff belonging to said board entitled to a bonus? If so, did every person thereof receive said bonus?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: If the hon. member would indicate what Registration Board he refers to we might be able to answer the question. The Canada Registration Board, which took the national registration, has no such name as the Montreal Board of Registration.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. How many Canadian officers belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force have been promoted to the rank of Brigadier-General since the beginning of the war, to date?

2. What are their names, the military rank which they held at the time they left for overseas, and the military district to which they belong?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the Government aware that a landslip has occurred at Ste. Marie wharf, which prevents the steamer Boucherville from commencing its sailing operations?

2. In connection with the construction of the wharves at this point, already commenced, is it the intention of the Government to extend said wharf construction as far as Hochelaga bay, during the summer season of 1919?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. POWER:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents relating to the dismissal of Major J. T. N. L'Heureux from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and the striking off of his name from the Canadian Militia.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of Mrs. Hembleton's report, dated in the month of May, 1918, and relating to Canadian flour mills.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

On the motions:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a return showing: (a) The names of all medical officers who joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force since the beginning of the war; (b) the length of service of each of the said officers, in England, France, Canada, or elsewhere; (c) the Units in which they served, the date and length of service therein, and (d) the decorations which said officers respectively received from the Imperial Government, and the reasons given therefor, in each case.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): I would ask that this motion be allowed to stand until to-morrow so that I may have an opportunity of consulting the hon. member with regard to it. As the question stands it would be impossible to obtain all the information asked for, and I think if I see the hon. member that he may possibly change the wording of it. The same remark applies to the hon. gentleman's other question asking for information in regard to the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

DEMOBILIZATION.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR-GENERAL MEWBURN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): Before the Orders of the Day are called I feel it my duty to make a statement to the House regarding the delay in the demobilization of troops as a result of a strike in Liverpool. For the information of the House I may read the following statement:

From the date of the Armistice to April 15th there have been demobilized or struck off strength of the Canadian Expeditionary Force 159,444 all ranks. During the month of March over 41,000 troops were brought back from overseas, carried to their respective destinations in Canada and demobilized. On the 16th April there were about 149,000 troops still overseas.

Arrangements had been completed for the movement of at least 45,000 troops from Great Britain to Canada for the month of April, and with the opening of navigation on the St. Lawrence, it is expected that this number will be increased, and it is hoped that the following ships will be available:

I have a complete list of the ships and can read it to the House or put it upon Hansard. The list gives the number of ships, their tonnage and carrying capacity, It is a rather long list and I do not suppose I need read it:

Steamship.	Tonnage.	Carrying capacity.
Adriatic	24,541	2,372
Aquitania	45,647	5,000
Baltic	23,876	2,570
Belgic	24,500	3,540
Cretic	13,518	2,027
Cedric	21,040	3,395
Celtic	20,904	2,718
Carmania	19,524	3,192
Caronia	19,687	3,980
Lapland	18,565	2,555
Mauretania	30,704	4,000
Minnekahda	17,221	2,559
Olympic	46,339	5,668
Ordima	15,499	1,200
Cassandra	8,135	1,440
Saturnia	8,611	1,897
Corsican	11,419	1,452
Grampian	10,955	1,604
Melita	13,967	1,933
Metagama	12,420	1,674
Minnedosa	15,000	1,960
Megantic	14,878	1,856
Northland	11,905	1,461
R. George	11,146	1,836
Scandinavian	10,322	1,912
Tunisian	10,576	1,297
Canada	9,684	1,452
Regina	16,313	2,000
Empress of Britain	14,189	2,914

Some of the above ships will have to dock at Halifax others at Quebec and Montreal. Even if some of them are of such capacity as to permit of them going into St. Lawrence ports, the Ministry of Shipping reports that the officers are not accustomed to navigation of the St. Lawrence and they are very timid about undertaking it. Therefore, some of the above ships will go to Halifax. Besides this, some of the ships go to Halifax and from there to New York to get cargo or passengers before returning to England.

I regret to have to advise the House that owing to serious strikes in Liverpool, there has been some delay in carrying out the above schedule this month.

Following the Easter holidays in England the dockers' strike commenced and cable advices say that scarcely any sailings are taking place. Every effort has been made by the Overseas Minister to secure greater regularity in sailings at my request, in order to accomplish quick disembarkation of troops on arrival at ports in Canada.

Further cables have been received stating that owing to continued strikes the ships will not leave in accordance with our programme and many ship sailings are quite uncertain.

The situation is very trying to soldiers waiting their return to Canada and has created a most difficult situation for those charged with demobilization; both in England and Canada, and it will create a further difficulty with sudden congestion at ports of disembarkation for the railway companies to carry out their programme. It may create congestion at both Halifax and Quebec, and there may be some annoyance caused to both the troops and the relatives and friends of the troops on account of the present condition and unavoidable delay but I can assure the House that every possible effort has been made and is being made to meet the situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only in very rare cases that any document can go in Hansard that has not been read in the House, but as this is an important communication I take it that the consent of the House will be given that it appear in Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Certainly.

TRANSATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. ROWELL (for the Postmaster General): On Friday the hon. member for Maisonneuve raised a question in regard to the delivery of Canadian mails at New York by ships carrying Canadian troops, and in connection with the matter he read an extract from the Halifax Chronicle. I have made inquiries of the Post Office Department and find the position to be briefly this: At the present time, owing to the interruption of regular ocean traffic, due to the transport of troops and supplies, the greater part of the mails have for some time been coming to New York. The particular steamers in question were not steamers that travelled regularly from Liverpool to Halifax, nor were they subsidized to carry Canadian mails; their regular route was from Liverpool to New York. Arrangements were made with the shipping authorities by the Overseas Ministry of Militia or the Admiralty for these ships to carry Canadian troops to Halifax on their way to New York. The Post Office Department here was not advised that they were carrying Canadian troops to Halifax or that they were carrying Canadian mails, and did not know of it until the mails were landed in New York. They were sent on these ships by the British authorities, and as the ordinary route was from Liverpool to New York the British post office authorities evidently addressed the mail to New York. The matter has already been taken up with the British post office authorities to see if this cannot be changed, and to ensure that on all steamers which bring troops to Halifax the mails will be landed there. I hope such an arrangement can be made with the British post office authorities.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' SALARIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SANFORD JOHNSTON CROWE (Burrard): Before the Orders of the Day are called I would ask the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) if he is prepared to make a statement regarding the outcome of the conference held with the Western postal employees.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL (for the Postmaster General): Some days ago, before the Easter recess, I made a statement as to the result of the conference with the Eastern postal employees, and I said at the time that negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily with the representatives of the Western employees. I think that on the whole reasonably satisfactory conclusions were reached. I cannot take up the time of the House now to go into all the matters that came up for discussion, as the Western employees presented some forty-eight distinct requests to the Post Office Department which they desired to have considered. The great majority of those matters were of a purely routine departmental nature and were dealt with by the Postmaster General and his administrative staff, on the whole, I believe, in a way satisfactory to the representatives of the employees. There were, however, certain important questions of policy raised by the Western postal employees some similar in character to those raised by the Eastern employees, and others that differed from those in the East. I shall refer briefly to the most important of these questions.

The first demand was for the equalization of payments as between East and West. Hon. members will recall that for many years the Post Office employees from Sault Ste. Marie West received an additional allowance of $180 to meet what was assumed to be the higher cost of living in Western Canada. When the Post Office employees waited on the Government in July last, the Eastern employees pointed out that in their view the basis on which the additional allowance had been made in the past no longer existed, as the cost of living was approximately the same in the East as the West, and they asked that this discrimination should be removed. The Government

went a step towards removing it at that time as they only granted $50 additional bonus to employees in the West while they granted $100 to those in the East. The Government's answer at the present time was that the matter would be dealt with in the re-classification now being made by the Civil Service Commission. Under the re-classification, men will be paid according to the character of the work done, irrespective of the section of the country in which it is done. (This request was from the Eastern employees.) Another request was that the provisional allowance which had been made to men receiving $1,800 or under should be extended to all Post Office employees. The Government replied that this also would be dealt with in the re-classification.

A further request was that they be granted overtime for work done beyond the regular hours for service. The Government agreed to that request, and decided to pay overtime at the rate of time and a half. The fourth request was for a Saturday half-holiday all the year round, or for at least a weekly half holiday. The Government has agreed to the principle of a forty-four-hour week for the postal employees—that is a half holiday for the week—believing the House and the country would support it in doing that. In so far as the half holiday can be given on Saturdays it will be given, but the public service must be maintained in important city post offices. Therefore, those who cannot get the half holiday on Saturday will get it on some other day of the week, or overtime will be paid, or some other suitable arrangement made. Then they asked and pressed that as, under certain Orders in Council, men who had served overseas were relieved of passing the qualifying examinations that barrier should be removed as against all who had not passed that examination. The Government could not see its way clear to grant that request. It felt that the men who had served overseas were entitled to have the barrier in question removed, because they were not here to pass the examination, but, as a matter of fact, in the re-classification that obstacle will disappear, and the basis of examination will be entirely different. Another request made was, in view of the fact that there are many temporary employees in the postal service who have been paid the minimum salary for a considerable time, such employees be granted an annual increase in the same manner as permanent employees, or be appointed to the permanent staff. The Government could not see its way clear to put these temporary employees in the same position as permanent employees, otherwise there would be no advantage in passing the examination and coming into the service; but in the re-classification, so far as vacancies permit, they will be taken into the permanent service. Further it was asked that provision should be made for the necessary machinery for dealing with and adjusting all disputes and grievances in the service, with a suggestion that the co-operative principle outlined in the Whitley report might be adopted. In answer, the Government pointed out that employees in the public service stand in an entirely different position from that of workers in industrial establishments, where the employer is personally and directly affected by the rate of wages paid. The Government has no such interest, its sole object being to deal fairly by the employees in its service, and by the public which it represents. Secondly, it was pointed out that there already exists in the Civil Service Commission an impartial tribunal which is recommending salary schedules and dealing with promotions as provided in the Civil Service Act. Thirdly, one of the members of the Government, Hon. Mr. Maclean, has at the request of the Civil Service organizations, been asked to hear and deal with all questions affecting the Civil Service as a whole, or a particular branch of the service. The employees now have the opportunity of going to him directly in connection with any matter affecting the service. It was further pointed out that in any case the commission appointed to investigate the question of industrial relations was only now commencing its work, and until it had reported no further action can be taken.

I would only mention two other matters that occasioned a good deal of discussion. One was the claim that all acknowledged cases of injustice through the evils of patronage be immediately rectified, and that all time and monetary loss sustained be granted to all employees so affected. These gentlemen claimed that certain employees in the Post Office were entitled to promotion some years ago on their merits, that these promotions had been delayed, and that these employees had suffered an injustice, and that therefore the Government should now rectify this injustice. The view of the Government was that it could not undertake to review the acts of prior administrations in connection with promotions in the Civil Service. If it did it in one branch of the service, the Post Office, it would be asked to do it in all branches of the service, and whatever the

disadvantages might be the Government could not undertake to remove them. Another request made was for a minimum salary, and for a certain scale of allowances. To this the Government's answer was that those matters would be dealt with in the re-classification when it came down. On the whole, so far as the Government, acting in the public interests could meet made with the provincial governments inportant matters will be dealt with by the re-classification, and on some questions the Government felt that it could not meet the views presented to it.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATER-POWERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): I desire to ask the Minister of Railways if the report is true that the Government intends to develop some water-powers on the river St. Lawrence, and if so, whether any arrangements have been made with the provincial governments interested with regard to the proprietary rights to the bed of the river? Linked with this question I desire to ask another which concerns the permission which an American company obtained from the International Waterways Commission to dam the river St. Lawrence in order to construct works for the production of aluminium for air ships, it being clearly understood that that permission would be withdrawn immediately the war was over. What steps are being taken to carry out the understanding in question?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): In regard to the hon. gentleman's first question, he, of course, understands that any work undertaken by the Government in connection with the development of water-powers on the St. Lawrence could not be proceeded with until Parliament gave the necessary authority. The matter is one which has been under discussion in this House for a number of years. As I explained the other evening, the question was brought to the attention of the Department of Railways with a view to having construction work proceed on the St. Lawrence river, and the matter was also discussed in Congress at Washington during the last session. Further than that nothing has been done. With reference to the hon. gentleman's second question relating to the dam that was placed across the Long Sault rapids in order to develop power during the war, I do not understand that the decision of the International Waterways Commission was as the hon. gentleman states. If my memory serves me right, the company in question were empowered by the Waterways Commission to build this dam which was to continue, not only during the war, but, I think, for five years afterwards.

VACANT COUNTY COURT JUDGESHIPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): May I be permitted to ask the Acting Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, if the Government have reached any decision relating to the appointment of a county court judge for District No. 6 in Nova Scotia; and, if not, when it is likely to be dealt with?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): There are several vacant county court judgeships inclusive of the one referred to by the hon. member (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), but this Government having suggested to the various Provincial Governments that they should take into consideration the reduction of the county court judiciary in each province by amalgamation or otherwise, I have not thought well to recommend to Council the filling of the present vacancies.

THE CLOSURE.

INTERPRETATION OF RULE 17B

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Justice what is the understanding on Rule 17B as to the time allowed hon. members when we get into Committee, whether they can speak once on each clause, or once on the whole Bill? There seems to be a conflict of opinion in the press. Before we get into any trouble I would like to have a definite opinion from the Acting Minister of Justice.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: My opinion is this: That after the motion of which notice has been given, is put, should it be carried, there will be a clause taken up, presumably the first clause in the notice. Each hon. member may speak twenty minutes on that clause, but if it should carry the debate up to two o'clock, then all the clauses covered by the notice and the preamble and title must be decided by the House. If, however, the debate should conclude earlier than that hour on the first clause, the next clause would be taken up, which would revive the right of any hon. member who had spoken thereon.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE UNDER CLOSURE RULE.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 70, to incorporate Canadian National Railway Company and respecting Canadian National Railways.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that at this sitting clauses 2, 3, 16, 20, 21, 22, 29, and proposed 31 and 32, the first schedule and proposed second schedule, preamble and title of this Bill be the first business of the Committee and that consideration of same be not further postponed.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Chairman, this rule—

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is rising to a point of order?

Mr. DEVLIN: No, to the discussion of clause 20.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not debatable. I have just put the question upon the motion.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am not going to debate the motion; I am going to begin the discussion of clause 20.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman would be out of order at the present stage.

Mr. DEVLIN: In debating clause 20?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: I may do it in a moment's time?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Motion adopted; yeas 98, nays 34.

On section 2—Term of office of directors—Vacancy—Annual meeting.

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Chairman, it is a peculiar thing that history should in some cases repeat itself, because those who were in the House in the year 1917 will remember that the Act to purchase the Canadian Northern Railway was passed under the rule of closure, and that any hon. gentlemen who were against the granting of large sums of money were of necessity debarred from criticising those grants through the fact that free speech was then refused to what up to that date was a free Parliament. I say, Mr. Chairman, that history sometimes repeats itself. We find ourselves to-day in this peculiar position that we are considering the first important measure that has been brought before Parliament this session, and are debarred from giving it proper consideration through the same rule of closure. In other words, before the war we were told that we were going to fight for a free Parliament. The war is over, and what are we face to face with to-day? I am sorry to have to say so, but I want to say it with all the energy that lies in me, we are face to face with a Government that imposes once again upon the discussion of an important subject, involving millions of the people's money, the rule of gag. It was surprising to many of us to witness honourable members seated opposite, who, upon other occasions, stood for freedom of speech, stand up to-day and say that on this question, which has simply engaged the attention of the House for two or three days, there should not be liberty of speech. I hope that hon. gentlemen who voted that way will understand the full import of their vote, and that henceforward as far as they are concerned they do not stand for a free, but for a tramelled Parliament.

Millions of dollars have been spent upon the Canadian Northern Railway, which is to be taken over by this company. Indeed, the company has been formed without any consultation of the members of Parliament. The Canadian Northern Railway has, in name, become the Canadian National Railway. In the Ottawa Citizen are published the times of arrival and departure of the Canadian Northern trains between Toronto and Ottawa, being the hours of the trains of the Canadian National Railway. The directors were named by the Government before the incorporation of the company, and their salaries are being paid by the Government. Everything in connection with the working of this system is and will continue to be under the absolute control of the Government—and when I say "absolute control," I mean such control as will be allowed by the Canadian Northern Railway system. The man who drew up this Bill was not an officer of the Crown, not one of the legal advisors of the Department of Railways, but the lawyer of the Mackenzie and Mann—I should say, of the Canadian Northern system, Mr. Lash. He gives the Government his Bill and says: Now, you be a lot of little dummies; dance, but pass the Bill. The Government accepts Mr. Lash's Bill, and, through the Acting Prime Minister, says to the House: This is Mr. Lash's Bill, and it must be passed. We ask for information,

but the Government refuse to give it. When we ask what salaries are being paid to the directors of the Canadian Northern system, we are told: You shall inquire no longer; Mr. Lash's Bill is about to be passed under the rule of closure. Closure may be a good or may be an evil thing, but the principle of it as applied to this Parliament is a bad one. Everywhere liberty of action and speech is asked for, and it is a sorry thing indeed that the Government should apply the principle of the curtailment of the right of free speech in order to tax the people—yourselves and ourselves, the people of Canada. For that the Government will answer to the people.

Before my time lapses, I want to say a word or two about what this railway is costing the people. The people have obtained about ninety-eight per cent of the common stock, which has been declared by two officials of the Government as perfectly useless. When the Government are asked what else the people have obtained, they try to make an elaborate argument, but invariably come back to that stock. That is what the people have, and no more. What has the system cost the country? It has cost about $298,253,263. According to the testimony of Professor Smart, a very able writer whose version was published in the Montreal Star in 1917 or 1918, based upon the then market prices, the company is going to cost the country some $13,000,000 a year in deficits. The country is groaning under the high cost of living. Investigations are being demanded on all sides; yet you are standing party to the expenditure of the people's money to the extent of hundreds of millions and you are not inquiring where these hundreds of millions are going. No hon. member on the opposite side has taken the trouble, I am sure, of reading the Auditor General's Report from the first page to the last to find out where the people's money is going; yet that is what we are here for. What we cannot find in the Auditor General's Report we try to find out from the Government. We had an instance of that this afternoon. In answer to a question as to where $115,000,000 had gone, the Acting Prime Minister said: Well, the vouchers have not come over—it would take an awful lot to send them over, I suppose—but the accounts have been audited on the other side and have been declared to be satisfactory. And the $115,000,000 of the people's money must go. The people are clamouring for a reduction of the high cost of living. Has the Government taken any one step since the beginning of the session to reduce the cost of living? Not one. We are paying a Food Commissioner for reports. We are paying exorbitant sums for a little rag of a newspaper called the Official Record, which contains no real information. It merely gives clippings from a lot of other newspapers; and it is sent out as the Government official organ. In not one line of that journal is anything told of an attempt of the Government to reduce the cost of living. The Government have not studied the question; they do not know anything about it. The Government represents the wealth of this country, the manufacturers of this country. They do not know what the people are suffering or what it is costing them to keep their homes up. They have absolutely no idea of what the people are doing in trying to keep themselves supplied with meat. The people can hardly buy butter; yet the cold storage plants are loaded up with butter for exportation to the Old Country, while New Zealand is supplying the Canadian market at prices lower than those at which we can obtain butter in this country. And why? Simply because the profiteers have control of the butter. They have put it into cold storage, and they are holding it for higher prices; but the Government is doing absolutely nothing in the matter except taxing the people and imposing more taxes. People complain to-day that they are being taxed to the hilt. What will the taxes be after the Government have taken over all these railways, after they have paid for the debentures held by the people of Canada for loans made to the Canadian Northern? I happened to catch this bit of information supplied in May, 1918, in the Senate. Upon a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Belcourt, the Hon. Sir James Lougheed gave the following information. With the permission of the Committee, I will read the passage:

> I have great pleasure in placing this upon the Table. It shows securities of a par value of $69,000,000 securing the indebtedness of $67,000,000 which I mentioned yesterday.

All this is money which the people of Canada have to pay, for which the people are going to be taxed. Yet, because we protest against it, or at least, because we want to make some inquiries as to how the money is to be expended, my learned friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), with all the art and ability he is known to possess, is brought into the ring; and he starts a sparring match, and when any man attempts to ask a question, the minister stands up and endeavours, not

to give the information, but to spar the other man out of the ring. This must be somewhat new to the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) whom I see in his seat to-day. The hon. member must recall just a few years ago when he would attempt to speak of public ownership and to advocate the taking over of all transportation lines, vessels, railways and so on. Many times during the course of the last fourteen years I have heard him speak in favour of public ownership. How dumb was the opposite side of the House then, and he would have received no encouragement whatever, were it not for some encouragement he got from this side of the House. He spoke to absolutely deaf ears on the other side; not one man would stand up with him; he could not even present a motion in favour of public ownership supported by one member on the other side of the House. Yet here is the apostle of public ownership in his seat to-day, looking, with all the pleasure that a man can summon up, with the knowledge of converts he has made to the cause, from the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) down to the last man. The Acting Prime Minister said the other day: The whole trouble is that the Opposition are against public ownership, and that is why they are opposing it. The Acting Prime Minister knows perfectly well that the question of public ownership versus private ownership has never come up for discussion in concrete form in this House, so that he cannot say who are in favour of public ownership and who are in favour of private ownership. But up to three or four years ago, with the exception of the hon. member for South York, there was not on the other side of the House a man who was in favour of private ownership in this country. Therefore, it ill becomes the Acting Prime Minister to cast any slur upon members seated upon this side on the ground that they are against public ownership. Are we against public ownership because we want some information regarding this Bill? Are we against public ownership because we do not believe that it is the right method to pursue, that the first important Bill brought before the House must be brought before us under the rule of closure?

4 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member has spoken now for twenty minutes. He will be able to continue his remarks on some other clause that comes under consideration.

Mr. DEVLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, because I wish to discuss Clauses 28, 29 and 30.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not wish to express my opinion regarding this "gag" law which the Acting Prime Minister saw fit to bring in on Friday, in lieu of giving information which the Government were either unable or unwilling to furnish to this Committee. The Acting Prime Minister blustered into the Committee about twenty minutes to six o'clock on Friday afternoon when Section 20 of the Bill, a section that had never been printed, that had never been submitted to the Committee before, had been under discussion for less than two hours. At about five minutes to four o'clock, as will be found from Hansard, an amendment was moved to take in some forty or forty-four railroads, and shortly before six o'clock the Acting Prime Minister suggested to the chairman that he call it six o'clock, so that the minister would have an opportunity, at eight o'clock, of making a statement to the Committee for the purpose of endeavouring to cover up the actions of this Government and their nefarious—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CAHILL: Co-operation with the Mackenzie and Mann crowd. It is a cowardly action of a cowardly Government to undertake.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression, as it is certainly not parliamentary.

Mr. CAHILL: I bow to your decision, Sir. I know you will permit no stronger language, and nothing milder will express my feelings in the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. PARENT: They can swallow it.

Mr. CAHILL: They have swallowed so much already; this is nothing new to them. We are debating a Bill to incorporate the Canadian National railways. On Friday at four o'clock in the afternoon the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) brought in an amendment, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that the minister could not at that time have named ten out of the forty railways. I will challenge any minister of the Government to name, without looking up Hansard, the places where any of those railways start and finish. They cannot do it, because they do not know. The Bill

was prepared for them by Mr. Lash—by Mackenzie and Mann, and there was not, in the House, one minister, not excepting the Acting Prime Minister, who could answer one question without first submitting it to the gentleman who was sitting to the left to supply them with the information which Mr. Lash had furnished to the Government in order to put something over on this country. The Acting Prime Minister, with a great flourish, came in shortly before six o'clock for the purpose of bringing in closure on a Bill embodying forty-four charters, after less than two hours' debate, and without a copy of the amendment being submitted to this Committee.

In fact, the Bill we are debating now was only distributed when we came into Committee at three o'clock to-day. And yet, hon. gentlemen opposite hope to lead the country to believe that the Opposition has been obstructing because it was opposed to public ownership! Why, the Acting Prime Minister himself would not state whether he was in favour of public ownership or not. He has never told the House where he stands on public ownership; it is not on record anywhere that he is in favour of it. Why, then, should he insinuate that hon. members on this side are not in favour of public ownership? The reason the Government have brought in closure is because they are not in a position, or are unwilling, to reply to the questions we have asked. They are not able to explain the clauses of the Bill, and their only hope of getting it through is by applying the closure. The Government has a majority of over fifty, and after a debate of only two hours they bring in closure, because the Opposition is making things so hot for them and they do not want to be delayed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CAHILL: Absolutely; there is nothing else to it. There is not a man on the Government side who can explain the clauses of this Bill, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. That is the reason why they refused to debate the clauses in Committee, when we can get up and ask questions and put them in the hole they are in now. The Government cannot explain their attitude or their actions, and if they attempt to stand up and defend Mackenzie and Mann and their crowd, they will soon find they are on very thin ice and have only a very slim following in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to throw the blame on this side of the House, and ask, what will the country think? Mr. Chairman, I should like to go to the country and see what the people think about the Government and Mackenzie and Mann on this question. I should like to go to Ontario or any other place where there is a vacant seat and debate the question of public ownership under the control of Mackenzie and Mann and the Minister of Railways and with the advice of Mr. Z. A. Lash. If hon. gentlemen opposite are so brave about what is going to happen to members of the Opposition for their attitude on this question, let them go to the country now in any constituency that the Government will throw open, and see what the country thinks on their own attitude on public ownership before they attempt to blame us. We are not objecting to public ownership of this railway. We have the railway, and we want an honest management of it, but I have no hesitation in saying that I do not expect it with this Government in power, because they have not been honest in their dealings with the railway situation so far. The question of public ownership has not been raised in this House. I tried to bring it up last year but could not get a debate on the subject. The members of the Government would not say whether they were in favour of public ownership or not. The Government will not tell us to-day whether they are in favour of public ownership, but prefer to draw a red herring across the trail and blame the Opposition for holding up the Bill.

I should like some information on clause 2, but I have very grave doubts of getting it, because the only information we got on Friday was from back benchers, who were immediately gagged when the minister saw they knew something and were willing to impart it. Clause 2 deals principally with the date of the annual meeting, and in this connection I wish to make a suggestion to the Government. The clause provides that the annual meeting shall be held on the second Thursday in April of each year. Now, the statistical year ends on December 31st, and the year of most companies ends in December, and in order that Parliament may have the necessary information—if the Government intend to give us any, which I very much doubt—I would suggest that the date of the annual meeting be changed to the end of December. But if the Government can give a good reason why the date should not be changed, I shall be content.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): It is really an extraordinary thing

that the Opposition, whenever they debate the question of railways, should throw up an enormous cloud of dust and yet absolutely fail to proclaim their faith in the principle of public ownership. While it is quite possible that the Government may in matters of detail or even in the general management of the business fall more or less into error and be open to criticism, because that is the lot of all human beings, nevertheless by this very Act the Government are pledging themselves to the principle of public ownership, and it is merely wasting the time of this House and of the people of the country to issue such vacant challenges as we have just heard.

Mr. CAHILL: Sure it is. Nobody will take them up on your side.

Mr. BURNHAM: The Government stand or fall by the principle of public ownership. They have found that the giving of subsidies and the granting of lands and making financial arrangements with vast private corporations were running this country into bankruptcy; so this new policy has been adopted. The Opposition is not trying to find any way out of the difficulty at all, but is simply standing for private ownership. If the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Cahill) wishes to back up his challenge by going into some neutral constituency and fighting the election on the principle of public ownership, he will find many a man on this side of the House to take up his gage. But on the other side of the House, I believe there is not one man in favour of public ownership.

Mr. CAHILL: What about you?

Mr. BURNHAM: I am ready to back up what I say. If any man wishes to contend West Peterborough on the question of public ownership, I will resign and go right at it. Let my hon. friend stand up and say whether he wants it done.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Government will open the constituency, I will do it.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand that he accepts the challenge?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Resign.

Mr. DUFF: I will fight you.

Mr. BURNHAM: What does the gentleman say who is waving his arm so wildly over there? What are the wild waves saying? There is no getting away from the fact that this Bill is a test of where we stand on public ownership. Whoever heard of such a thing as seriously suggesting, in discussing this clause, that the date should be changed from Thursday in April to the end of December, as if the affairs of these great corporations could be managed by such guess-work as that. Let hon. members of the Opposition proclaim one after another this afternoon that they are in favour of public ownership, and then there will be some sympathy for them not only in this country but on this side of the House. But there is not the slightest doubt whatever that they are against public ownership. They are here to express their opinions, and if they are not opposed to public ownership let them say so.

This House should manage the public business of the country, and if it is not capable of directing public corporations, it is not fit, directly or indirectly, to conduct the public business and therefore the whole system of democratic representation stands condemned by the men who rise and make such trivial complaints as we have listened to. They do not care how far-reaching or extravagant their statements may be, because they are determined to oppose public ownership and advocate private ownership, since there is more in private ownership for their friends than there is in public ownership.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER: I have not taken a very active part in the discussion of this Bill, but I have listened very attentively to all that has been said and I am really at a loss to know why my hon. friend the leader of the Government, when he spoke last Friday, deemed it fit to make such a scathing indictment of us Liberals sitting on your left. We were asking questions simply because we desired information, and I fail to understand why he should impute to us any motives other than that, and to suggest that we were endeavouring to espouse the cause of private ownership rather than public ownership, and that we were unprogressive Liberals lacking faith in Canadian enterprises. and believing that the great Prairie Provinces did not need railways for their development. The unmistakeable inference from his remarks was that we on this side of the House did not want further extension of railways in the West, and his statements were calculated to set the West against the East. That is all I can make of it. Then my hon. friend in the greatness of his heart, and no doubt for the purpose of showing his consistency, pleaded for unity, with all its intoxicating memories. He urged us to be optimistic and to have faith in the outcome of this great period of reconstruction; but no sooner had he completed the remarks in which he made this lofty appeal than he

suavely pressed the button which put into operation the air compressor of the gagging machine, thereafter gracefully making his exit from the Chamber. And now, Mr. Chairman, we have this patented infernal machine working smoothly, and to the keen delight and entire satisfaction of its ingenious inventor. I am going to be fair with my hon. friend the leader of the Government, because I should be loath to criticise him unduly; but I must perforce ask him the reason for his assertion that all of us Liberals are opposed to public ownership of railways, and why he should think it a crime for us to ask questions. Why, he himself asked for information; and I may ask him, has he not himself ridiculed the proposition of public ownership? Certainly, for he was reminded of the fact by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, and I was glad to observe that he took it in good part. I do not suppose my hon. friend will deny me the very same privilege that he claimed for himself. I do not see how I can endorse legislation introduced for the purpose of bringing railways, either taken over or to be taken over by the Government, under the control of a corporation responsible not to Parliament but to the Government of the day. There are good arguments in favour of public ownership.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOURNIER: That is all right. I have an open mind on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOURNIER: Hon. members may laugh but they will hear the rest of my statement: There are also objections to public ownership. There are arguments on both sides, and I do not question the authority of the sponsors of the Bill, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Railways. Indeed, they may be well versed in railway matters, but in my opinion, considering the qualifications of the two hon. gentlemen, and with all deference to them, I should say that one of them is best versed in law, while the other is undoubtedly best versed in starch. It seems to me that the present Cabinet has developed a remarkable propensity for the assumption of responsibility at a rate which the public has not been able fully to follow, and I do not know how I can vote squarely on the question when we cannot get the information which we seek. Am I going to tell my constituents that the greatest argument in favour of public ownership is the revival of forty-four charters to gentlemen owning townsites and all the land on which they can speculate? I am in favour of public ownership but I want to say to hon. gentlemen who have sat here all through the discussion and some of whom, it seemed to me, were almost dead, that before I undertake to support public ownership I want the few pennies in my pocket and my watch put in a place of safe keeping. I have listened very attentively to all that has been said in regard to this Bill, and all that I have been able to gather is the fact that it creates a combination of very great power which will exercise a political sway unprecedented in our history. This legislation has been very comprehensive in its provisions. Even the headquarters are to be chosen by Order in Council. The form of railway administration proposed is not so much public as it is cabinet ownership, and the ministerial party is vested with powers far beyond the traditional responsibility of Governments. Now, I am a French Canadian, but a Canadian wherever I go. I have the honour to represent Bellechasse, the finest riding in the province of Quebec, and I come from that very spot where the first page of Canadian history was written, where Christianity and civilization made their first lodgment in that vast extent of country covered with wilderness, where the toilers of the soil converted forests into verdant fields thereby planting the first seed of Canadianism on this continent. I am a Canadian, I repeat; therefore why should I not believe in Canadian enterprise? I am a firm believer in Canadian enterprise and progress, and I resent any insinuation to the contrary.

There are strong reasons against the proposed legislation. I am open to conviction on this matter, but how am I to be convinced when the Government refuses me information? The Government's record is not one that can be accepted with good grace, is not one to lead us to trust either the financial capacity or the political honesty of the system which it represents. In this connection let me quote the opinion of an expert on railway matters, Mr. Lovatt, he says:

> There is nothing so essential to the financial peace and the commercial and industrial welfare of this country as a definite government railroad policy.

That is very good advice, let us have a definite policy, but here we are confronted by a new condition. I will be frank with the leader of the Government. Here we have the Canadian Northern on our hands, and I ask who is responsible for this?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes, who, tell us?

Mr. FOURNIER: The leader of the Government must look in the direction of his associates; Toronto magnates, malefactors, and, if the expression is permissible, unscrupulous financiers. They are the men that have brought about the present condition of affairs, because they were the bondholders, and they knew that if the Government should take over this railway those bonds would be enormously increased in value and they would be saved from disaster. We now have on our hands what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) pronounced not long ago in Montreal to be a "white elephant." As I do not profess to belong to the so-called aristocracy I will state, in the common, ordinary language of the day, that the public has been handed a lemon. Who wrecked these national enterprises? Take the Transcontinental railway. We were told on the floor of the House by no less a personage than the leader of the Government that the Transcontinental line was an awful thing. But I ask, who wrecked the Transcontinental line? The Acting Prime Minister, in his remarks on Friday night, spoke of this and other railway enterprises as "dirty Liberal babies." When the Transcontinental was in operation, when my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, came into office, what was done with this great railway which was to connect the West with our Atlantic seaports, which was to carry western grain for seven cents a bushel cheaper than any other railway, and which would prove a shorter route to our ocean ports by hundreds of miles than any existing line? Have we not to blame Toronto magnates and unscrupulous financiers? It has been said that all our grain is going by the New York route. If our anticipations in carrying our western grain to our own seaports have not been realized, if the Transcontinental has not proved a success, who is responsible for it? The Acting Minister of Finance charges that we Liberals are unpatriotic. In what category should we place those who have wrecked this railway system? Does my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) think I am going to quietly listen to lectures from him in view of such a record? Not on your tintype. We are conversant with the facts and we know all about the management of the Intercolonial which is referred to frequently as a perpetual national scandal. The Acting Minister of Finance virtually says to us "Believe in all I say." The minister when he takes that position resembles a woman who was reprimanded one day by her husband. Whether she had done wrong or not I cannot say, but her husband made an accusation against her and her reply was "No, I did not do it." "You did," he observed, "because I saw you," whereupon she retorted, "Do you believe the evidence of your own eyes more than you do my word? If so, what sort of a man are you?" In the same way the Acting Minister of Finance takes the position: If you do not believe me what sort of Liberals are you? The minister has presented a very strong indictment of Liberals because they have asked questions. We have been a little bit scrupulous and hesitant about passing all the clauses of this Bill in the absence of complete information. I say to the minister that his indictment of Liberals was not to my liking and I shall, regardless of whoever it may concern, offer a little indictment of my own, and I would ask those affected by it to paste it in their hat so they may see it quite frequently. The minister says I am not patriotic. Very well, here is my reply to that:

Patrician, aristocrat, Tory—whatever his age or name,
To the people's rights and liberties, a traitor ever the same.
The natural crowd is a mob to him, their prayer a vulgar rhyme;
The free man's speech is sedition, and the patriot's deed a crime;
Whatever the race, the law, the land,—whatever the time or throne,—
The Tory is always a traitor to every class but his own.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and for whom I entertain a very sincere friendship, made the statement that this country has been handed a lemon in taking over these railways. I do not know that I particularly care to quarrel with him as to the accuracy of the statement, but if this country has to relieve the existing financial thirst to a certain extent, it must be by making a certain amount of lemonade out of that lemon. That is the only observation I have to make with regard to the so-called lemon which we have taken over. I have listened for the last three or four days to the debate on this railway question, and so far as I have been able to interpret that debate, it has been more or less on the abstract principle of public ownership. I do not intend to impute any motives to the gentlemen sitting to your left, Mr. Chairman, because if they, and if we all, looked back over the history of public ownership in this country, we might find a good deal of reason for criticising public ownership in general. But the trouble in the past has been that we have mixed politics and

patronage with public ownership. Both sides of politics in Canada have done that, but I have faith enough in the present Government, and in future governments, to believe that hereafter the two ingredients mentioned will be eliminated from the compound—that politics and patronage will be done away with in connection with the administration of Government railroads, and that we shall be given public ownership in its best form. To my mind the debate on the abstract question of public ownership is entirely beside the real question at issue: no matter what may transpire during this debate, as to the good points or bad points of public ownership, the fact remains that we possess in Canada to-day nearly a billion dollars' worth of publicly owned railways, so that debating the abstract question does not help us at all in the matter. Furthermore, if we take over the Grand Trunk railway, which is very likely to happen in the future according to my reading of the trend of events, then we shall have a billion and a half dollars' worth of publicly owned railroads in this country.

One other observation I wish to make is this, that under those circumstances, considering that we have that billion dollars' worth of publicly owned railways, I consider that any blow at public ownership leads us distinctly towards national financial suicide. Transportation by railways in this and other countries is as truly a tax on the people as is a customs tariff. Railways are the highways of the country. In other words, in the old days the ordinary roads were the highways; to-day the railways have taken their place. Except in the remote past we did not permit the ordinary roads to be controlled by private interests, and to my mind it is just as much to the interest of this country that the railways, which are now our highways, should not be controlled by private interests. So that I do not hesitate to say that at least theoretically I am a public ownership man. I do not go to the extent of saying that we should to-day take over the Canadian Pacific Railway, as was stated by the hon. member for North Waterloo. I would not take that step until we have proven that we are capable of managing in a capable manner the billion dollars' worth of railroads which we now possess free of politics and patronage.

I have no horrors of public ownership in general, and one of my reasons for entertaining that opinion is that a year before the war I had the pleasure of travelling over publicly owned and controlled railways in France, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Germany and Belgium, and outside of Italy I saw no inferiority in the handling of the traffic on those railways with the handling of the traffic on the privately owned railways in England. Therefore there is no reason in the world to my mind why we should not make good in the handling of our own railroads.

There is one other point I wish to make before I sit down, because I do not intend to take up the twenty minutes allotted to me. The question has been brought up as to these forty-four charters ennumerated in Section 20. It appears to me that Mackenzie and Mann kept those charters open because they were convinced there was some value in them. If so, why should we refuse to take back those charters for the benefit of this country? I cannot see for the life of me why we should refuse to do so for the reason that some private corporation may wish to build in future through the territory covered by those charters. Supposing it is true as suggested by some hon. members that land in the neighbourhood of the lines to be built under those charters is owned by Mackenzie and Mann or other private interests, because most of the land in the West has been alienated into private hands by various governments from time to time, that is no reason why any government which controls the destinies of this country should not use its best judgment in regard to building any of those projected lines. The granting of a charter does not constitute an order to build the railway mentioned therein; if it did we would not have so many private corporations looking for charters. In my opinion the taking over of those forty-four charters is simply handing back to the people of this country what belongs to them. I listened very intently to the different reasons advanced by hon. gentlemen, but I fail to hear a single legitimate reason why those forty-four charters should not be taken back by the people of Canada as their own property.

The conclusion I have reached is that it is the duty of every Canadian to stand up and support public ownership to the best of his ability, for the reason that if he does not do so he is hitting at a railway business controlled by this Government of the value of at least one billion dollars.

Mr. POWER: The hon. gentleman said no Canadian would be against this Bill. Does he consider that the two million of us in Quebec are Canadians?

Mr. MANION: I did not say that no Canadian would be against this Bill; I said no Canadian should be against the public ownership principle of this Bill.

Mr. POWER: Do you consider the people of the province of Quebec are Canadians?

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman will sit in this House a long time before he hears me say anything against the people of the province of Quebec.

Mr. McMASTER: I have merely a verbal suggestion to make in respect of Clause 2. During the previous debate on this section it was pointed out that the Government intended the directors should be appointed every year, should be appointed or re-appointed. That was my understanding. I fail to see that the section as amended carries out that understanding. It now reads that:

> The directors shall hold office from one annual meeting to another or until their successors are appointed—

It would seem to me that if the Government did not make the appointment the old directors would continue in office until their successors were appointed. I understood that that was not the idea of the Government, and as a way of more adequately giving effect to what I understand to be the desire of the Government, I would suggest that after the word "office" should be inserted the words "for the term of one year" and strike out the words "or until their successors are appointed." Then the section would be perfectly clear in the sense that these directors would have to be appointed year by year.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 2 carry?

Mr. EULER: Like another hon. gentleman who addressed the Committee, I have not had a very great deal to say with regard to this Bill, and anything I have said was, as I thought, entirely in the interests of public owenrship. I am not an obstructionist, but the mere fact that I might be called such will not deter me from using the twenty minutes which are at my command for the purpose of criticising this Bill, despite the fact that we have in vogue that up-to-date instrument of autocracy, the closure, which can be compared only with that other gag of the Acting Minister of Justice—the War-time Elections Act.

It has been stated that a good deal of time has been wasted in discussion of this Bill. Last Tuesday and Wednesday I would have said the same thing. I felt at that time in connection with one of the earlier clauses that a good deal of time was wasted; but I want to submit this, Mr. Chairman, that that time was wasted because of entirely trivial objections on the part of those in charge of the Bill to answering questions that were entirely in order. It seems to me that a good deal of the friction that has arisen in this Committee, so far as hon. members on the Opposition side of the House are concerned, is caused by a tendency on the part of those responsible for this Bill—and I refer more particularly to the Acting Minister of Justice—to refuse to give any consideration whatever to suggestions that come from this side of the House. I can remember no instance where a suggestion from this side of the House has been accepted. I am free to admit that the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill has a great deal of ability, but if I might take the liberty I would say that he will add to his stature if he will widen his outlook sufficiently to admit that some good can come from his opponents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. gentleman permit me an interruption? He is quite in error, or else he was not in the House at the time, when he states that no suggestions were accepted by way of amendment from the other side of the House. I would recall to him the fact that several were accepted, indeed, many more than from this side of the House, because many more were offered, and one was accepted which to-day, I am afraid, may have to be reversed.

Mr. EULER: I was not in the House when all these were offered, but as a general thing I believe that my statement holds good.

On Friday afternoon we had an address from the Acting Prime Minister on public ownership. I have a good deal of admiration for the manner in which the Acting Prime Minister has conducted the business of the House. He has ability, he has urbanity; he has seemed to adopt an attitude of fair-mindedness throughout. But I resent with all the strength in my power the statement he made on Friday that this was a fight between the advocates of public ownership and the advocates of private ownership. That statement—with all respect for the high office which the minister holds—was an out-and-out appeal to the press gallery. What he said may sound very well and may read very well in the press, but I do not believe that it was founded upon fact. To my mind, it was mock heroics. It was interesting as an evidence

of quick conversion to the public ownership idea, but to me it was not at all convincing. One gentleman who spoke this afternoon said that none on this side of the House were in favour of public ownership. I may say almost the same thing about hon. gentlemen on the other side. I have no accurate knowledge of the attitude of men on this side, but I could count on the fingers of one hand—I would not need to use them all—the men on the other side of the House who are definitely on record as in favour of public ownership. Anything that the Government has done is no proof that they favour public ownership as a principle. We have taken over these roads not because we believe in public ownership—although I do—but as a matter of necessity; and the Acting Prime Minister is making a virtue of necessity. Would the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, if we take it over, or the Canadian Northern have come into the possession of the people had it not been for the fact that these roads could not carry on any longer and that it was absolutely necessary for us to take them over? The Government have not shown by their actions that they are really believers in the principle of public ownership. I resent also the veiled suggestion of the Acting Prime Minister—I do not know that it was a veiled suggestion; it was made pretty openly—that the members on this side are dictated to by, or are the tools of, any private company or organization, meaning the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not believe a word of it, and I do not think that the Acting Prime Minister does. Indeed, it looks to me that the accuser should rightly be the accused; the Acting Prime Minister said the other day that only two courses were open in this matter of railway ownership: either the Government must develop these roads which we have acquired into one great system and operate that system in competition with the Canadian Pacific railway, or the Canadian Pacific railway would itself operate all the railroads in the country. Why did he never at any time make the suggestion that the Government might some time own and operate all the railroads in Canada including the Canadian Pacific railway? Had he said that, there would be room for the belief that he is a real believer in the principle of public ownership. But the Canadian Pacific railway has been kept out of it all the way. "Do not touch the Canadian Pacific Railway;" that has been the attitude of the Acting Prime Minister. The Canadian Pacific railway is a private corporation, and it comes ill from the Acting Prime Minister to accuse us on this side of being the henchmen of the Canadian Pacific Railway when the evidence rather inclines us to the belief that that may be said of himself.

I believe in public ownership, absolutely. In that respect I may not be in accord with all members on this side; but I am a believer in public ownership on principle. I believe that the time will come when all public services upon which the convenience and prosperity of the people depend can no longer be entrusted to private interests, which often run counter to those of the people. That is my reason for criticising the provisions of this Bill. I want to see public ownership given a fair chance; I do not want to see the cards stacked at the outset in this public ownership game. I have had a little to do with public ownership in a smaller way. Ninety per cent of the people of western Ontario believe in public ownership. In my own city of Kitchener we own practically all the public utilities and have operated them successfully. In Ontario we are going into the operation of railways, and that is one reason why I think this Bill should be carefully scrutinized. I will come to that later, if I have time.

My strongest reason for making suggestions with regard to this Bill is that I believe the people of Canada are making demands for a much wider application of the principle of public ownership than we have to-day, and I do not want to see the project damned in its infancy. If it is a failure now, the whole future development of public ownership in other directions will be set back a generation or more. I believe that the time is not far distant when we shall own all the railways in this country, including the Canadian Pacific railway. The time may not be ripe for the acquisition of the Canadian Pacific railway; financial objections may be raised to that, but if we rise to our duty we shall own and operate successfully, in the interests of the people, not in the interests of private capital, all Canadian railways. I believe also that we will control telephones, telegraphs, and express services and own or control our natural resources, our oil and mineral deposits, etc. The common people may demand before many years—we see indications of it now among the working people and others—that the Government take over the banking interests, which, I believe, in many instances have hampered the development of this country and its interests. Insurance is also a question for nationalization. In a general way,

it is my opinion that all those services upon which the prosperity and convenience of the common people depend will, in the end, perhaps after a great deal of difficulty, become the property of and be successfully managed by the people. Therefore let us take all proper precaution to ensure success from the outset. The Government's responsibility in that connection is truly tremendous.

The opposition which has developed to this Bill is primarily for three reasons.

The first one is the disinclination or refusal of the Government to give information which they ought to give. This has led to a feeling of suspicion on this side that everything is not just exactly as it should be. A second reason, about which I know very little and am not very much concerned, has been suggested, namely, that these forty-four charters in the West are to be used for political purposes. The most important reason of all is as to the personnel of the Board that is going to operate the national railways. We have been told—and I absolutely agree with this—that in order to make public ownership of railways a success, we must have at the helm the very ablest men in the country. Is it logical to reappoint as the managers of this national railway, men who could not make a sucess under private ownership of the Canadian Northern? I say, it is not. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) has been very persistent in his endeavours to procure information, and sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite have rather jeered at him, but what he has done has made some impression upon the public mind. Whatever hon. members opposite may think or believe, there is throughout this country a feeling of profound distrust that the Canadian National railways are still, to some extent, under the control of Mackenzie and Mann. I believe it is true that the public mind is uneasy at the thought that the men who have been taking out of this country a great deal more than they have ever put into it, still have, to some extent, their hand in public affairs in connection with the National railways. There may be no justification for that suspicion, but that suspicion is there, and the Government ought to take cognizance of it. Unless you have public confidence behind this project, you cannot make a success of it.

In Western Ontario, the people will soon develop a system of hydro-radial railways to be operated by electric power from Niagara falls. It would be a pity if the steam railroads which we have now, many of which are not being operated successfully on the branch lines, should be continued in operation in that way, and that we should have to parallel them with electric lines, operated, we shall say, under the chairmanship of Sir Adam Beck and his Hydro-Electric Commission. Here is the difficulty as I see it. The men who are going to have charge of our national railways are men who were not formerly in sympathy with public ownership. I question whether they are now. The man who will be president of the Canadian National railways has, as is well known, been in conflict with the men in

5 p.m.

Western Ontario who are trying to advance the idea of public ownership of railways and to operate them by electricity. The two parties ought to work together, and wherever possible, the steam roads should be converted into electric roads. But under present conditions, with Mr. Hanna in charge of the Canadian National railways and Sir Adam Beck in control of the Hydro-Electric Commission, I think that is almost impossible. Let me read a quotation from the Toronto Globe along those lines, although it does not go so far as I did:

> In Ontario economy and efficiency demand the co-operation of the Canadian National railways and the Hydro-Electric Commission. The wasteful duplication of lines must be prevented, and the Hydro-Electric Commission should be permitted, when the Grand Trunk acquired by the country, to convert many branch lines into electric roads. These branches, which serve exclusively some of the richest and most populous districts of the province, are so far below the standard of the trunk lines, and so handicapped by heavy gradients, that they are much more adapted to electric than to steam traction. The Canadian National railways would profit by turning them over to the Commission, as they would continue to serve as feeders, without cost to the national system. For years the Hydro-Electric railway projects have been held up, waiting on Federal plans.

In conclusion, I would say to the Government, I believe they would be well advised if they constituted an entirely new board of directors to run the Canadian National railways. Let them pay the price and get the best men they can, men who believe in public ownership, and keep their hands off, cutting out patronage, and then there will be a chance for success.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am inclined to agree wtih the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) that we have public ownership because of necessity. That necessity is forced upon this country by hon. gentlemen opposite, because it was the way the railway situation in this country was bungled

by the political party which they represent that public ownership is a necessity at the present time. If we go back to the initiation of the Canadian Northern, what group of public men was it that first provided the money to get the Canadian Northern started? The gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they were in power, launched this project upon the country; they got Mackenzie and Mann committed to the work by giving them bonuses, grants, charters and all that kind of thing. The greatest offence they committed was this: that having had this great railway very largely constructed, they then started another transcontinental railway, and put something like $550,000,000 into that other line, which has become bankrupt and which the country has to take over and the effect of constructing which was absolutely to destroy the work that Mackenzie and Mann were trying to do in building what would have been a really profitable Canadian transcontinental railway. I am surprised that a sense of shame does not prevent hon. members opposite from standing up and protesting against public ownership and against the Bill before us that is trying to put public ownership in a sound position. It is they who are responsible for the plight in which the country finds itself at the present time. If, instead of subsidizing the Grand Trunk Pacific, and building the Transcontinental Railway, the party which hon. gentlemen opposite represent had put another $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 into the Canadian Northern and required the Grand Trunk to operate with the Canadian Northern, we would have had in this country to-day, or we would be on the verge of having two profitable transcontinental railways, instead of one that is profitable and two that are practically bankrupt. The greatest financial crime ever committed in this country was the inauguration and construction of the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it was so regarded at the time. The then Minister of Railways retired from the Government because he would not be responsible for the policy that was then forced upon the Liberal party, and it was because of the vast sums of money spent upon what was foreseen by practically every impartial, public-spirited man throughout the country, who had no axe to grind, to be impossible of success, that we find ourselves in the tremendously difficult position that we are in to-day, and that we are forced to take over not only the Canadian Northern, but the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific. So the responsibility rests with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. COPP: Some of them are over there with you.

Mr. HOCKEN: The Canadian Northern is the best laid out railway in the Dominion of Canada; it goes through the best territory, has the best grades, and is the best located, and if Mackenzie and Mann had been supported in their undertaking we would have saved all or pretty nearly all of this $550,000,000, and would have had a profitable line. It sounds mighty funny to hear hon. gentlemen opposite criticising Mackenzie and Mann, because it is not very many years since, when they were in power, they were pouring money into the hands of these two men with a prodigality that was simply astounding. They started it, we all know that, and brought the enterprise to the point where the Canadian Government had either to continue pouring money into it or take it over. There was no other choice. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite stand up to-day and denounce Mackenzie and Mann, and curse everything connected with that road. So that you would almost believe they had never been in favour of it. In my judgment, Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann are the greatest railway geniuses the Dominion of Canada ever had. They have laid out a line which when properly coupled up with feeders in the eastern part of Canada will be quite as profitable as the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the time will come, and in my judgment is not far distant, when public men, instead of cursing Sir William Meckenzie and Sir Donald Mann, will give them their proper place in our history as men who have performed a wonderful service for Canada. They may have got rich out of it; railway promoters generally do; nevertheless, by their genius they have given us something which will prove to be a most valuable asset of this Dominion. While I am opposed to continuing to pour out public money into private hands, I still can see the service these men have performed for Canada, and I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite that they cease denouncing these two men whom they started on their career.

I have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite declaring that they are not enemies of public ownership, that they have an open mind and all that sort of thing, but I have only heard one of them say he was in favour of public ownership. The sentiment in the county of Waterloo, as a matter of fact, is

such that no man can occupy a public position there unless he is in favour of public ownership.

Mr. COPP: What about you?

Mr. HOCKEN: Why I am the champion public ownership man of the city of Toronto. Everybody there will tell you that I have gone farther in advocating public ownership in Canada than any other man except the editor of the Toronto World. He was the originator of the whole cult of public ownership, but I have always been a pretty close follower. I am quite plain in declaring where I stand, but I do not hear hon. gentlemen opposite declaring where they stand. They are doing their best to-day to escape the obliquy which they expect will fall upon them for their attitude on this Bill. Perhaps that is good politics; I am not well versed enough in politics to say.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has public ownership even been an issue at a general election in Canada?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not in a federal election, but it has been an issue in some provincial elections. At all events, it is an issue right here to-day; that is the issue which we are debating.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no such issue here.

Mr. HOCKEN: The issue is whether we shall have public ownership of railways of this country, or whether public ownership shall be throttled; and the motives of those who are raising technicalities and discussing side issues are just as plain to the people of this country as they are to the members of this House. I do not like to see a man blow hot and cold; I have no use for a Laodicean. I like to see a man one thing or the other; I like to see him affirm his convictions and stand by them; and I would like to see hon. gentlemen opposite who are in favour of public ownership get up and declare themselves.

There are powerful interests in this country opposed to the nationalization of railways, and those interests centre largely in the city of Montreal. If you take as an index of their attitude the press of the city of Montreal, there are very few friends of public ownership down there. I do not know whether that accounts for the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite or not. In the province of Ontario, practically from the Ottawa river to the St. Clair, and north to James bay as far as population exists, the people are in favour of public ownership and the nationalization of the railways. While we regret that so much money has been put into the Canadian Northern, and that the road has not yet reached the point we might have expected, we are satisfied that to-day there is nothing else for us to do but to take it over, put it on a good basis, and operate it; and we look forward to the day in the not distant future when the road will pay.

Our railways, I understand, are to be kept free from politics, and I believe that the way the Government has adopted is the best way for keeping politics out of the road. I believe that the men who have been placed at the head of our railways will manage the system in the public interest.

Mr. McMASTER: Does the hon. gentleman know who these gentlemen are in whom he has such faith?

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not know them all personally but I know those who are in the chief places. They are expert railway men, and I have a very high regard for their business ability and integrity.

Mr. EULER: Does the hon. member know or does he believe that these men are believers in public ownership?

Mr. HOCKEN: They have accepted a public trust, and I believe they will observe it just as faithfully as the hon. member observes his oath of office.

Mr. McMASTER: May I suggest that that is a somewhat Laodicean answer?

Mr. HOCKEN: No, it is a straight answer I believe they will perform their duty towards the Dominion of Canada just as faithfully as Lord Shaughnessy performs his towards the Canadian Pacific. I think that the Government have chosen the one man for president of the road. He was in the road at the start, has been in it at every stage, and knows every detail of its business. The men associated with him are all men of ability—railway experts or financiers—who are capable of giving this country good service; but they must be supported.

I am not surprised that from the other side of the House there should be a good deal of doubt expressed as to the attitude of Canada concerning public ownership, for I find the principal Liberal organ in the city of Quebec avowedly hostile towards public ownership of railways. I think I have a right to assume that Le Soleil speaks for the party represented by gentlemen opposite, and it comes out distinctly opposed to the purchase of the Grand Trunk, which

is an essential part of any harmonious and effective plan of nationalizing railways.

Mr. PARENT: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what paper he is quoting from, and the translation of the extract?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am quoting from a translation in the Montreal Gazette. Will the hon. gentleman accept that?

Mr. PARENT: What is the date?

Mr. HOCKEN: Unfortunately, I have not the date; it is Tuesday.

Mr. PARENT: You should make it clearer.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have cut out the extract from the Gazette and it reads:

> It would seem unbelievable that at the present time when Canada is weighed down with an enormous debt and finds it difficult to meet her financial engagements, and especially when we are obliged to contract a further loan of $350,000,000—

Mr. PARENT: It must be a bad translation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not responsible for the translation. I am giving it to the committee as I have it.

> —in order to meet our war obligations, and when we have before our eyes the unfortunate railway venture of the United States, that anyone should dare speak of buying the Grand Trunk system, thus increasing the public debt by several hundred million dollars more at the present time.

That is the attitude of the chief Liberal organ in Quebec and it is only in harmony with the position taken by most speakers on the other side. As far as I can judge, the purchase of the Grand Trunk railway is an essential part of any undertaking to make profitable what we now have, and I hope that the Government will take it over. The Grand Trunk in Ontario and Quebec, joined up with the Canadian Northern in the western provinces, will make a better transcontinental system than the Canadian Pacific railway; and if the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite had pursued that policy instead of putting $550,000,000 into another transcontinental railway we would not be in the dilemma in which we find ourselves to-day, and the Grand Trunk might still remain under private ownership. But there were men connected with that enterprise who thought they saw a big thing in it. We know how sadly disappointed they were. And there were certain people, too, who thought it would be a great achievement to enhance their reputation. So that it was carried out at the expense of the country and we are forced into the present position by necessity. I stand here to declare myself in support of public ownership and the nationalization of railways, and I hope the time will come when the Canadian Pacific, along with the rest, will be nationalized. What we have at present should be put on a sound basis, and the next thing is to take over the Grand Trunk and incorporate that with the National Railway system. After we have reached that point we might consider how much further we should go.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I want to say to the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat that the issue, as some of us understand is, between public ownership of railways and ownership by Mackenzie and Mann. We on this side are in favour of public ownership, but we want real, genuine, clean ownership, divorced altogether from any influence on the part of Mackenzie and Mann. The hon. member and some gentlemen around him seem to favour a peculiar kind of public ownership under the control of Mackenzie and Mann, but to this proposition we on this side are absolutely opposed. We have been discussing this Bill for some time, wrestling with my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice in an endeavour to have it improved, but he has not given us any information and has declined to consider any of the proposals that we have put forward. There are in the Bill a few clauses that we are especially opposed to, and we have offered a number of amendments but they have been rejected. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has hardened his heart and refused to listen to us and that is why there is such a desperate struggle over the Bill. If we received the information to which, as representatives of the people, we are justly entitled, and if the minister were disposed to consider the amendments which we think ought to be accepted, I do not think there would be any necessity to resort to the closure under rule 17B in regard to the passing of the Bill by the House. We are asked to revive 44 defunct charters of which we know nothing. Many of them have been passed by the legislature at Regina, and many others by the legislature at Edmonton. They have never been before this House, and hon. members know nothing about them. We asked for the route that the railways are to take, a map for example, showing what part of the country they are supposed to serve,

but that information we have been denied. We also asked for the mileage, which I think is a reasonable request. I suppose there are many members on the other side who do not know any more about this matter than we do, but they seem to be willing to accept this Bill in its entirety without the slightest information at all. If there are vicious clauses in the Bill—and I contend there are—the Government will have to take the whole responsibility. Some day there will be a big railway scandal in the country, and money will be stolen, and then the people will say that if the advice of the Opposition had been taken in the debate in 1919 this would not have happened. The attempt of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and others to place the members on this side of the House in the position of advocates of the Canadian Pacific railway is very unfair. Those hon. gentlemen know that this is nothing but a slander, and that as a matter of truth the Canadian Pacific railway has always had more support from members on that side of the House than it has received from this side. At the same time, I have no quarrel with the Canadian Pacific railway, but that question does not arise at present for we are simply creating the machinery to run the Government railways that we have already acquired. If there is anything that we on this side do champion it is not any railway or any corporation, but it is the rights of the people of Canada. I may inform my hon. friend that the Liberal party were the pioneers in Government ownership.

Anything that has been done in Canada to give the people control of the railways has been done by the Liberal party. The National Transcontinental railway was one of the largest undertakings of the kind ever entered upon by this country. That is a case of government ownership. The people secured and maintained their right to the National Transcontinental railway. Gentlemen on the other side fought and voted against it, and did their best to prevent the building of this railway for the people. The appointment of the Board of Railway Commissioners is another, and very important step, taken by the late Liberal Government. Prior to that date the railways had full control and charged what rates they pleased, but the creation of the railway board gave a certain amount of control over the management of Canadian railways, and the credit of that step is due entirely to the Liberal party. If the memories of hon. gentlemen opposite are not too short, and if they will look back over the history of this country, they will find that the Liberal party have been the advocates and pioneeers of public ownership, whereas the Conservative party have been the advocates of private ownership.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You have not a very appropriate leader now.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: He is a good man and quite sound on this question. We are quite willing on this side to give public ownership a fair trial, but the necessity for caution can be understood—I have no doubt the Minister of Railways himself has some misgivings—owing to the experiences which we have had in the past. Public ownership of railways is not a new question in Canada, we have had forty years experience of it, and it has not been a very successful experience. We have not succeeded very well in the past as regards public ownership, but I hope we may do better in the future. The Intercolonial has not been a very great success; it has not developed Eastern Canada, it has been to a large extent a drag on the progress of that part of Canada for the last forty years. For eighteen years the former Conservative Government, dominated by that great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald—were so unprogressive that they were content that the Intercolonial should end in a field opposite the city of Quebec. They took their traffic up to this field and dumped it there and gave it to some other railway to carry. However, a change took place in 1896, a new Government came into office, a progressive Minister of Railways took charge, the Drummond County railway was purchased, and by means of it the Maritime Provinces were connected with the commercial metropolis of this country—the railway was extended to the great city of Montreal. Not only that, which was a really great step, but we got improved trains, we got a fast freight service, and a great done was done to make public ownership acceptable to the people of the Maritime Provinces. The question of branch lines had been before the country for many years. For twenty-five years the people of the Maritime Provinces kept asking the Government to build some branch lines for the benefit of that part of the Dominion. No steps were taken to accede to their request, not that the branch lines were not needed, not that it would not have been a good commercial policy to have carried out what was asked for, but the Government was afraid to build one branch line for fear the construction of twenty or

thirty more would be asked for, and it would get them into trouble. The consequence was we got no branch lines from the Government in the Maritime Provinces, and any that were constructed were built by private enterprise. That was owing to lack of enterprise on the part of the Government. I hope we shall do better in future. I think it is the duty of members on both sides to make as good a Bill of the measure we are now considering as we can, and to stand by Government ownership and try and convert it into a success. But, as I said before, there are difficulties in the way. We have a case of Government ownership in this city in the shape of the Printing Bureau. Has it been a success? On the contrary it has been so badly managed that the Government appointed a royal commission to investigate it. That commission made a report and told us the Bureau was permeated with graft, incompetency, and inefficiency. It told us that men were employed in that institution and written down as proof-readers, who could not read proofs and could not do anything at all to earn the money that was being paid to them. That shows what Government ownership may come to if it is in the hands of an inefficient Government. Take the case of the construction of ships by the Government. We embarked on the building of tramp vessels. A ship called the Voyageur was built and launched in the Vickers yards at Montreal last November, and a great display was made at the luncheon on that occasion. Speeches were made and——

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman has made one statement that is not quite correct. The commission which investigated the Printing Bureau did not report in any way that there was graft in connection with the institution.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Perhaps I was wrong about the graft, but the inefficiency was clearly demonstrated, and the institution was proved to be a great failure, although it has been under direct control of the Government. When a man takes wages for work that he cannot perform it is closely allied to graft. However, I was referring to the ship construction policy of the Government. This ship to which I referred—

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend, I know, would not like to leave the House under any mistaken impression. The report of the commission to which he referred declared that the state of things of which he complains had obtained ever since the institution of the Bureau and during the regime of successive Governments since then.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I did not state that the Bureau was not inefficient during the term of the former Government, I do not know that, but it is certainly inefficient at the present time, and this Government has been in power long enough to make it efficient. If my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) is in charge of the Bureau it has done him very little credit. If he had the courage to appoint a competent foreman at the Bureau, told him to dismiss every man that could not do his work, and replace them with efficient employees, and make that foreman responsible for getting the work done, he would not have any trouble, but he has not the courage to do that.

Mr. BURRELL: I think my hon. friend does not wish to do me an injustice, and therefore he will permit me to interrupt him and make this remark: I would say that practically within the first two months of coming into charge of the Printing Bureau I did what has never been done, placed this matter in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, who, under the Act which empowered them to carry out a re-organization, appointed the commission referred to, the idea being that the time had come when the Bureau should be reorganized, and this process is now under operation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I am very much pleased to hear that my hon. friend has awakened and is going to do something. I do hope he will be successful. All the same he would have done better if he had placed the Bureau under a competent foreman. I was speaking of the matter of government ownership of ships, and pointing out how important it is that we should have efficiency and good management if we are going to adopt the policy of government ownership. The vessel to which I have referred was launched, speeches were made on the occasion, and we were told that she was to be the pioneer ship and that a great development in Canadian trade would be the result. A private owner would have taken . that vessel down the river St. Lawrence before the ice formed and winter set in, but what did the Government do? They sent her down to the city of Quebec and she lay there from the date she was launched in November until about the middle of January. She was fitted out with groceries and supplies in Quebec and lay there until the river was frozen over and filled with ice.

She was then despatched down the river, but only got as far as Father Point, when she was stuck in the ice. The Government sent the Montcalm down to extricate her and the Montcalm also got stuck. Then the Canada was sent to the relief of both vessels, and she got to within fifteen miles of the others when she stuck fast also. A request was then made that the Prince Edward Island ferry should be sent up and liberate the three steamers from the ice, but the Railway Department very wisely refused to accede to the request. However, a storm came and broke up the ice and freed the vessels, and the Voyageur finally arrived in Halifax, where she lay in a damaged condition and finally had to go into dock to be repaired. The other day, when we asked what she was doing and where she was located, we were told she was engaged in carrying sugar at a very low rate of freight to New York to help the refiners there to compete with the refiners of Nova Scotia, Montreal, and elsewhere throughout Canada. The Government also informed us that they had purchased another steamer called the McKee. We were anxious to know whether the McKee was engaged in developing Canadian trade or not, and made inquiry. What did we find? We found that the McKee had been sent to carry coal from New York to the west coast of South America, to Chile, for an American firm, and that she is going to take back fertilizer to New York, being chartered by the month. That is the way in which the Government is developing Canadian trade. We are expending fifty millions this coming year in building ships, we are told for the purpose of developing Canadian trade, and the start that the Government has made in that direction is in the manner I have described.

That shows that Government ownership in the hands of an inefficient government may be a great handicap instead of a benefit to the business of the country.

We are proposing to unite in one system four great lines of railway---the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, involving an enormous expenditure of money. What is the Government's idea of the management of that great system? They are handing it over to a man (Mr. Hanna) who made a complete failure of the Canadian Northern system. He and his associates succeeded in getting a lot of money out of the people of Canada through the Government of the day, but they made a wreck of the enterprise in the end. And the reasoning of the Government seems to be this: That having failed in managing one railway, we will hand over to this man and his associates four railways forming one of the largest railway systems in the world, and we will put that system under their control. The advice of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was absolutely sound, that we clear up the old wreck altogether, that we get a new name for this system, and place it under new management. Is not that a reasonable proposal after the experience the country has had for the past twenty years of the Mackenzie and Mann people? Why do the Government refuse to follow that advice? Is it possible that my hon. friend the leader of the Government is still doubtful of the success of government ownership? Is he looking forward to the people of Canada becoming so disgusted with public ownership after a few years under such management that the old team will get the property back again? Is that his plan? A few years ago he was not in favour of government ownership. He is a recent convert, I believe, of my hon. friend from South York. He went to see him at night, like Nicodemus, and my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) converted him in a kind of way to government ownership, but he seems to be as reluctant as Nicodemus was to be born again, and I do not believe his heart is in this proposal of government ownership. He is said to have told his friends in Toronto some years ago that those Governments which were taking away from private interests the things that belonged to them were adopting the methods of that old Hebrew tyrant, King Ahab, who expropriated Naboth's vineyard. I do not know whether he has changed his real sentiments or not since he joined his present associates and got his legs under Jezebel's mahogany. Perhaps he may think so still, but that is a matter I would not venture to express an opinion on. However, it looks very suspicious when we see the Government insisting on so much control by the old Canadian Northern Railway management of this new system that we are now proposing to set up.

Now, what would a private concern do if they purchased a bankrupt company? Would they continue the old management? Take the two Ontario banks that are being wound up at the present time, to the sorrow of their stockholders. Would the liquidators maintain in control those who wrecked those banks? I say no, they would do nothing of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have to direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that his twenty minutes have expired. He may continue on another clause.

Mr. TURGEON: Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the debate has turned on the question of public ownership of railways. If the advocates of public ownership were to be counted in this House, we would have to come to this side to find a goodly number. Nineteen years ago when we were advocating the further extension of the Intercolonial Railway with a view to extending the principle of Government operation, we were handicapped by the then Opposition, composed chiefly of members from Ontario, every one of whom was opposed to Government ownership of railways except my hon. friend from South York, who since then appears to have made some converts in his province. During the twenty years that I have been a member of this House, and for twenty years before that time, I have advocated that the Government of Canada instead of paying out money to private interests to build railways should undertake the work itself for the benefit of our people. We have paid excessive bonuses and made extravagant grants of land to railway promoters, and if we had retained those moneys and lands we could have built the railroads and Canada would to-day be in a better position than she is after her experience of private ownership.

The province of New Brunswick gave a quarter of its timber lands to a provincial company to build a railroad crossing the southern part of the province, and that grant has been a hindrance to the prosperity and development of the province ever since. We gave millions of acres of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of their very prosperous line, but I might remind this House that if the Government had now in the treasury the millions of dollars which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has for the last twenty-five or thirty years realized upon those lands we would be able to build the Canadian Pacific railway and make it an equally prosperous undertaking, provided we had as economical managers as those who have been in control of that company up to the present time. If my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior had to-day in his possession the lands which are still in the possession of the Canadian Pacific, he would be able to provide for the settlement of every one of our Canadian soldiers, and so give them the chances they are looking for to-day.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

I was most amazed when on Friday a couple of hon. members on the other side of the House passed reflections upon hon. members on this side and suggested that we were opposed to nationalization of railroads, although every one of my hon. friends opposite had been opposed to the principle until very recently; they have been converted, they say, by the necessities of the day. We have heard the hon. member for Springfield—whom I regret not to see in his place—say that he also had been advocating the principle of nationalization and that it was due to the maladministration of the Liberal party that railway affairs had come to such a pass—that, figuratively speaking, naked infants had been left on the doorstep of the Government and had to be taken care of. Yet, he himself in 1912, one year after the change of Government, was busy in Winnipeg seeking to bring the country under the rule of Liberal administration. I was amazed at the language of the Acting Prime Minister last Friday night when he attempted to defend his case, which he evidently found not sufficiently strong. The member for Springfield had referred to the children left in nakedness on the doorstep of the Government. The Acting Prime Minister, who generally uses fair and proper language to express his sentiments, went further and said that these were dirty, filthy babies. Evidently he had forgotten that previous to 1911 he, as well as the then leader of the Opposition and the members of the Conservative party, thought that these children were in a healthy condition and growing sturdy and strong. The best evidence of the prosperity of the country at that time, and therefore of the railroads, was the attitude taken by my hon. friend and the then leader of the Opposition when the Liberal leader and the Liberal party proposed a measure of reciprocity with the United States, with a view to providing greater freedom of trade for Canada. They said, "Do not touch it; let well enough alone". My hon. friend saw those children then clothed with the mantle of prosperity; to-day he says that they are dirty, filthy babies. Hon. gentlemen opposite say this simply because it suits their own purposes. The Administration that succeeded that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1911, in the course of two or three years, drew back the country from the state of prosperity which it had enjoyed for fifteen years and put it into a state of uncertainty and retrogression, back to the position in which it had been prior to 1896.

Hon. gentlemen say that the Intercolonial had produced deficits. But it must be remembered that in a country like Canada, with its thousands of miles of territory from one ocean to the other and from the United States to the Arctic, great lines of railway were necessary; and these could not be expected to pay from the start. Neither can we expect this new company immediately to put the railways of Canada in a paying position. But the development of the Intercolonial railway has been good not only for the Maritime Provinces, but for the western provinces as well. During the first years of its operation it was not developing very much the interests of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It was carrying at cheaper rates the products of the manufacturers of Ontario and the West and taking care of trade that would otherwise go through New York and Boston. Thus the Intercolonial railway has contributed to the prosperity of the whole of Canada. We do not expect this new corporation to produce immediate surpluses, but it is the nucleus of the nationalization of railroads and we on this side of the House desire that it be placed under the control of the people through the Parliament of Canada. The member for Kamouraska(Mr. E. Lapointe) moved an amendment to the Bill which would have made the operation of these national railways more democratic in this time of democracy. But instead of trying to bring about more democracy in the administration of our railroads, hon. gentlemen opposite wish to establish an autocratic administration behind the curtain of democracy by placing this company outside the reach of the people. Another amendment was submitted to provide that one or two representatives of labour be on the directorate of the new corporation. But hon. gentlemen opposite professedly devoted to the public interest in the nationalization of public resources, could not see their way clear to accept this amendment. Can we not find in the ranks of labour, men with sufficient knowledge and ability to give the benefit of their experience to the other members of the directorate of this company? To have done this would add to the confidence of the people in the new corporation.

Hon. gentlemen say that we are opposed to the development of the West. I have always said, and I say it again to-day, that no member of this House, no man in Canada, is more devoted to the development of Western Canada than the modest member for Gloucester. My heart and soul are in Western Canada. I am a member of this Parliament, but I am also a citizen of Canada. We are not here to be sectional; we are here as Canadians to work for the good of Canada as a whole, and when we advocate the development of the resources of any part of the country it is with a view to the general benefit of Canada. In this Bill there is a list of forty-four charters which are to be renewed. and when we ask for information, it is said that we are against the advancement of the West; that we are not optimistic about the West. No one in Canada is a greater optimist as to the immense resources and future of Canada than I am. For some years before the war things had come to such a pass that the railroads, of which the minister to-day speaks so highly, had practically ceased operation, and one-half of their freight cars were stored away in the divisional points in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In 1914, conditions became so disastrous that the Government, finding itself going down so fast, was about to take the plunge before the country rather than wait for another year, when war was declared which, from an economic standpoint, saved Canada for the Government. The moment the list of charters was brought before the Committee, the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. H. A. Mackie) stated that the schedule included a charter for a railway in his constituency, the renewal of which charter might perhaps mean the ruin of that portion of Alberta. He wanted an amendment, but he could not have it; he was told simply that later on, when the Estimates came up, he could vote against the item. But if he voted against the Estimate, his county would be deprived of that line of railway. If he wanted the location of the railway changed, he would have to bring in a new charter, and consequently, there would be duplication. Speaking of duplications, the duplication that has brought Mackenzie and Mann to ruin is a duplication made by this Government from Edmonton to the Pacific coast, a duplication of over 700 miles of railway in the most difficult and expensive portion of Canada for railway construction. That duplication was made directly after the Liberal Government had, in 1911, refused to grant permission to Mackenzie and Mann to duplicate the Grand Trunk Pacific from the same point to the Pacific coast, a duplication which would have diverted the trade of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the Canadian Northern, a trade, which, in the estimation of our late regretted leader, would not for years to come be sufficient

for two lines. If that duplication had not taken place, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the country would have been in a better position to-day, and the Grand Trunk Pacific would not have been in the hands of a receiver.

At six o'clock, the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Section (2) agreed to.

On section 3—capital stock:

Mr. PEDLOW: I should like to read this section:

> The Governor in Council may declare that the company shall have a capital stock, with or without shares, to such amount as may from time to time be deemed expedient. All such stock shall, until otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council, be vested in the Minister of Finance on behalf of His Majesty.

It is closely connected with other clauses of the Bill, some of which have been passed. With clause 12, for instance, which grants power to transfer to the company the stock or controlling interest of His Majesty in any railway company; with clause 23, which grants power to construct and operate railway lines; with clause 26, regarding the issue of securities; and with clause 29, granting power to acquire securities of other companies. The Government are seeking very extended powers indeed for the Governor in Council, who may confer unlimited control on the directorate by order in council. I called the Government's attention to these wide powers when the resolution on which the Bill is founded was under discussion.

It seems to me unreasonable for the Government to ask power that the Governor in Council may declare that the company shall have a capital stock. The country will have to pay for everything, and it seems almost ridiculous to ask for this power. In the second place, if this power is granted, there is no provision in the Bill determining the amount of capital stock which the Governor in Council may transfer to the company. I think this should be named in the Bill. As it is, succeeding clauses give the Governor in Council power to transfer this stock from the Minister of Finance, holding on behalf of His Majesty, to the company to any amount desired, and the company may do almost anything with the stock and with the moneys raised from its sale, transfer or hypothecation. They are given power, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to construct and operate railway lines and so on. Clause 26 gives the company almost unlimited powers regarding the issue of securities. For these reasons I fail to see any necessity for the section we are now discussing; and even if the stock is granted, I contend that the amount should be named here. We know that the Canadian Northern was capitalized at $100,000,000, on a 60-40 basis, the Mackenzie and Mann interests getting 60 per cent and the people of this country the other 40 per cent. That is quite recent history, and every one knows that as a result of that arrangement this country has had to pay $10,800,000 to obtain possession of the company's holding, nowithstanding the fact that after a thorough investigation the stock itself was declared to be of no value whatever, and that for it not one cent had been paid by the holders.

I think we should incorporate in one section of the Bill the names of the directorate. At present we do not know to whom the management of this great company will be entrusted, and it is only fair that we should know. Extensive reference was made to this point in the press in the fall of 1918. We read in the Globe that the predecessor of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) declared that unless he had his way and secured the appointment he would tear things up by the roots, meaning, of course, that there was trouble in store for the Union Government if they did not carry out the arrangement made in the election campaign of 1917.

I might repeat what I said on Friday night regarding the references made by the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) and some of his followers to hon. members on this side of the House, which references have been made again this afternoon. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to understand distinctly that they have no justification whatever for saying that we on this side of the House are opposed in any shape or form to public ownership of public utilities.

Mr. MICHAUD: I hate at this moment to speak under the regulations of closure. It reminds me of the modern history of some countries beyond the seas, where people are gagged and unable to speak when they wished. Mr. Chairman, we have spent only a few hours on this Bill, and in my judgment every minute employed has been time well spent, because this is a gigantic enterprise for Canada to undertake. We have been spending too much money on railroads and not enough on

harbours, and navigation, and forestry, and fisheries. Let me quote from an Ontario newspaper of 26th April, a despatch concerning a statement the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) made to an Ontario delegation which came to see him about harbour improvements:

Ottawa, Ont., April 26.—That Canada has devoted too much attention to railways and not enough to water transport and that "a horrible mess" has resulted, was the declaration of Hon. F. B. Carvell, Minister of Public Works, yesterday afternoon. He was answering a delegation from the London district which asked for harbour improvements at Port Stanley and in the course of his remarks said: "I know of nothing in which we are justified in spending public moneys so much as in improving methods of transport and I have to say that heretofore water transportation has been neglected entirely too much. We have gone ahead building railways and we have built too many. I am not saying who is to blame—the whole country probably is to blame. The result is a horrible mess and the Government is compelled to take over lines."

I think we have enough railways and that we should begin to develop other methods of transportation. We have to send our products out of Canada and in order to reach our markets we must have proper water transportation. We have a debt of probably $2,000,000,000, or $250 per capita; and there are 14,000 miles of railways that belong to the Dominion, or one mile to every 300 of the population. In view of these facts, is it not time that we seriously considered the importance of any measure involving the expenditure of large sums of money on further railway development? At one time I was in favour of public ownership of railways, but my experience of the service rendered by Government-owned lines has been such as to compel me to change my view on this question. While travelling on a Government train one winter we were held up for a couple of hours at an inconvenient place, and in reply to an inquiry as to the cause of the delay the roadmaster informed me that they were having a difficulty with the tanks, which were frozen. They were obliged to dig into the brook, to cut out the ice and pump water into the engine. I asked him why the tanks had not been repaired, and his reply was that they never got satisfaction from the Government. That is one example of the results of public ownership. To give another illustration, I may say that I was recently in the yards of the railway in the town where I live, and there was a train composed of about forty-five or fifty cars with one engine trying to start it from nine o'clock in the morning to three or four in the afternoon. I asked one of the railroad men why it was that there was only one engine and his remarkable reply was: "We cannot get orders from headquarters."

Mr. J. D. REID: What date was that? Can you give us any information as to when this happened?

Mr. MICHAUD: I may inform the hon. minister that this matter was brought to his attention, and it has been remedied to a certain extent; but I must say that on the International railway to-day there is no possibility of any successful operation under Government ownership. To-day owing to the unsatisfactory operation of the railway it takes three days to receive a reply to a letter mailed to a point six miles distant, I read this morning in the Campbellton Graphic of April 24 an article under the caption "Better Service Needed." It reads:

The mail service along the International Division, C.N.R. serving settlers between Campbellton and St. Leonards, is a most wretched one and should not be longer tolerated; on account of the poor service on this railway, mail is greatly delayed and the settlers in some districts, send their mail by other routes if they wish to reach Campbellton promptly.

The train service is also deficient and with the change of time, a daily express service should be inaugurated.

Why not restore the service which pertained under private ownership, that is an express over and return the same day. Certainly, there should be a daily express train on this route.

Before I support the public ownership of railways many matters must be explained beyond any question of doubt. Of course, I may be wrong, but so far I have seen nothing but disappointment in the service rendered by railroads under such ownership. I desire to read some of the remarks of the Acting Prime Minister on Friday in reference to this matter. He said:

I have been abused many times in this House on account of my railway policy,—

Abused, why? Simply because we ventured to debate for a few hours section 20 of this Bill, which involves millions of dollars. Forty-four defunct companies are to be revived, and we were at sea as to how much money would have to be spent on the railroads, and very naturally were seeking information on the subject. It was denied us, however. And yet the Acting Prime Minister, in the face of this, charges us with abuse of himself. Let me continue the quotation:

—and I have often thought: What have I done that I am so abused? I found a couple of half-starved babies on the doorstep of the Finance Department when I went in there, puling weakly creatures, ill-dressed, dirty. Well, we have them here to-night, and they are not bad looking children.

Well, whatever credit these infants may be to their progenitors, and while they are somewhat dirty, I would like to know who nursed and fed them and what sort of food they were given. Was it Borden's condensed milk? If haply hon. members do not apprehend the point, I beg to say that my meaning is that the Government are responsible for these dirty babies. I do not think it will do any harm to repeat that we cannot afford to spend much more money on railways, and the people cannot bear further taxation.

We read also that there are strikes everywhere throughout this country. Why? Because of the high cost of living. I blame this Government for not taking the proper steps to reduce that high cost now that the war is over. We need a good administration of railways, and I am sorry to say that the Government in that regard has not pursued the policy calculated to achieve success.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: When the discussion on this Bill began this afternoon we were treated to a very eloquent speech from the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) declaiming against the Government for having made an effort to promote the passage of the measure by introducing the closure, and we heard a great deal from the hon. member, in a manner peculiar to himself with regard to the application of the gag and the consequent inability of members to discuss the Bill on its merits. To demonstrate his sincerity in that position the hon. gentleman occupied about seventeen and a half minutes in discussing every subject under the sun but that of the Canadian National Railways, and about fifty seconds in discussing a matter having any reference at all to the clause under discussion. He was followed by member after member on the same side of the House. I listened to all of them attentively, and but one reference did I hear to clause 2, and only an incidental reference to any other part of the Bill, except that made by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). There must be a reason for this, and after trying to determine what it might be, I have reached the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite find they must do something to extricate themselves from the difficult position into which they have brought themselves. The only thing they can do is to throw sand in the eyes of the public by shouting "Gag," in regard to the measure, with respect to which they cannot offer any constructive suggestions or any solution for the problems with which we are confronted. The Bill is an honest effort to provide means by which the country may relieve itself from the tangle into which men—of whom the hon. members opposite are the official legatees—through incompetence and reckless extravagance, if nothing worse, plunged it in the years that have passed. It passes my understanding, how men can declaim, as they have done and are doing, against the actions of this Government, not only in connection with the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Northern Railway, but as regards the men who built and managed the latter system, some of whom are now in the employment of the Government, managing the Canadian National Railways.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) referred to the incidence of taxation that would result from the incorporation of a board of directors to manage the Canadian National Railways and taking over of railways as has been done and will be done to a further degree. He did not say anything, however, in regard to the incidence of taxation that is resulting and will continue to result from the $500,000,000 that has been wasted in the construction of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railways. On one or two previous occasions in this House I took the liberty of saying that we were not likely to get very far in the solution of these problems by harking back to what has taken place in the past, but if hon. members insist in keeping these matters before the House there is only one thing to do and that is to answer them. The situation we are in to-day with regard to railways is the direct result of the iniquitous policy —nothing more or nothing less—that was pursued in railway construction during the regime of men of whom the hon. members opposite profess to be the successors. How are we going to get out of the position in which we find ourselves? We are forced to take over these railways whether we like it or not. It is not a question of whether a man is in favour of public ownership or not, it is a problem that we cannot get away from. I will come to the matter of public ownership in a few moments. We have these railways on our hands, and we must manage them, if they are not going to be a burden that will ultimately sink this country into bankruptcy. The Government is proposing to incorporate a board of directors to manage the railways free from political interference, if that is possible. I believe that it is possible. Notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to

say, I believe that we can find in this country men of sufficient public spirit and ability to manage the Canadian National railways and manage them efficiently. The present general manager, or president, and the present board of directors of the Canadian National Railways have been held up to ridicule in this House and all kinds of inefficiency has been charged against them and even their honesty has been called in question. It was stated this afternoon by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) that we were placing in charge of the Canadian National Railways men who had made an utter and hopeless failure of the Canadian Northern. We also have the statement of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) on Friday last with regard to the management of the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific railways:

> If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morphy) wants to know the difference between the building of railways in the days of the Laurier Government and the building of railways to-day, it is simply that in our time there was competency and capacity in the railway administration, whereas to-day there is recklessness and incompetence.

There is recklessness and incompetence in the management of the Canadian National Railways and there is recklessness and incompetence in the construction and management of the Canadian Northern Railway, while according to the leader of the Opposition there was efficiency in the management of the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways. The Canadian Northern Railway was built simultaneously with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental. It was just as good a railway, with a much better location, and was built for less than one-half the money that was put into the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railways. Although I may be a few miles out, I think that 9,555 miles is the approximate mileage of the Canadian Northern, and with a reasonably fair equipment it was produced for approximately $400,000,000. On the other hand, we have about 4,000 miles of line, without any branches or equipment worthy of the name, that has cost this country $500,000,000, and to complete it and make it possible to operate, will bring that cost up to $550,000,000. Yet the leader of the Opposition contrasted the men who were responsible for that $550,000,000, or $125,000 a mile, with Mackenzie and Mann, who were simultaneously able to build their line as it is to-day for less than $40,000 per mile, and whose system was managed by Mr. D. B. Hanna.

How can hon. gentlemen square these two statements? I have stated before, I repeat it now, and I challenge contradiction, that there never was in this or any other country a railway of the same character produced or the same amount of money as the Canadian Northern railway. In that railway this country has an asset that is second to none on the American continent —not even to the Canadian Pacific. And that railway system was carried on under the management of the man who is now president of the Canadian National railways. I do not know whether the present president may be the best man—it may be that this Government or some other government may find a more capable man—but until he has been given a fair trial, there is no man in this House or out of it that can raise his finger and point to one thing in the record of D. B. Hanna and say that it has not been in accordance with good railway practice.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to ask him a question at this point, especially as we cannot get any information from the ministers, and apparently he is a railway expert. He tells us that this road was built economically and was well managed. Will he explain why it could never pay its way?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman, I was just coming to that, and I am glad the leader of the Opposition has raised that question. The Canadian Northern railway for the two last years for which an accounting is available paid all its operating expenses and between three and four million dollars towards the interest on its bonded indebtedness, a record that in the same period of time has never before been accomplished by any transcontinental railway in America. What has been the record of the Grand Trunk Pacific road that the leader of the Opposition himself says was constructed and managed economically? Only in the last two or three months, as he knows, the management of that line said: Unless the Government comes forward with ten or fifteen million dollars we will cease operation, because we cannot earn enough money to pay the wages of our employees. Is that right or is it not?

Mr. McKENZIE: I had no reference whatever to that road.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: What is the Transcontinental east of Winnipeg doing?

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. member wants to do me justice, I had reference to

the expenditure of money by the Government so far as the Government had control over it; I had no reference to any company whatever.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I am willing to admit that under the arrangement made for the construction of the Transcontinental the Government had very little control—or, at least, if they had any control they did not exercise it; that is certain. If hon. members opposite wish to go into a discussion of what took place in connection with the construction of the Transcontinental, well and good. I am ready for a field day in connection with it.

An hon. MEMBER: Forty million dollars went into graft.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I do not know where it went, but I have said before and I repeat it now, a hundred and twenty-five million dollars went into something that was not building a railway.

What we are trying to do is to find a solution of our railway problem, and to that end the Government has brought before the House a measure to incorporate a company to manage our national railways. Let me repeat again, that if D. B. Hanna is not the right man, and if the present Board of Directors are not the right men, there is a means in this Bill by which we can get the right men. What this House and the country must do is to face this issue squarely. Give the management an opportunity to bring the roads all into one system, develop them as they should be developed, and if that is done the Government has an excellent transportation system. It is true that in order to be fair to the railway itself we will be forced to write off the money that we have ourselves thrown away. But that is not a matter that need now concern us. Having read this Bill from start to finish, I can see nothing in it but what is consistent with a reasonable effort to place these railways on a basis where they can be efficiently managed free from political influence. In reading the discussion that has taken place we find that hon. members opposite, one minute demand that the Canadian National railways be taken out of the influence of politics altogether, but in the very next breath they say: We do not want to permit the Board of Directors to pass even a by-law as to how they will conduct their business unless they come before Parliament for the sanction of that by-law. That is the kind of discussion that has been going on all the way through the piece.

Let us see what the situation is. Hon. members have stated that this country is burdened with what the Canadian Northern has cost and will cost. We have a present liability of possibly four hundred and fifty million dollars in connection with the Canadian Northern, and we will be called upon to expend on maintenance and equipment and on terminals possibly an additional hundred million dollars, and we will be called upon to construct branch lines to give the people of the adjacent country an efficient service and gather the traffic necessary to make the railway pay. In order to do that we will again have to spend money, but so long as we keep that expenditure within proper limits in relation to the producing capacity of the railway, which in the final analysis depends on its mileage, the country has nothing whatever to fear. I believe that the leader of the Opposition and hon. members opposite will agree with me that in ten years from now with proper management the Canadian National Railways will not only be paying their way but will be producing for this country a handsome revenue.

One word with regard to public ownership, because that qusetion has been brought forward and there has been a manifest effort to have members declare where they stand on it. My recollection is that the hon. member for Maisonneuve referred to a declaration by Lord Shaughnessy in regard to public ownership, in which he declared himself very emphatically as opposed to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not in the speech I quoted to the House.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I was not able to notice that the hon. member quoted anything from Lord Shaughnessy that would show us a solution of the difficulties in which we find ourselves to-day. No man in this House or out of it has a greater regard for Lord Shaughnessy than I have, and for the splendid system of transportation that has been built up under his genius, but when Lord Shaughnessy or any one else comes before the Canadian people and offers a solution for the present railway problem he will be talking about something practical; so long as he simply declaims against public ownership as a theory it is merely so much idle twaddle. We cannot get away from the present condition of affairs. Would the hon. member for Maisonneuve or any one else suggest that we hand over all these lines to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Would he suggest in the alternative that we should hand them

back to Mackenzie and Mann and the Grand Trunk, take the burden of a billion dollars of debt and give them the earning capacity of the road? If not, what other solution is there? The only other thing we can do is to take these roads and operate them. If any member of this House will show me a way by which we can get back to the position we were in before the duplicate transcontinental lines, the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental, were projected side by side, I would say with the hon. member for Maisonneuve; I am in favour of the private ownership of railways. But the hon. member knows as well as I do that that is an utter impossibility. It would be a financial tragedy to put all the railways in Canada under public ownership at this time. The time may come when we shall be able to do that. We now have an opportunity, in this Canadian National Railway Company, of demonstrating our ability to operate publicly-owned railways. There is this saving situation,—we have in Canada, without any exception, the finest, the best-equipped and the best-managed railway system in the world.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. gentleman (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) says that the party which I have supported all my life and which I now support, is responsible for the present railway situation. I prefer, if I may do so without discourtesy to my hon. friend, to take the history of railway development in Canada from the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) who has made a study of this matter and whose accuracy and fairness will be admitted by members on both sides of the House. In an eloquent speech which he delivered some days ago, he said that frankly he believed that both parties were responsible for the present railway situation; that the Liberal party had done things which he thought unwise and improvident in connection with railway development, and that the Conservative party had done likewise. The Liberal party had the excuse that whatever they did that was unwise or improper was done when there were bright days in the Canadian horizon; when there was promise of great increase in the population and development of the West; but the Conservative party helped the Canadian Northern railway by vast subsidies and allowed them to build towards the West from Calgary when wise people could see that they were throwing money away. That is the difference, as I see it, between the railway policies of the two parties.

The next point upon which I wish to animadvert for a moment is the testimony which the hon. gentleman gave as to the high character of those in charge of the Canadian Northern railway. Whether the management of the railways under the Canadian Northern Railway Board—for I think it amounts to that—is good or not, it will not affect very much, at least personally, the interests of the member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson). I understand that his mills are served by the railway company whose late president was the head of that company for which he has such a great and proper admiration, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

In a moment of haste, the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) the other night was unkind enough to suggest that because the members sitting on your left, Mr. Chairman, did not acclaim the arrival of this Bill in the House with loud huzzas they must be prompted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Such a statement was unworthy of the Acting Prime Minister. But do I to-night hurl back warm words across the floor of the House? No. Christianity bids us forgive. Besides, we know under what heavy responsibilities the Acting Prime Minister is labouring. We know that what he said was said in a moment of nervous exhaustion or nervous irritation. He is bearing upon his shoulders a burden that should not fall upon any one man. Think of it; in a Cabinet which has grown to the swollen proportions of twenty-three members he has to bear two men's jobs and fulfil two men's duties. The work of leading the House and acting as Prime Minister is enough to tax the mental and physical power of any one man. But besides that, he has resting on his shoulders the administration of one of the most responsible departments, that of Finance. Is it any wonder that he is crushed beneath that load? I charge this Government with inhumanity in that with a Cabinet of twenty-three ministers they allow one man to do two men's work.

The Acting Prime Minister is trying to do something which every man of experience will acknowledge is an impossibility, that is, to court two ladies at the same time. He is paying attention to Lady High Tariff and Lady Low Tariff—or perhaps it would be better to say that they are paying attention to him. They are pressing their attentions upon him in such a way that I am sure he often says:

> How happy could I be with either,
> Were t'other dear charmer away.

Of course, his business friends in Toronto are high tariff people, and it is nice to think as your friends do. Then he is a man of education, of information and broad intelligence, and of course the policy of a low tariff must appeal to him.

Now, perhaps I have wandered for a moment from the exact subject under discussion—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: No one noticed it; even the diligent member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) did not call me to order.

I may be asked: Are you in favour of or against public ownership? One of the members from Toronto who addressed the committee a few moments ago was scandalized at the idea of any one not being for public ownership: why, public ownership is thought well of in Toronto; that should close the discussion. But the member for East Algoma who probably knows more about engines and railways than most of us know, says very frankly that personally he is for private ownership, but that we are face to face with a condition under which we are forced into public ownership. I agree with him. We are forced into public ownership and we have to see how we can make a success of it. So let us not have this great vaunting of superior political virtue because we are for or against public ownership. The conversion to public ownership of those whose faces I now look into is of most recent date. It was said that one of the Frankish kings became converted to Christianity and that his armies were converted by regiments and were baptised by platoons. That is very much the condition in which hon. members opposite find themselves in regard to public ownership. If they have all the zeal for public ownership which some of them display, it is the zeal of apostates who have recently turned from another political belief—or I should not say political belief for it is a question not of party politics but of economics. Many gentlemen on the other side, had they possessed the courage and frankness of one of the members for Prince Edward Island, would have risen with him when a vote was demanded on this question.

It has been repeated to me time and again by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that we are face to face not with a theory, but with a condition: How can we make public ownership a success? Every man in the House wants to make it a success; yet if it is not a success I do not think anything short of bankruptcy faces the Canadian people. What must we do? First, we have to change the mentality of the people in the matter of their rights and their obligations towards the Government. What have we generally found in the past? Let me illustrate by a story. Some years ago a member of one of our provincial governments was fishing on a salmon river when a telegraphic despatch was brought to him. The messenger was treated with all the kindness which kindly men show to those who do them a service, and then he was asked by this provincial politician: "What do I owe you, sir?" The man said: "Well, Mr. Smith, who is going to pay for this, you or the Government?" If it was the man personally, the messenger charges were to be low; but if it was the Government, the messenger charges were to be high. That, I am sorry to say, has been the mentality of the Canadian people, and perhaps of people throughout the world. That mentality must be changed. The people of Canada, if we are to have an independent, sound, economic existence, will each have to say: What can I do for my country?—rather than: What can I get out of my country? It being a fact admitted by all, that example speaks louder than precept, how has this Government helped to raise the people of Canada to the altitude which I have just indicated? When Union Government was being formed, certain men had to retire from public life in order to make room for others. Did they retire into the modesty of private life? No. One was made a Lieutenant Governor; one was made a Chief Justice; and then we were told that patronage had been abolished.

What has been the attitude of this Government as regards the newspaper press? We would have thought that, when Victory Loans came to be floated the Government might have asked the newspapers, as a matter of patriotism, to give great advertisements for the Victory Loans; the Soldiers' Settlement scheme and so on, if not free, at least, at low rates. What did the Government do? On the one hand, they presented the newspapers with cheaper paper, and, on the other, they gave them payment for advertisements at higher than ordinary commercial rates.

The next great point and one insisted upon by the Acting Prime Minister was that the people must have confidence in the administration of this great railway. I cordially approve. But what is the basis of confidence? Frankness. Have we had frankness? The other day we asked for information as to where the Canadian National railway was buying ties, and we were told that it was not in the public interest that

such information should be given us. Not only was it in the public interest that we should have that information, but the information was withheld from us because private interests interfered. Those ties, about which the question was asked, had been purchased by the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid), or those responsible to him, from the Northern Construction Company. Moreover, the Northern Construction Company represents the Mackenzie and Mann interests, and the price at which those ties were bought was higher than should have been paid for them. Because my information is to-day that that construction company is going around from dealer to dealer in ties and getting ties at several dollars less than the stipulated price which they are to get from the Government. It is the same game of the middleman again, making money out of the people of Canada.

We have been told that we should have absolute confidence in this board because they, forsooth, know a good deal about the management of the Canadian Northern in the past, and because the Canadian Northern has, in the past, had a management that will bear investigation. May I just give an illustration which comes under my own personal observation? Some time ago, a firm of Philadelphia bankers, 9 p.m. for which the firm that I was associated with then acted, had bought certain bonds of the Canadian Northern elevator at Quebec, which was a Mackenzie and Mann concern. Those bonds were endorsed by the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway; the money for them was paid over into the hands of the Mackenzie and Mann interests, the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway, and was used in the development of that line. Sir Donald Mann, then just plain Dan Mann, assured one of the Philadelphia bankers that, as long as Mann had one dollar, the interest on those bonds would be paid. The interest on those bonds was not paid; but that is not the gravamen of the offence, because any one is liable to a financial reverse. But when we applied to the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway to implement their endorsement on those bonds, we were told that in endorsing those bonds they had gone beyond their charter powers; and it was not until we had obtained a judgment against them in the superior court and in the court of review, and we were on the eve of having the case tried in the Supreme Court at Ottawa, that they settled. That is one fact I am giving to the Committee, and it is by reason of such things as this that the Canadian people will not be satisfied until the Mackenzie and Mann control of the past is eliminated from the control of the Canadian National Railways for the future.

There must be economy in administration, but I find no evidences of economy in this Government. I find that they are not cutting down the Estimates as they should. I even find—if we may explain or illustrate a large thing from a small—that when the ministers are indoors, they allow their automobiles to go on puffing, waiting until they come back, instead of shutting off the engines and starting them again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: My hon. friends laugh, but let me tell them that while economy is made up of small things, economy in itself is a big thing. It was Bacon who said: "Economy is a great revenue." Well, it is not a revenue that this Government will ever enjoy.

We want to have the management of these roads divorced from politics, and that is quite right, but how are we going to do it? No suggestion has so far been made. We must do it in one of two ways. There will be thousands and thousands of employees of the national system, when it becomes fully developed, who will be sufficient in constituency after constituency to turn the balance. What we shall have to do will be either to introduce proportional representation, in which I am a strong believer, or do as Australia did, create a couple of constituencies in which the railway men would vote—they would, of course, have to vote by mail,—in order that the Government would not have the temptation, on the eve of an election, of raising the pay of railwaymen throughout the country in order to get their votes.

There is another thing in which I think the Government has lamentably failed in spite of suggestions made by hon. members on this side of the House, and that is in giving representation to the workers on the board of directors of the Canadian National railway. This should be done, because experience teaches it, and it is what Great Britain has done along the lines of the Whitley report. I offer these suggestions with the best will in the world for the success of the Government railroads, in which we are all vitally interested; and I hope that, although it would appear from the faces of many I see before me that the good seed I am sowing is falling on stony

places, or on stony hearts, there are some who will profit by them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: For a few moments, I intend to address the Committee as one who believes in public ownership, and most of all, as one who believes in public ownership at this moment and as the means of dealing with the railroad problem now before the people of Canada. Public ownership is in the air in English-speaking communities throughout the world. The Mother Country, Great Britain, saw fit at the beginning of the war to take over the railways; she has them now, and she will never part with them. We have it on record that the present Prime Minister is preparing now, with the aid of the Government, for absolute and public ownership of the railroads of Great Britain. He knows now that the only way to have the loyal support of the railroad men of England to the Government and the railway system is to establish a national system of railways. What did the United States do? At the beginning of the war they took over every railroad, and they have them yet, and are now working on a plan, not to give the roads back—that will never be done—but to improve and complete the roads, consolidate and co-ordinate them, supply money for their improvement, and run them absolutely in the interest of the people. They are adopting public ownership, not as a secondary measure, not as something to be resorted to in time of trouble, but absolutely on its merits. Great Britain is for public ownership, the United States is now for public ownership, and our co-dominions, Australia and New Zealand, have had public ownership for many years and are so well satisfied with the system that you could not get them to change it. Wherever public ownership of railways has been tried, the great democracies of the world to-day all insist on keeping the roads public-owned; they do not want to part with them. South Africa has been built up on public ownership, and the regeneration of Africa under the leadership of England is absolutely based on a Cape-to-Cairo railway, which will be the property of the Empire for the furtherance of the trade of the Empire and the extension of its settlement and influence. Look at all the great countries of Europe. Germany organized herself into the power she was in the war largely on public ownership. She may have lost the war, but she did not lose it by reason of her public ownership; in fact, she got her strength in the war largely from the public ownership of her railways. The evidence of all mankind is not that the people of different countries are apologizing for public ownership, but that they are taking to it because it is the one thing absolutely necessary for the settlement of their transportation problems. So I am not coming here to apologize for public ownership, or to be afraid to state my belief, and in particular I am not going to be a bat; and I want to tell the House what a bat is. A bat got into an argument with the other animals as to whether he was a bird or an animal. As occasion suited him, he said he was an animal or a bird. At one time he would say: "I am an animal. Don't you see my nose is like a mouse's?" When he saw things going another way, he would say: "I am a bird. Don't you see my wings?" But all the time he was a bat. Are the public men of this country to be bats? The people of this country want to know where you are, whether you are a bird or a beast, whether you are for public ownership or against it. For heaven's sake, don't be a bat. But that is the case with a large number of men in this House. It is not the case with the people of this country. They have seen and learned what has taken place in other countries, and are all for public ownership. I should like to see some man get up here and say: I am against public ownership, because of the experience of all the countries of the world that have adopted public ownership in the past and have practised it and found it, as they think, to succeed.

Coming to Canada, what ought to be our position in connection with the railways of this country? We have heard the question discussed a good deal, but I want to approach it from this point of view. We have the railways, which give the service and are represented by the shareholders; we have the people, who pay for the service, and they are largely interested. But in English-speaking countries—and it is only in English-speaking countries it has come about—in connection with the railroads we have developed not only the shareholders who own the railways, and the people who use them and pay the traffic charges, but, in America, and Canada especially, we have developed what is called the railway magnate. These magnates, or executives controlling the roads, have always been against public ownership, and have tried to persuade the shareholders that public ownership is against them; but they have not been able to prove that. They have always been able to prove, at least they think so, that it was essential that the conduct of the road should be left

in the hands of the magnates. But the United States has got rid of them all, and we are getting rid of them in this country, and the last remnant—I speak with all due respect of Lord Shaughnessy and his associates— the last appearance in this country, of the railway magnate who dictates both to shareholders and the public is in the Canadian Pacific Railway. I give them credit for the way they have run their road, but the Canadian Pacific Railway must bow to its fate. It must be absorbed and I am ready any day, in order fully to achieve public ownership in this country, to take the Canadian Pacific over, and to guarantee just as good management to the public as the Canadian Pacific has given us as a private-owned road. We can get the men to do it. I am ashamed to hear my fellow-Canadians in this House say: We cannot trust the Canadians; we cannot trust democracy in this country with the public ownership of railways. I want to tell Lord Shaughnessy and his friends in Montreal, and that other lord, Lord Atholstan, who is also against public ownership, that they have not got the people of Canada with them. The people of Canada believe in public ownership. They know they can get competent men from amongst our own sons to run our railways. The Canadian Pacific will have to bow to what is coming and come in with the other roads.

Another thing has taken place, and it has been mentioned only incidentally in this House to-day. The largest holder of shares in the Canadian Pacific railway to-day is the Government of Canada. The people of Canada the other day took over, I believe, $20,000,000 of the stock of the Canadian Pacific that had been forfeited because it was owned by German shareholders.

I want to tell the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific another thing: If they continue to listen to these magnates like Lord Shaughnessy, instead of looking after their own interests, they will come out at the small end of the horn; but if they are wise they will sell their shares to the Canadian people. The appeal I make now to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific is this: Now is the time to sell and get the best price you will ever get for your road. Come in with the other railways, and the people of Canada will have a great national system with all the railways run for the benefit of the country at large.

I want to speak to my friends from the West. Transportation is the great question in this country, but rail is only one means of transportation. If we go into the public ownership of railways, we must nationalize the steamship lines as well, and until we have done that we shall not have really solved the transportation problem. The evidence of the whole world to-day is that there must be nationalization of transportation not only by rail but by water also. One is the complement of the other. Transportation now is not merely national; it is international, and the real solution of the transportation problem of the world to-day is a joint transportation on an international basis of public control and public ownership. There is no other solution, and the evidence I give to my friends from the West is this: While, by the service of the Railway Commission we were giving to the people of this country, and especially to the people of the West, reduced freight rates, every dollar of reduction that the railroads gave was taken from the farmers of the West by the private-owned steamship lines of the world.

Transportation is a wide and far-reaching question and there is no solution of the problems involved but public ownership. When you have public ownership you are absolute master all the time, and your chief objective is not profits but good service to the people and, after that, good treatment of the men engaged in the service. To this is largely due the progress that is being made in Great Britain to-day in public ownership. The workmen and the coal owners see it, and we must accept it here gladly and not with any apologies. I do not think we should hear any more apologies for public ownership. Can any one go into Ontario and apologize for public ownership there, after the experience we have had with the Hydro Electric? What is Canada deficient in especially in Ontario and Quebec? It is power for the railroads. On the other hand, what is Upper and Lower Canada rich in? It is water-power. And we are allowing that water-power to pass into the hands of private corporations. I think we should keep it for the proper supply of the roads, and when we have public ownership of the roads and of the rivers of the country we shall have the cheapest possible transportation. The worst record in the history of the world in railroad matters is the record of the control by the private capitalists and the private executives of the American railroads. They made a colossal failure of it from start to finish. They wrecked and looted the roads and left them in the dust; and if the American nation has to pay to-day for the roads it has taken over it is because

those roads were looted and allowed to run down. They were robbed and were never co-ordinated nor consolidated, nor were they concentrated in the public interest, but were operated for the special profit of the individuals who happened to control them.

Now, we are going to start with the Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, and we may bring in others. There are a number of lions in the way, or at least so it is said; but we have to approach the problem apart from politics, and I think the Government are making a fair effort to do so. I have heard them criticised, but still they are making some headway. They are doing what the people of Canada have asked them to do, and if they refuse to do it, there will inevitably be an accounting at the next election when the issue will be: Are you in favour of public ownership, or are you opposed to it?

I have in this House for many years expressed as well as I could my views in favour of public ownership, and I have been sometimes discouraged by lack of response in the House. But the response from the people has always been unequivocally in support of public ownership. My advice to hon. members is not to trim on this question but to find out where they stand and to insist that the Government in power shall carry out public ownership on progressive modern lines as is done in other countries. Is Canada going to stand aside after what all the other nations of the world are doing? I have heard a good deal said about the application of the gag, and it reminds me of a little incident in Canadian history. The first Jesuit who spent the winter outside of what is now the city of Quebec had very little experience of the country, but after spending a winter in the woods, in the course of his narration of his experiences he made the following striking statement: "S'il y a du froid, il y a du bois,"—if there is cold there is wood. As regards the gag, all I have to say is that the attitude of the people on that question is summed up in an epigram somewhat similar to that of the Jesuit: If there is obstruction in the Parliament of Canada, there is the closure. I am not here to justify the closure, but I want to say that the people desire to have this Bill put through. There is nothing else to do but to approach the situation, to vote the money, to stand the loss, and let those who are responsible bear their responsibility. Both parties are more or less worthy of blame in that matter. I know that some hon. members, at the very beginning of this awful trouble, did put in a protest in the House, and it is on record. Man after man whom I have seen in this country talking in favour of public ownership at one time blocked it; but they have come around, and especially those in the Government to-day are trying to support the measure. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side may have a good deal of justification for what they say, while hon. members on this side may approve their own recriminations. But that is not the question, and what the people are concerned in is a solution of the transportation problem on the best possible lines, recognizing that transportation is made up of river and rail, sea and land. In France there is a Ministry of Communications, by which they mean railroads, telegraph lines, express and telephone, and all the other systems of communication associated with them. Now, we not only have a national system of railways coming into our hands, but we are going to have steamers and telegraph systems which we must nationalize. We must also have a national express and a national parcel post. And in this connection I would like to know what the Government are doing. For two years I have waited to see some sign of a nationalizing of the splendid telegraph system in their hands. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) had an opportunity ten years ago of giving us an Imperial cable service. It was not carried out although it should have been, and I think it is important that we should have an Imperial cable service to meet the growing demands of communication. We must have a great system of communication in all these things, and must recognize that the underlying principle of all these matters is public ownership, administration and responsibility. Let us make a start so that the world may know that Canada really has faith in public ownership of her communications and transportation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very pleased indeed that my good friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) scented a debate on public ownership and hastened from Toronto to Ottawa. It is always a pleasure to listen to him and I must give him this credit: That for the period of twenty-three years during which I have been in this House he has been very consistent on this issue and has steadily advocated the policy of public ownership. But on that question he is somewhat of a doctrinaire——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Thank God, there are some of us.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —and I am always afraid of that, because a doctrinaire may sometimes take his mirage for a reality. However, I am bound to say that on some phases of this particular question of public ownership I am not afraid to take sides with my hon. friend. He has just referred to the State control of cables. I was accused the other evening by the Acting Prime Minister of being in favour of private corporations and standing for private corporate rights in this House. He has evidently forgotten the history of the last few years because when I was in the Government, and since I have had a seat in His Majesty's loyal Opposition, I have always preached in favour of the State control of cables. I had, as Postmaster General, the clear evidence that in this country the consumers of the cable, if I may use the expression—or the users, but "consumers" is perhaps a better expression—were being mulcted by the cable ring, and I advocated in England and in Canada, in company with other men—Mr. Henniker Heaton, for instance—the establishment of an all-British State-owned cable. We have not yet succeeded in that enterprise, but I hope that as a result of this war the Governments of Great Britain and of Canada will see the necessity of having a State-owned cable, with the nerve centre in London, so that the news of the day can be disseminated, without being tainted by foreign influence, throughout the various portions of the British Empire. Moreover I say that as we are going to have a still larger British immigration to our Western Prairies, it is important for these settlers that we should get a cheap cable rate. But that is not the question at issue this evening; we are speaking of the Canadian Northern, and again I wish to state to the Committee that I never, in the discussion that took place last week, pronounced myself on either public or private ownership. I did not offer any solution. I admit—with both sides of this House, with my leader, and with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat—that we have to face a condition and not a theory in this matter. We now have the Canadian Northern. Two years ago we were obliged, after many and many sacrifices made on behalf of that company by the people of Canada, to expropriate the company. We had to appoint an arbitration to go into the affairs of the company, and since that arbitration the control of the Canadian Northern system has come into the hands of the Dominion Government. Therefore we have to face an existing condition, and, nolens volens, we are forced to accept to-day the administration of that system of railways. What I blame the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) and the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) for is, that they stated on Friday last that this was a fight between corporation interests and public ownership. That is not the case. The objections that were raised against the policy of the Government were two-fold: first, the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) objected strenuously to clause 16 because in that clause parliamentary control of the expenditure, the vast expenditure of money which the administration of this railway system will compel, is taken away; second, we were shocked, to say the least, when the Government intended surreptitiously to revive forty-four wrecks belonging to the old Canadian Northern Railway without informing the Committee of the mileage involved and of the probable cost of the construction of those lines. I do not say that the Government intends to build these forty-four lines, but whether the Government, or whether the board, of which Mr. Hanna is president, intends to build them or not, the House is entitled to know the mileage involved and the probable cost of them. I added as an argument, which has not been refuted, because it cannot be refuted, that whether you spend money or not on these forty-four lines, you affect thereby the credit of Canada, and if there is one thing in economics which ought to be sacred to the Government of the day it is the national credit. When you go to foreign markets to borrow money, as you will have to go for that purpose in the future as you have done in the past, the money-lenders will take your ledger and they will say: What are the assets and what are the liabilities of Canada? They will look into Canada's financial position carefully, and they will know the obligations assumed by the Government for the near future. Do you imagine for one moment that if you seek to borrow money from Kuhn and Loeb, or from Morgan, of New York, that they will not inquire what are the assets of the Dominion and the liabilities as well? Sir, I say, as a Canadian and as a patriot, having the interests of my country at heart, the Government should shrink before adding that enormous possible liability to the ledger of this

country. These were the objections that were urged against the two clauses of the Bill, and I see no reason in the world why the Government has imposed the closure in restraint of discussion. No one on this side of the House, and I say it to my friend the acting Minister of Justice, will recede from the necessity of passing this legislation, but we want legislation that is fair to our own reputation and fair to the people of Canada. I say that Government ownership is not an issue in the House to-day, and it was not an issue last week. That was a bogey raised by the ministers because at the present moment there is a popular fancy in some of the provinces in favour of Government ownership. The Government is anxious to please the great province of Ontario where that policy is popular to-day. The Government also wishes to please the western provinces by lavishly promising the construction of forty-four lines in order to pass its budget without any tariff reductions such as are called for in the West.

Before declaring myself in favour of Government ownership of the railway system of Canada, as I stated a moment ago—and my record is well known—so far as regards our cable system I am in favour of Government ownership, I wish to say that it is a question of circumstances, it is not a hard and fast rule which you can impose on the people. We must be guided by circumstances and, as wise men, we must be above all guided by the experience of two peoples, one supposed to be the shopkeepers of the old world and the other the keenest business men of the new world. I refer to the British nation, and to the American nation. I am surprised that I, with my French blood coursing through my veins, who am not supposed to be a business man, should have to repeat this elementary truth to a majority of my fellow members who belong to a race of cold, matter-of-fact men, men whose business ability and business honesty have been known from time immemorial. Those business instincts have made both Great Britain and the United States of America the great commercial countries they are to-day—I repeat, I am surprised to have to recall to my fellow members such an elementary truism that before adopting such innovations we should be guided by the experience of both Great Britain and the United States. My hon. friend (Mr. Manion) this afternoon cited the example of France in favour of Government ownership of railways. I know something of the railway system of France, and I say to the members of this Committee that that Government system has been a fiasco. But now let us take the precedent of the United States and of Great Britain. The other day I gave the House some facts and figures with regard to the United States Railway situation, but let me once more recall to hon. members a few further facts and figures which were given recently in Montreal by a gentleman who is a Canadian by birth, Mr. Mitchell, who has become in the great business centre of New York one of its leading men. Speaking before the Canadian Club in Montreal he said:

> Notwithstanding the increase in rates, which were far greater than private management had ever dreamt of asking, and which produced a greater gross revenue by $865,000,000, the people of our country, after suffering inferior service, were called upon as tax payers to advance $210,000,000, the amount by which the net earnings failed to equal the guaranteed rental. In other words the American people paid $865,000,000 more in rates for inferior service and were taxed $210,000,000 in addition, so that the true cost to the people of one year of Federal operation amounted to $1,075,000,000. With these figures before you I need not repeat that the popular passion for Government ownership and operation has materially cooled during the past year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the experience of Great Britain? We are guided in political affairs by the experience of the Mother of Parliaments. We are guided in commercial matters by the business principles of the British people. Well, Sir, what is the experience of Great Britain? I find this information, not as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) said this afternoon, in his mild and smiling way, in Le Soleil of Quebec, but in that great Toronto weekly, Saturday Night:

> A statement on the condition of the railways of England was recently made in the House of Commons by Sir Eric Geddes. He said that after four years of Government war control the roads are in a semi-paralyzed financial condition and that the Government is now losing $1,250,000 a day in operating them. Further statements made by an authority who has been visiting England are that the railway employees, including the workers in coal mines and industries supplying materials to the roads, have in effect confiscated the properties. The whole English railway system to-day is potentially bankrupt. The burden of meeting the deficit in operation and paying the rental to the owners is being carried by the public treasury. That is, the increased labour cost is being met by the English people through taxation.

This is not my invention, this is the dictum of Sir Eric Geddes, who to-morrow, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to know, will be the principal of McGill University. What does he say further?

> Beginning in October, 1914, and running to November, 1918, there were eight successive

wage increases, varying from three shillings to six shillings per week, and totalling thirty-three shillings—$7.40. Thus was added $275,000,000 to the payroll. At the end of the war, when Lloyd George appealed to the country for a vote of confidence, the railway unions made a renewed demand for an eight-hour day. This was granted. Thus was added $125,000,000 more to the payroll, making a total increase in wages of $400,000,000, or 160 per cent. The payroll had been increased to $650,000,000, as compared with total railway revenue before the war of $680,000,000. In addition, there was a very large increase in the cost of coal, steel and other material, adding $140,000,000 more to the operating expenses.

In all the operating expenses have been increased to $970,000,000 per annum. Including rental or interest on investment, the total cost of producing transportation is now $1,220,000,000 as compared with $680,000,000 before the war, an increase of about 80 per cent.

No increases in freight rates have taken place to offset increased costs of operation, the increase of 50 per cent in passenger fares early in the war being a measure of restraining travel. This increase probably added $100,000,000 to passenger revenue, bringing it to $780,000,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Will the hon. gentleman pardon me if I ask him to confirm his statement? It is a comparison between war times and peace times.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend believes that peace times will give us a cheaper administration of our railway system, he is more visionary than I thought he was.

Mr. BURNHAM: What alternative does the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just one moment, and I am through; I have only twenty minutes. It is all very well for my hon. friend from South York to say, as he did a moment ago, and as my hon. friend from East Algoma said in the fair statement he made this evening, that Ontario and the West want Government ownership. But give to Ontario and the West a few figures as I have done this evening, and you will find that the business sense of the people of those provinces will make them pause and ponder before launching Canada upon such a venture.

My hon. friend spoke of telegraphs. I am for cable ownership, chiefly for Imperial reasons. We know from experience that the Pacific cable can be made to pay. But what is the report with regard to Government-owned telegraphs? With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall take two or three minutes more, and then I shall finish.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Michaud): With the consent of the Committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the United States, Congressman Aswell, of Louisiana, introduced a resolution for taking over the wire lines. The United States Government has had the wire lines under its control for some time. Here is the published statement of Congressman Aswell:

> I am the author of the resolution that was made the basis of existing law taking over the control of the telegraph and telephone wires for the duration of the war. I believed in it heartily and worked for it faithfully, but I am very frank to state that I am greatly disappointed and discouraged to note the increase of 20 per cent, ordered on telegraph rates. I am not yet ready to admit that any such increase is justifiable or necessary.
>
> This means the death knell to Government control or ownership of telegraph, telephone and railroad lines. I owe it to my people and to Congress to apologize—

Yes, after experience, he has to apologize.

> —for my resolution if Government control means increase in rates.

The best means so far has been devised for the administration of our public utilities, for the administration of such a public utility, as a railway system, is the Railway Commission, which controls the rates and gives ample satisfaction to the people. But the facts are facing us; we must take the Canadian Northern, and, in the name of all that is honest and sacred let us give an administration that will meet with the hopes of the people; let us vest that administration with such powers as will not be above the control of the representatives of the nation in Parliament. It was stated a moment ago that the Liberal Government was lavish in its expenditure in connection with the railway companies. Let me say, in justice to the dead statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that he at least never granted one inch of Canadian land to a railway company, whereas the Tory party by their subsidies created all the land barons of Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: Like all the others on that side of the House, the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has wandered far afield. One idea I got from him, however, was that Government ownership is not an issue. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make an assertion of that kind, because no bigger issue is engrossing the minds of the people than that of Government ownership of the great railway lines, under consideration in this Bill. I agree that the theoretical question of public ownership is not exactly an issue now, but public ownership as involved in the condition that Canada finds

herself is certainly an issue. The issue is forced because the railways have been put upon the country. I do not propose to go into any avenues of complaint as to how they got there. The member for Maisonneuve says that the Government wants to please Ontario and the West. Why he puts Ontario in when not one of the railways in schedule No. 2 is situated in the province is very hard to understand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend does not want to be unfair, I know. It was on the abstract question of government railway ownership that I said that the Government, by raising that issue, was trying to please Ontario and the West—not on this particular railway question.

Mr. MORPHY: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and will take him on his remark that it was to please the West. In the schedule of the Bill it is proposed to take over forty-four charters in respect of lines running through fertile lands in the Western Provinces, charters which were applied for by other railway interests and are said to be of great value in the linking up of branch lines with the main trunk lines of railway that this country has to maintain and operate. When the hon. gentleman speaks of the West, my mind goes to what the West is. Twelve or thirteen of these lines are in Alberta, twenty-three in Saskatchawan, four in Manitoba and four in British Columbia. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman does not like the West.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the contrary.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY: He cannot really understand how any one could say a good word for the West. The other night he complained bitterly, almost to tears: All this money for the West and nothing for Quebec. How it pains him to see that splendid West on the threshold of further development. I was struck by the remark of the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) in reference to the vast resources of Canada. My mind immediately went to the great province of Alberta crying as one in the wilderness for branch lines to open up its splendid resources. But the member for Maisonneuve says: Nothing for Quebec; therefore starve the West. Consider alone the natural resources of Alberta. Alberta is rich beyond the dreams of avarice. I was astounded when I looked at the figures; in that province they are operating two hundred and seventy-nine collieries which produced, in 1916-17, 4,648,604 tons of coal—all this with their meagre facilities, with their trunk line of transportation crying out for branches. Over four million tons of coal from a country almost unknown from the point of view of coal. Underneath the soil of Alberta which bears the golden wheat there are gold mines in coal, beyond the dreams of any one here. These are the fields through which these branch lines will run; from them they will draw inestimable trade to the trunk lines and will develop, in grain and in coal, tremendous traffic for the Government railroad. But the hon. gentleman says: Money there? Nothing for Quebec? How low will hon. gentlemen descend in their arguments—arguments that do not savour of high public spirit? To the West we all look forward as the great harbinger of prosperity in the future, as the real feeder of the Empire in the days to come. Yet the hon. gentleman says: Everything for the West, nothing for Quebec.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) has been much more frank than the member for Maisonneuve, because he has told us where he stands with regard to public ownership.

He has no confidence, no faith in Government ownership as applied to this Bill; he has no confidence in anything this Government undertakes. Therefore, he is willing to risk not only the prosperity of the West, but the success of the scheme, simply for small political advantage, and nothing more. The other night, the hon. gentleman put himself very clearly on record as regards public ownership. He said:

> I was never in favour of Government ownership. There can be no mistake about where I stood. I am not in favour of it now; as I think private enterprise will do better in these matters. Particularly in colonization and development, will private enterprise and private energy do much better than Government ownership.

The leader of the Opposition is decidedly frank. The hon. member for Maisonneuve argues against public ownership, because, he says, if the Government take over the charters, that will prevent private enterprise from building these railroads. While pretending to be in favour of public ownership, he argues for private interests because he says that the taking over of these charters by the Government will prevent private enterprises from building these railways. Thus, we have two members on the Opposition side opposed to public ownership. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) says: I have no earthly use for public ownership; I am absolutely opposed to it, first, last and all the time.

A back-bencher from Ontario, the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler)—and I do not see how he can sit on that side on this great issue—tells the front-benchers they are all wrong. Thus we have, on the other side, the front-benchers against public ownership, the balance afraid to speak, and one voice alone crying in the wilderness scolds them. What a happy family are hon. gentlemen opposite upon this question? I feel very strongly that the people of the provinces throughout the Dominion, including Quebec, are, as one hon. gentleman said to-night, in their very hearts and souls, actually and honestly, in favour of Government ownership as regards this great railway system. Why? What else is there to do? We have the roads placed on our shoulders, and they must be operated by the Government, or, if not, by whom? Will hon. gentlemen opposite, freeing themselves from this destructive criticism, tell this Committee some plan whereby this system, which in the meantime is a great incubus, but which, in time, will, I believe, become a great public project, redounding to the welfare of this country, may be successfully operated under the conditions which confront us to-day? I will give place to any hon. gentleman opposite who will tell us just what alternative there is; I am willing to sit down in order to give him an opportunity to state one. You see, Sir, the fatuity of the situation. Hour after hour, for days, we have been called upon to endure factious opposition, the wasting of the time of the House and the country without one alternative proposition being given. If hon. gentlemen opposite would even say: We have a plan, but we will not tell you; but they have not sufficient temerity for that. Here we are as a Canadian Parliament submitting to destructive criticism hour after hour and day after day. What time was there ever before in the history of Parliament when the closure should have been applied to such absolutely futile destructive criticism of hon. members who are not talking even to the clause before the Committee?

Mr. ROBB: If the hon. member will allow me, I will tell him that the Government had a plan submitted to them not later than the month of February. I am quoting from the report of the annual meeting of the Grand Trunk railway held in London, England, on the 21st March, 1919, at which the president makes the statement, that they offered to the Government—

> —an exclusive arrangement for the exchange of traffic at North Bay with all the Government lines, including, of course, the Grand Trunk Pacific, thus affording the Government lines in the West access over the Grand Trunk to all eastern points, and offering at the same time to work all the Canadian lines in the East at cost.

Mr. MORPHY: I am sure the Committee will be delighted that somebody has got up. Where is the leader of the Opposition on the subject? Has he approved this plan? Does the hon. member who has spoken say that that is a good plan? See him smile. Will either he or the leader of the Opposition take the responsibility?

Mr. ROBB: What does the hon. member himself say about it?

Mr. MORPHY: I have not studied such a chimeric proposition presented by such a half-read resolution as that. The situation is one of great concern to the country; the country's interests are vitally wrapped up in it. And I once more say I think it is a pity, indeed, a shame, that the time of this Committee should be so taken up by futile criticism, without one constructive plank in the platform of hon. members opposite, who show by their paucity of resource, their lack of progressive measures, their absolute inability to put some plan forward, that they are not to be taken seriously; and I think they should be condemned for taking up the time of the Committee in what is nothing short of absolute obstruction to one of the greatest measures which the Dominion has ever had before it.

10 p.m.

Mr. PELLETIER: Much has been said as regards public and private ownership. I do not believe that is the real point at issue; but on the other hand, since the Government is ready and willing to operate, as owners, all railway lines, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific, public ownership is, in my opinion, bound to play its part in the drama. I am far from being ready to vote in favour of Bill No. 70. To begin with, we on this side of the House are only desirous of getting information as to who will be named as directors, what their salaries will be and so forth. It took us about an hour the other evening to learn that Mr. Hanna's salary was $25,000 per annum. Further, I do not believe that by taking over these roads the country will be better off, because the company will demand enormous sums of money to repair the roads and put them into good running

order. Then it will be discovered that we shall have a very heavy deficit every year, and what will be the decision of the Government then? They will say: This is a losing proposition; we will turn the roads over to private enterprise. And the roads will then be turned over to the same monopolists, the Government's friends, and the public will be the losers. We also asked who were the owners of the tracts of land through which the forty-four roads, the charters of which the Government wishes to revive, will go. We have been unable to get an answer, but I can safely say that Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann are the owners of thousands of acres alone. I shall state further that Mr. Mackenzie's sons own thousands of acres of land in those districts, and the information given my by the friend of one of the hon. members on your right, Mr. Chairman, who went West to buy land for cultivation was: These lots or plots of land belong to Sir William Mackenzie or Sir Donald Mann or Sir William Mackenzie's son. Why did they and other speculators secure so many acres of land? In my opinion it was simply because they were aware of the Government's intention, and felt absolutely safe in acquiring this land. There is no use asking further questions on this Bill, Mr. Chairman, because since the "infernal machine," the closure, has been set to work "mum" has been the word on the other side of the House. The Government is very anxious to load up the country with debts even though we now owe over $2,000,000,000. Who are the world's bankers, may I ask? The treasurer of our neighbouring republic recently announced that the United States has advanced further sums to the Allies as follows: Great Britain, $100,000,000; Roumania, $5,000,000; Serbia, $268,000. This with previous loans makes a total loaned by the Americans to the Allies of $9,138,829,000, and of this $4,236,000,000 went to Great Britain. Is not this enough to make us sit up and take notice before taking further action? I sincerely hope that it is; but there is no use in hoping in this case, for the simple reason that the question has been already decided. The closure is working and the Bill will pass whether you like it or not, but I shall certainly take pleasure in voting against it because I consider it against the best interests of the country at large.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I did not intend to say very much in regard to this Bill, but it has involved so much discussion in connection with Western Canada that as a representative of that part of the country I feel it is my duty to say something.

I was very much surprised to hear the arguments which were brought forward by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), complaining about any expenditures which might be made in the West, and I was equally pleased to hear the forcible arguments of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) setting forth the value of that country. We need railway construction there. The province of Alberta is rich in wheat lands, in timber lands, in mineral lands, in coal lands, in asphalt deposits; it is so rich in natural resources that I believe in the not far distant future it will be one of the leading mining, as it is now one of the leading agricultural provinces of the Dominion. An hon. member (Mr. Morphy) from Ontario has referred to the coal production of that province. Although the province of Nova Scotia, from which the hon. leader of the Opposition has the privilege of coming, is one of the greatest coal-producing provinces in this Dominion, and has been engaged in that industry for many years, for decades, yet the province of Alberta in the year 1918 exceeded in coal production every other province in the whole Dominion. It is because of these natural resources that we desire railway construction in the West; and we have other reasons than those. We have the obligations which were assumed by the Provincial Government of that province. We have heard much criticism of Mackenzie and Mann, and no one can criticise them more strongly than I have criticised them in the past. They have taken to their bosoms Governments from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They have possessed alike Federal Governments whether of Conservative or Liberal stripe, and Provincial Governments; they have done more, I believe to corrupt public life in this country than any other two men who were ever in the country. Do hon. gentlemen opposite want to allow the administration of one of the great railway systems of this country to remain in their hands, or are they perfectly willing that we should assume the responsibility which has been cast upon this Government? We find ourselves in the position that we must either keep pouring our money into the bags of these railway magnates whom hon. gentlemen opposite all criticise, or we must assume the obligations, put money into the enterprise, and eventually make it a benefit to the people.

So far as the province of Alberta is concerned, the charters which are referred to

in schedule 2 were all guaranteed by the Government of that province. They received their charters, their bonds were guaranteed, and the bonds for three of the lines have been sold and the money now lies in the bank. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the credit and honour of this country. Is it more honourable, I ask them, not to construct those lines in the province of Alberta when the bonds have been sold to the English bondholder, than to assume the obligation which was entered into, not by this Government, but by the Government of the province of Alberta? We owe it to the bondholder to construct those roads. We also owe a duty to the settlers who live along or within travelling distance of these projected lines. It has been argued by the other side of the House, when we put through this schedule it will induce people to settle. We have already induced these settlers to come to the province of Alberta. Thousands and tens of thousands have come on the strength of these charters the bonds of which were guaranteed and sold. These settlers have moved in with their families, and have been crying out since 1911 for railway construction. I submit that this Government owes a duty to those settlers to expend the proceeds of those bonds and give railway communication in that part of the country.

As to the lands through which these lines travel, there seems to have been great anxiety on the other side of the House as to whether it would be a good business venture. I should like to have the privilege of taking many of my friends through the country which will be traversed by these lines. You will pass through some of the richest agricultural districts in the Dominion—through country which will produce hundreds of millions of bushels of grain in the future and support your ports in the East. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain about this expenditure of money on railway construction in the West, but I hear no complaint from any single man about the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spent in Sydney, Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Toronto and Fort William on harbour improvements and terminal facilities. We realize they will be an outlet for the produce of the West, and we are now only asking that some recognition of the West be given, so that we can develop our own country by means of railways, and then the produce of the West will help build up the great water terminals which you have here in the East.

My hon. friend from Maisonneuve was very much exercised as to the effect the reviving of these charters would have on the money markets of the world. He says we are bankrupting ourselves and that we will not be able to borrow a dollar because there are charters in this schedule. Does he not know that every railway company in this country has carried on for years branch lines under charter upon which they have done no work and that the people in different parts of the country are suffering for want of railway construction? It will not affect the credit of the country one particle to have these lines. The hon. member suggested that these lines were being projected because Ontario was in favour of public ownership, and that it was being thrown out to the West as a sop to satisfy them in connection with the tariff. It must strike him that the tariff and railway construction are two entirely separate problems, and those who are interested in the tariff in the West will not be bought by any promise of railway construction which may be given by this Government. There is no part of Canada that is more strongly in favour of public ownership than the Great West. Perhaps we have been forced into public ownership, but the time is coming when the West will demand public ownership of nearly all its great utilities, the express companies, the telegraphs, the telephones and steamships, and almost every great utility which is necessary to carry on the commercial business of the country. The people want public ownership, and I think we should be fair and not condemn the scheme before it has been tried. Do not let us bring in petty party politics, but let us get together and demonstrate to the world that public ownership of railways and utilities can be made a success. Let us co-operate to the end that every country may point to Canada as the pioneer in this great work. The men who are engaged in the administration of the railway have been criticised in the House. Every member on the other side knows that Mr. Hanna, the president of the company, has the reputation of being one of the best railway men in Canada, and why should he not be employed by the Government? We have also heard reflections on Mr. Z. A. Lash who, as hon. members on the other side must know, is one of the ablest lawyers in Canada. Why should his services not be employed? Now, if hon. members opposite continue to cast slurs on these gentlemen they are just damning public ownership and we shall never get the best

men in Canada to assume positions of responsibility under such circumstances. I think the discussion on the part of the hon. members opposite has been one endeavour to do what they could to defeat public ownership, and they have criticised the Government unjustly and unfairly for purely party purposes. They say they want information on this and on that. Are we going to spend the time of the House in discussing railway ties on the 25,000 miles of railway in Canada, or in talking about section hands and general managers? There is much more serious and important business to be discussed, and we should lay aside these trivial matters and proceed to questions of real importance. There is no fear that there will be any patronage, because the railway employees themselves are so powerful now that patronage in the administration of the railway system will never come into play. I have very great pleasure in supporting the Bill, because it is an honest endeavour, as far as possible, to remove the railway systems from the sphere of politics. The question of public ownership was discussed in England during the last years of the war. This scheme which England thought good enough to consider—and I trust they will adopt it—should certainly be good enough for Canada.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It has been suggested that this Bill does not propose Government ownership, but rather provides the machinery to operate our Government railways. I think the hon. member for Maisonneuve is more responsible than any other member of the House for the fact that the discussion has drifted to the issue of public ownership versus private ownership. The first day the subject was introduced the hon. gentleman read an extract from the Winnipeg Telegram ridiculing Mr. Hamilton, the representative from Saskatchewan on the board of management. I wish to refute anything that has been said derogatory of Mr. Hamilton's capabilities, and to do this it is necessary that I should refer to what the hon. member read at that time. The article was headed "Making Railway Experts," and was addressed to the editor of the Winnipeg Telegram. It reads:

> Sir:—The West has furnished our Government with two men to fill national railway positions. A short biography of them should provide a tip to President Beatty of the C.P.R., and should also point the way to thousands of ambitious Canadian youths. It should also quiet the disbeliever in Government ownership of railways, as it clearly shows that our prairies turn out captains of industry by the simplest of training.
>
> [Mr. Tweedie.]
>
> Charles McGill Hamilton, in the early '90s, was attending school in Indian Head and later in Regina. About 1902 he settled on a section of land near McTaggart, Sask., a village about ten miles north of Weyburn. He followed this worthy but uneventful career until two years ago, when he was nominated in opposition to the Unionist candidate for Weyburn.

This is a misstatement of fact, for Mr. Hamilton was never nominated in opposition to any Unionist candidate. He was a Liberal candidate for some three years prior to the formation of the Union Government.

This article continues:

> A few months later he was appointed a director of Canadian National railways. Farming a section of land in Saskatchewan is a mighty good training for directing the affairs of a national transcontinental.

You will notice that it is stated that Mr. Hamilton attended school as a boy. This, I am sure, no one will find fault with, as it is necessary for every young fellow to attend school. But the writer of this article failed to mention that Mr. Hamilton had continued at school until he fitted himself for a teacher's certificate, which profession he followed for a number of years.

The article stops there with respect to Mr. Hamilton, but I wish to add that besides these qualifications, which I claim are real qualifications, Mr. Hamilton is at the present time and has been for quite a number of years, president of what is known in our province as the Rural Municipal Association. This organization has branches in the whole of the organized part of our province, and the annual convention brings him in touch with the reeves, secretaries, and councillors of these rural municipalities once a year. So that I claim we have not in our province a man better fitted to deal with transportation problems than the same Mr. Hamilton. Why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) should read this article to the House I cannot understand. I am confirmed in my belief that he was out to do Mr. Hamilton some harm, because on Friday some other hon. gentlemen to your left, Sir, referred to the management of this road. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) interjected the question, "What about Mr. Hamilton?" I want to say to the hon. gentleman, in order to dissipate any fear he may have in this respect, that Mr. Hamilton is one of the coming men of the province of Saskatchewan, one who will do honour to the board of management of the Canadian National railways or any other organizations with which he may be connected. Another gentleman, whom the same article presumes to ridicule, is Mr. Porter. I will not read what the article has to say about Mr. Porter, but I desire

to state that I have known this gentleman for many years and he has qualifications which Mr. Hamilton does not possess, inasmuch as he had been a railroad man for a great many years. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) saw fit to read the article in question and to ridicule Mr. Hamilton, I thought it well to point out that the Saskatchewan people are well satisfied with their representation on the Canadian National Railways board, and so far as Mr. Porter is concerned he has been, as a railway man, connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific for many years, and has simply been put into another position; that is all.

There is another matter that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) touched upon in respect to my province which I thought was not right. In discussing this question he made the statement that many of the western provinces were almost bankrupt. I do not know which of the western provinces he referred to particularly, and as he did not definitely say I take it that Saskatchewan was included. For this reason I think I am justified in putting on Hansard a statement taken from the budget speech of the treasurer of the province of Saskatchewan, as given on the 29th of January last. It says this:—

> On December 31, 1918, the gross public debt of the province amounted to $29,635,906.26. On a population basis it amounts to a charge of $39.83 for each individual in the province, using as a basis of calculation the population used by the Dominion Government in calculating the subsidy to the province. That is the charge per capita, $39.83. In considering the matter, however, the fact that a large portion of this debt is self-sustaining must be considered. That is to say, the taxpayer of the province as such does not have to pay the interest on it. That portion of the public debt which is self-sustaining amounts to no less a sum than $13,159,000. That amount includes investments in the public telephone system. The taxpayer of the province does not pay interest on the amount invested by the Government in the public telephone system. The public who use the telephone system of the province pay that interest in the form of telephone rentals and toll charges. The telephone system of the province is based on the idea that the people who get the service, and not the general taxpayer, should bear the burden. So that while the province has loaned to the telephone department for the purpose of building our telephone system the sum of $7,184,000 the general revenue of the province is not charged with the interest or sinking fund on that sum, the telephone department, out of its receipts, pays into the treasury annually a sum equal to the interest on that investment and the sinking fund with respect to the loans made for therefor.

Then in respect to the Saskatchewan Co-Operative Elevator Company, the Government loaned that organization $1,878,000. The Saskatchewan Farm Loans Board loaned to the farmers of that province $1,826,000, and there was another small sum loaned in respect of the Regina cyclone mortgage. Now, Mr. Chairman, this leaves the net debt of the province of Saskatchewan at $16,476,000, or a per capita debt of $22.14. This, I think, will bear very favourable comparison with that of any other province in the Dominion.

In respect to the branch lines of railway, as outlined in schedule 2 of the Bill under consideration, much has been said and hon. gentlemen have asked for information regarding them. I will have an opportunity of speaking when that part of the Bill is under consideration, I expect, and I can then give the hon. gentlemen information that I think will be sufficient to convince them that all branch lines to be built under these charters in my constituency are absolutely necessary to its development, and I have no doubt that there are other hon. gentlemen from the Western Provinces who will be able to answer the same for their constituencies. In this connection let me point out that while it has been charged that the Government is playing party politics with this Bill, the people of Saskatchewan have got their eye on the Government and on its railway programme. No matter what government is in power in this country, they are looking for a progressive policy with regard to the construction of branch lines which are so much needed in our province.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks on this Bill. When I went to Montreal on Friday last I was of opinion that the measure would be disposed of by the time I returned, but I find that in my absence, after certain speeches had been made by certain hon. members, the Government deemed it necessary to invoke the closure. Now we are trying to discuss the different clauses of this Bill and give our opinions with respect to them, and I am glad to have had this opportunity afforded me to-night. Coming up in the train I happened to read in one of the newspapers, said to be a supporter of the Government, that the Opposition were not serious in their attitude on this question, but that we were just spokesmen, gramophones, so to speak, and tools in the hands of other people who were forcing us to make this fight against the Government in order to prevent it from carrying out the policy upon which it had decided. In this connection the names of Lord Atholstan and Lord Shaughnessy were men-

tioned. Well, Mr. Chairman, if these noble lords exercised a potent influence in 1911 in carrying this Government into power, surely criticism cannot be made if their opinions are cited to-day. The views of these noble lords ought, for the purpose of argument, to be just as good to-day as they were in 1911. We are not backed up by Lord Shaughnessy or by Lord Atholstan; we are speaking our own minds and simply saying what we think ought to be said on this Bill. Why this rush? Why introduce the closure? When the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and other members on this side of the House were simply asking for information that they were perfectly entitled to, why did not the Government answer them properly and tell the House why these forty-four charters were being inserted in the schedule? The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) said that these charters were absolutely necessary for the West. If they were, I submit that years ago the Government should have forced its best friend, the Canadian Northern, to look after the interests of its dear friends, the western provinces.

We are reproached with having no policy; one of our friends opposite said that none of us could stand up and state what was our policy. Mr. Chairman, in opposition we are at liberty to criticise and point out what is wrong in the policies of the Government; but when called upon to prescribe measures to save the country from the calamity which the present Government is hastening upon us, the hon. leader of the Opposition and his immediate supporters will be ready with their policies. The western provinces are clamouring for more railways to help their development. They were aware of that necessity years ago. The Canadian Pacific Railway was built by a privately owned corporation, subsidized by the Government of the day the members of which were large holders of the company's stock. Other railways have been helped as well, but not so much as the Canadian Pacific. The Grand Trunk was helped, and the Canadian Northern was helped because it was a friend of the Government's, and the money of the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario and the eastern provinces was spent lavishly to build up the western provinces; but, Sir, in the province of Quebec there are districts which have been clamouring for railways for many years, and it is only in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen that they are going to have a railway—I am speaking of my own constituency, Charlevoix-Montmorency. We are told that the West absolutely needs many railways. Nationalization is a fad of the West like many other things, the Hudson Bay railway for instance, another white elephant. The West craves to get it all its own way as much as it likes at the expense of the other provinces, pay what they like for it. The hon. member for Red Deer said last Friday that railways should be built in greater number throughout the West. I have here a book, a comparatively modern book, published in Toronto—that fact should surely give it sufficient authority—and it contains the following statement:

> Of Manitoba, the foreigner seeking a home in a new land is told:
>
> "Railways have anticipated the future, so that few farmers are more than eight or ten miles from a railway."
>
> And for fear that Manitoba's attractions may not allure, the Government's immigration advocates point out that in Saskatchewan:
>
> "The province is so well served by the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, and Grand Trunk Pacific, that few of the established settlements are more than 10 to 20 miles from transportation; new settlements do not have to wait long for railway advantages."
>
> For Alberta and British Columbia, the argument is the same—railways to carry the settler to the lands, and railways to haul his grain and other farm-products to market. In other words, to use a salesman's expression, railways are the "talking-point" to the outside world.

This book was published in 1917 and is entitled "Railway Nationalization and the Average Citizen," by William H. Moore. He is telling the people of the West that they have enough railways, and he says:

> Advocates of Government ownership and operation fail to show wherein the public are to benefit thereby. There is not to be more capable management, nor improved service, nor cheaper carriage. Government ownership is a fad come out of the West, where the people change their minds as often as a woman changes her gown, and each new-fangled notion is acclaimed as the real panacea. The volatile nature of Northwest sentiment has had many manifestations; the Hudson Bay railway need only be mentioned. If it were demonstrated that under Government management Canada would enjoy a better and cheaper railway service, the policy would be worthy of approval and acceptance; but no effort at this demonstration is even attempted. The United States Congress has given the President control of the railways during the war and the after-period of demobilization, and has guaranteed to their owners dividends equal to the average earnings of three years preceding June 30, 1917, but Congress promptly rejected a proposal of Government ownership. An increase in rates will soon follow. There is no other course if the burden of guaranteed dividends is to be equitably distributed. Government direction in the United States, moreover, has accomplished noth-

ing in the way of expeditious traffic movement that the Railway War Board has not quite as satisfactorily effected in Canada.

The problem given courageous statesmanship in Canada is this: to finance the railways over the period of closed money markets without impairing their management and without loading upon the people an enormous liability which private capital and enterprise should sustain.

This policy of the Government I submit, Sir, has been adopted in a very hap-hazard way without knowing what it will lead us to. When you have such men as Lord Shaughnessy and Mr. Mitchell of New York, whom the hon. member for Maisonneuve referred to to-night, Prof. Irving Smart, Mr. Beatty, the new President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Sir William Wilson Hoy, General Manager of South African Railways and Harbours, who tell us that nationalization of railways is not a feasible thing, especially in such a young country as ours; when we have the example of the United States and of the countries of Europe—France, for instance—showing the failure of state ownership, I do not see how this Government has the temerity to unload on the country such a burden as this railway problem that we are asked to vote on to-day. I see only one reason: it is because the Government has some friends whom it wants to protect. We are told they are interested as well as Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann—for whose stock the Government paid over $10,000,000, stock which was supposed to be worth nothing—and that behind those people there are other interests; an organization called the National Trust, this so-called financial ring of Toronto and the Canadian Bank of Commerce. I am told on good authority that in 1917 if the Government had not come to the rescue of the Canadian Northern Railway it would have meant the finish of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and that that was the reason why it appropriated certain funds for the benefit of Mackenzie and Mann, Z. A. Lash, the National Trust, and the Contracting Securities Company, which is the go-between of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the National Trust, Z. A. Lash and the financial ring of Toronto. I am not afraid to say that, Mr. Chairman, because I know what I am speaking about, and if it is not true there are gentlemen on the other side of the House who will tell me so. Nobody can say it is a wise policy in this great financial stress and in time of war.

The present Bill, it seems to me, affords hon. members an opportunity of expressing their views upon the Government's railway policy, and it also gives us an occasion to say exactly what we think of the Government. In throwing this big burden on the country the Government is going to lose the last bit of confidence that the people have in it. This policy of nationalization is not acceptable and should not be patronized as long as that policy will not show better results. Before we adopt it we should wait and see its results and we should be guided by the bad results obtained elsewhere and profit by their experience.

I was asked last year in certain parts of the community why certain people did not follow the law of conscription better, and my answer was that it was because the Government did not have the confidence of the people. Well, Sir, if the Government continues to press its present policy of nationalization of railways it will lose every confidence that the people ever had in it. After the next election I hope that we shall have a new Government which will be better able to guide the destinies of this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I purpose offering a little information with regard to some of the branch lines mentioned in the notorious forty-four. I do not think any particulars of this nature have already been given. The Government would have been well advised had they brought down certain detailed information in connection with the amendment introduced on Friday. Requests have been made for this information, and as it has not been given, and as I am familiar with a number of the branch lines mentioned, it is in order for me to give some of the details in connection therewith.

During the consideration of this Bill the time has been largely occupied with the discussion of a matter which, so far as I can see, does not enter into the question affected by this Bill, that is, the matter of public or private ownership. I have listened carefully to a great deal that has been said and have read speeches that I did not hear, and I have failed to see in them anything to show me that the question of public or private ownership enters into the Bill that is before us.

We in the West who went through the good old days of property fluctuations and inflations a few years ago became possessed of certain properties in the West, lands and lots and so on, and some of us still hold them. That fact might give people the idea that we are in favour of private ownership of land. On the other hand, should we run across some kind, paternal Govern-

ment which is desirous of purchasing our properties on terms similar to those on which it took over certain properties from Mackenzie and Mann, we would gladly give up our equities—because, as in the aforementioned instance, that is all we have left in them now— to the Government. We might then be said to be in favour of public ownership. And that indicates about the only connection that the question of public or private ownership has with this Bill. We have on our hands certain railway properties; how we got them does not make any difference so far as this Bill is concerned, but we have to deal with them. The fact that we have them might cause people to say that we are in favour of public ownership. I venture to say that if some private corporation should offer us for these railway properties anything like the amount that the Dominion has expended on them, the person here most strongly in favour of public ownership would not object to turning these properties over to that corporation. Not five members of the Committee would, if confronted with that proposal, fail to rise in their places and vote strongly for it; in which case we would be looked upon as in favour of private ownership. I do not see how a discussion of the question of public or private ownership is going to settle the matter. The Government brings down this Bill, and there is nothing in it to indicate that they are in favour of public or private ownership; they are not in any way committed to either. On the other hand, the Opposition make certain criticisms of the Bill. So far as I can gather, they criticise the character of the measure, not the principle of it; there is nothing to indicate whether they are for or against public ownership. If each member voted according to his own firm convictions, a number on each side would vote for public ownership, a number against it, and a number would be neutral, that is, would be in the position of favouring public ownership in certain circumstances and of opposing it in others. So that I do not think we are getting anywhere by discussing this particular question.

So far as I can figure out, the whole controversy now before us in connection with this Bill is with regard to these branch lines, and the question whether their charters should be renewed. I am surprised that some one has not preceded me, and given the information which I propose to give. I am more or less interested in a considerable part of the territory through which a dozen or more of these lines pass, mostly those in Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I have checked over the list as it appears in Hansard, and I propose to take up possibly half a dozen of the charters mentioned.

But let me first point out the situation generally as to railroads in the West. Most of the roads run east and west. Until pretty far north the settler can go in an easterly or westerly direction without much trouble, but it is very difficult to get across country, that is, north or south. There are, perhaps, only about three locations where there are north and south lines throughout the whole of the West. One line runs from Winnipeg to The Pas—which is only approximately north and south; another from Prince Albert to Regina through Saskatoon. From Edmonton to Calgary there is one direct line and a couple of lines that are approximately direct. But the vast areas in between have really no means of communication north and south except in a very roundabout manner The aim of a number of these branch lines is to give this north and south communication, not directly, but ultimately. Branch lines will be extended into certain districts where there is considerable settlement, with the idea of accommodating that settlement, and also of bringing other territory just beyond into a position to be settled, and eventually extending into that territory, and so on.

A line is proposed from Craven to Hudson Bay Junction via Yorkton. That would make direct connection, you might say, between The Pas, the terminal of the Hudson Bay railway, and Regina, through a country which is not served at all at the present time. Many settlers throughout that district are not eight or ten miles, but anywhere from fifteen to forty miles from railway communication. The intention is not to complete that railway at once, but to build a certain portion of it, serving well-settled districts at first, and eventualy completing the whole road.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the length of that line?

Mr. CAMPBELL: It runs from Regina to Hudson Bay Junction; I should say, about two hundred miles. It is already partly constructed at both ends. I am not, however, as familiar with that line as I am with others further north.

One of these charters calls for the construction of a line from Melfort northeasterly to the boundary between Saskatchewan and Manitoba. That line goes through one of the best farming districts in the whole

of Western Canada; the land is uniformly good. A large delegation from Melfort and surrounding country came here about a month ago to press for the construction of that line.

There is at the present time another delegation here from that district to press for the construction of that line. The intention of the Government and of the Railway Board is to grade thirty miles or so, and ultimately to extend the line to The Pas to connect with the Hudson Bay railway. The idea is not to do all that at once, but it is well in constructing a railway to map it out with some objective in view and then to do as much each year as conditions demand.

Another project is from Hudson Bay Junction, which is the junction between the Prince Albert section of the old Canadian Northern railway and that section which runs up to The Pas to connect with the Hudson Bay railway. This line is intended to be constructed from Hudson Bay Junction to the southern part of Saskatchewan, via Moosomin. Portions of that line have been built here and there, between Sturgis and Canora, between Canora and Yorkton, and between Yorkton and Melville. The idea is to link up these so that there will be a complete line running north and south from Hudson Bay to the southern boundary of Saskatchewan, to the coal fields.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the hon. member tell us the length of that line?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am sorry I did not figure out the length of that line, but when it is finally completed, it will be approximately from 250 to 300 miles long. I do not want to be tied down to an exact figure.

Mr. COPP: Is that road partly built?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Large sections of that road have already been built and these must be linked up in order to make a complete road running north and south.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Where does it go to in the south?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Down into the coalfields district at Estevan, right to the boundary, one might say. Presumably, it will run east of the Moose mountains, connecting up with Moosomin, from Moosomin to Yorkton, from Yorkton to Canora, from Canora to Sturgis, from Sturgis to Hudson Bay Junction. A good portion of that line has already been built, and these parts require to be linked up, so that there will be a complete line from Hudson Bay right down to the coalfields at Estevan and to the boundary between Canada and the United States.

There is another projected line from Prince Albert northeast to the boundary. I do not know so much about that line, but I understand there is a good settlement north of Prince Albert, and in this case it is not the intention to build that line at once, but to build into that settlement with the ultimate object in view of getting into the important mining fields at Saskatchewan and Manitoba boundary.

Still another line is from Melfort southeast to Thunder Hill branch. This is simply connecting up lines that have already been built. The suggestion of the delegation that is here to-day from that district is that the line, instead of running direct from Melfort to the Thunder Hill branch, connect that branch with Tisdale. That, I might say, is just a short section of probably thirty or forty miles, I am not sure of the exact mileage, but it goes through a good section of country and it will enable the people of that district to deliver their wheat and produce east and southeast, saving them a haulage of from sixty to seventy miles.

11 p.m.

Then, there is a line from Melfort southwest to Vonda, and farther on in the list there is one from Vonda northeast to Thunder Hill extension. Without going into details in this connection, I might say that these charters cover somewhat the same ground. The distance between Melfort and Vonda is approximately sixty or seventy miles, and already the grade has been made for twenty miles of that, and all that is necessary is to put on the rails. That grade was ready before war broke out, and, of course, since then railway building has been at a standstill. It is, therefore, very important that rails should be laid on that part of the road. So far as I know, all that is intended to be done is to put rails on the part that is graded this year, and extend for a few miles farther towards Melfort. When this line is finally completed there will be a direct route from Saskatoon via Melfort and Carrot River valley to The Pas, a well-settled, fertile country all the way.

The amount of railway building which it is actually intended to carry on this year does not amount to a very great number of miles, being little bits here and there throughout the west that will ultimately form into systems which will be of vast benefit to the west generally. I might take up the time of the committee in going through a number of those, but

I will confiine myself just to one instance in Manitoba. In the country west of lake Manitoba and between that lake and lake Dauphin, there is a considerable stretch of country a large portion of which is well settled. I know personally that people are hauling their wheat, not as an hon. member stated a short time ago, only eight or ten miles, but twenty-five or thirty miles. It is the intention of the Governmeent to extend the line from the south up twenty miles. Then there is a gap to Ste. Rose du Lac, and there connection is made with the main line of the Canadian Northern. It is the intention to extend this connecting line farther north, a distance of twenty miles. That means that two particular parts of this general district will be served by those two extensions and that these will be eventually linked up when the territory in between is settled up, but in the meantime, only settled districts are being served. Later the districts a little more remote will be settled up and lines running into those districts will be constructed, and eventually there will be a continuous line from Portage La Prairie to Winnipegosis, which will be a direct line and which will serve one of the best districts in Manitoba.

There has been a great deal of criticism regarding the Canadian Northern management, and particularly regarding the founders of that line, Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann. I do not purpose going over that ground, but while with a good deal of this criticism I heartily agree, I notice that there was no criticism of Mackenzie and Mann respecting the location of their lines. There seems to be a unanimity of opinion in this Committee that the Canadian Northern Railway system passes through a country which is probably the best for railway purposes of any part of the West. We must give those gentlemen who were the founders of this road credit for having made a particularly good selection of their territory, and they selected the particular districts which are covered by these charters. Therefore, if they were as wise in their selection of these districts as they were in their selection of the territory through which the Canadian Northern Railway system has already been built, it is to the great advantage of Canada that we preserve these charters for the use of the Canadian National railways, and of course, of the Canadian people.

I might say also in connection with these lines that as has probably been noticed, the general trend of a number of them is towards connecting up with the Hudson Bay railway, either indirectly at Hudson Bay junction, which is connected with the terminus of the Hudson Bay railway, by a Canadian Northern Railway section of about ninety miles in length, or directly with The Pas itself, which is the terminus of that railway. I do not purpose discussing the advantage or otherwise of the Hudson Bay railway project at the present time. Probably I shall have something to say about that later on.

But if as much wisdom has been shown in the north as Mackenzie and Mann showed in the rest of Saskatchewan and Alberta, then the connecting up of some of these lines with the Hudson Bay Railway is going to be of great advantage to the West generally, for you will observe that Mackenzie and Mann have had such connections in mind throughout their whole scheme of things.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the hon. member tell us the total or the average mileage of these forty-four lines?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I cannot give the total mileage, because I just obtained these figures this morning and I have not had a chance to study them closely, but I can say this: It is, I am informed, the intention to build 350 miles or thereabouts of these branch lines this year.

Mr. COPP: Have the contracts been let?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not know.

Mr. COWAN: I am not going to agree absolutely with the last speaker. To me this Bill is a public ownership Bill from start to finish. Its title is public ownership, the preamble is public ownership, the first section is public ownership and every other section down to the last. You cannot make anything else out of it. Furthermore, those who oppose this Bill cannot help but oppose public ownership.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. COWAN: That is my view. I am very glad to hear hon. gentlemen opposite demur, because it again proves to me that they do not know themselves just what they think about it. They have talked on all sides of the subject since they started. Their whole attitude from beginning to end has been an enigma. Some of them have said openly that they were opposed to public ownership. Others have evaded the question entirely and have talked all round it. Even the hon. member for Maisonneuve, for whom I have the very highest respect, told us he was in favour of public ownership of cables, but he did not tell us any-

thing about his views on public ownership of the railways. What did he do? He read copious extracts from one or two papers—for what purpose? These extracts showed that public ownership or public control in Great Britain during a recent period had resulted in a great loss to the Imperial Government. Now, what was his purpose in reading those extracts? Was it to help the cause of public ownership? I fancy not. To me he had only one object in view and that was to do his utmost in opposition to the cause of public ownership. To me it seems that hon. gentlemen opposite have talked in different ways seemingly for a purpose, so that when an election comes they will be able to go to certain people and say, "We oppose public ownership," and in other districts they will quote extracts from their speeches and say, "We are in favour of public ownership." But the fact remains that no matter what they say, they have put every obstacle possible in the way of the passage of this public ownership Bill, and when I find a man putting a lot of rocks on the railway track I must confess to thinking he is putting them there for the purpose of preventing the train from passing, if not of wrecking it. That is the position hon. gentlemen opposite are in.

I have all my life been a believer in public ownership. I have seen it tried in our part of the country in a great many ways, and I have never seen it fail where it was properly handled. Mind you, it has to be handled properly, as any private enterprise has to be handled properly if it is to succeed. I have no doubt whatever that the course now being pursued by this Government in creating this holding company, if I may so call it, is the very best one that could be adopted for the purpose of making a success of the system. A number of hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed to the failures we have had on the Intercolonial, and what political interference has done for that road. I am mighty glad we have had that experience on a minor project like the Intercolonial. It has given us a lesson and taught the Government what it is necessary to avoid in order to make a success of railway management. If we had not had that experience, we should probably have to gain it now in a much more costly way.

My purpose in getting up to-night is more to answer a question which was asked by the leader of the Opposition. He asked why it is that the Canadian Northern has not paid. The answer is very easy to me. Even the Canadian Pacific did not pay the first few years of its operation. I can well recall the time when I lived in that part of the country, thirty-two or thirty-three years ago, when conditions surrounding the Canadian Pacific were very similiar to the conditions surrounding the Canadian Northern or the Canadian National to-day. The country was not then developed; there was no trade then for the Canadian Pacific, just as there is very little trade to-day on the Canadian Northern. The Canadian Pacific had to develop the business, and it did develop it by settling the country. As the country settled the Canadian Pacific became one of the best-paying institutions in this country. Exactly the same conditions prevail to-day with regard to the Canadian Northern. That road has been built as much as a colonizing road as anything else, and the result is that the farmers have flocked in as the railway has been built. The hon. member knows as well as I do that you cannot go on a farm and produce anything to furnish traffic for a railway for a few years. The first year you break a few acres and have a mighty hard time. The second year is not so hard, and by the third year you are producing a little bit which will furnish traffic, and in the fourth and fifth and sixth years are doing better. The Canadian Northern had just reached the point where the produce of the farmers would furnish paying traffic for the railway company which handled it, and from now on I am fully satisfied we shall have exactly the same experience with the Canadian Northern as we had with the Canadian Pacific in years gone by. As soon as the country is settled and is producing the railway will pay. As the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) has said, it is located through the best stretches of country we have out there. I have travelled over a great many miles of it by automobile and buggy, and wherever I have gone I have been satisfied with the location which the Canadian Northern officials have chosen for their lines.

I have no hesitation in saying that in taking over the Canadian Northern Railway the Government has undertaken an enterprise which will be a paying one in a very few years.

In regard to these forty-four "notorious" branch lines about which complaint is made and which have been referred to as "wrecks" I must take exception to any such description of these lines. I resent the statement that they are wrecks. Twenty-three of them belong to the province from which I come, Saskatchewan, and I wish

to say that we have no wrecks and do not intend to have any in that part of the country. I heartily commend the Government for seeking to renew these charters, and I would condemn them if they did not. Can the Canadian National Railway pay simply as a trunk line? Undoubtedly it cannot. The Canadian Pacific Railway never paid as such, but only when they got branch lines as feeders, and that is exactly what is proposed to be done in connection with the Canadian National Railway. If the Government were so shortsighted as not to build these branch lines what would happen? The settlers out there could not wait forever for railway communication, which they must have in order that they may profitably follow agricultural and other pursuits. To my knowledge thousands of farmers are to-day twenty-five and thirty miles from any railway, and if the Government did not build these lines the settlers would continue an agitation until they secured them. If the Canadian Pacific railway builds into these districts do you think there will then be trade for this government-owned road? Unquestionably the business would go to the railway which furnished the best facilities for handling the traffic, and the result would be that the Canadian National would continue to be a losing proposition. It seems to me that the only thing to do is to revive these charters and to build the lines as soon as the money can be provided and conditions warrant, so as to furnish feeders for our own railway and to stem competition. I think the Canadian Northern have located their lines well. There is no duplication, and the impression that has gone abroad to this effect is absolutely false. There is no duplication at any point in any one of the three prairie provinces. There is a little stretch west of Saskatoon where the lines run probably four or five miles apart, and which might be regarded as a duplication, if any one wished to strain a point. As an old Tory I am going to make the admission that I think the Canadian Pacific Railway was improperly located in the first place. We have been hearing about "a thousand miles of rock" separating the East from the West, but this is only along the north shore of Lake Superior through which the Canadian Pacific runs. There is a magnificent stretch of fertile land which, I am satisfied will hold thousands and thousands of stock farmers. I think the grade and the curves on the Canadian Northern are superior to anything the Canadian Pacific has, and I am satisfied that to-day we have an excellent asset and need have no fear of Government ownership. I dare any one to go into our section of the country and advocate private ownership of railways, if he expects to win an election, for you could not win a single constituency in Saskatchewan on the policy of private ownership. In my own city we would not think of granting the franchise to any private company for the street service of Regina. We have made a complete success of government ownership of telephones and believe that the Government can make a success of government ownership of railways, and for that reason we are strongly in support of the scheme. Speaking for a large section of our people, I believe that this matter can be conducted without any political interference; and having studied the Bill as carefully as possible, I have come to the conclusion that we shall have as near an approach to government ownership without political interference as can be had. For that reason I give it my most hearty support.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to remove from the minds of good, honest gentlemen who sit to your right, Sir, the idea that we are obstructing the passage of this Bill or that we have done anything that appears like obstruction. We have received some slight information from the hon. member for Nelson to-night, and this we regard as very good and useful. It is the first sign of even the dawn of any information about these new railways, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, and others like ourselves who are anxious for the development of the country, would suppose that it would not be regarded as carping or factious opposition that we should ask for information throwing some light upon the subject so as to enable intelligent men on both sides of the House to form an opinion as to whether or not the enterprise is a safe and proper one, and one in the best interests of the country. Did we get that information from the proper source from which it should come? We have a right to expect this information from the Department of Railways, but they refused positively to give it to us. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) sometimes acts as a foreign missionary for the Government and makes speeches for this society—which speeches the President of the society says he has no authority to make, and that he speaks without the book—and we thought he was talking with knowledge out in Regina the other day. I put a question in this House to the presi-

dent of the home mission, the Right Hon. Sir Thomas, as to the authority of his missionary in the West, and he said that gentleman had no authority whatever, and that—to speak in vulgar language—he was talking through his hat.

Mr. COWAN: May I be allowed to correct the hon. gentleman? I never uttered any such statement and never made any speech in Regina, or anywhere else, whilst I was away, and never attempted to speak for the Government. I did say that I expected the Government would make reductions in the tariff. That is as far as I went, and if the newspapers enlarged upon it that is not my fault. I repeat that I never made a speech while I was away.

Mr. McKENZIE: I won't be so unkind as to say that the hon. gentleman could not make a speech. He tried to do so here this evening, and while it was not the best speech in the world it was a very good one.

Mr. COWAN: Thank you.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not finding fault with it at all, but it comes from a section where these roads are being built, and I would have expected of him better than he has done. He seemed to find fault with the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) for telling us nothing. Because of that I thought the hon. gentleman himself was going to do better. But when it came to his turn he took the back road and told us nothing at all.

Now I am sure that hon. gentlemen in this House who are willing to take their gospel and their information, their brains, their philosophy and their guidance from the Minister of the Interior, will be surprised when they learn that the drafting of this very Bill that we are supposed to have been obstructing was only completed about four o'clock on Friday. I am sure there will be some amusement in the minds and on the faces of hon. gentlemen who say that we were obstructing the Bill, when I tell them that on four o'clock Friday last, about three or four hours before the closure was applied, the drafting of this Bill was completed, a new section 20 was introduced, and what constitutes in the new Bill of to-day, five closely printed pages of new material were inserted in it. There was no sitting of the House on Saturday, or on Sunday, and we had no opportunity of discussing those five pages of closely printed matter and the new section that were embodied in the Bill, except for the few hours that remained between four o'clock and about half-past twelve, when, as I say, the closure was applied. Will any hon. gentleman sitting in this House with reason in his heart and in his head, and who acknowledges responsibility to his electors, say that we were wrong because we found fault with the very short period of time that was given to us for the discussion of a Bill the drafting of which was not finished until four o'clock last Friday, and the printing of which was not completed until some time to-day? At twelve or twelve-thirty to-day I sent one of the messengers of the House to see if I could get a copy of this Bill as newly printed. I failed to do so; I was told that it was not on distribution. The first time I saw this newly printed Bill was at three o'clock when I took my seat in the House, and I venture to say that was the experience of at least ninety per cent of the members who compose this Chamber. At three o'clock to-day, Mr. Chairman, the printed Bill was placed in the hands of members, containing a new section and five pages of new material, and the closure was applied on Friday night! Was it not therefore most extraordinary conduct to apply the closure two days before the Bill was printed?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but will any member of the Government, or any member of the House, say they ever saw this Bill in its present form until three o'clock this afternoon? And yet, two days before that the closure was applied on the ground that we were obstructing the progress of the Bill, which was yet in the womb of time, and about which we knew nothing. That statement, Sir, I think will satisfy you, and satisfy the people, that there was no obstruction in connection with this matter but only a fair and legitimate desire for information. Now, Sir, at four o'clock, this new section was brought down and the new schedule was attached, and we had seven hours in which to deal with the Bill before the closure was applied. Well, there are two hundred and thirty-five constituencies in Canada, but if you divided four hundred and twenty minutes by the number of constituencies, it will give each constituency 1-7/9th minutes. Think of it, each constituency in Canada was given 1-7/9th of a minute to discuss this Bill!

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will any person say that we were obstructing because we took

more time? The 235 constituencies in Canada took more than one and seven-ninths of a minute in discussing this Bill, and therefore hopeless and reckless obstruction is charged. But is the charge of obstruction well founded when I tell you, Mr. Chairman, and when you know, that a very large body of the Bill did not come to our notice until to-day? No, it simply makes the charge more ridiculous. Suppose we had nothing to deal with at all but the forty-nine new clauses, or new subjects that were added to the Bill. Applying the same rule as in the other case gives us the enormous time of nine and a half minutes to each constituency for the purpose of discussion. Think of it! Think of all these constituencies with their population, their intelligence, their want of knowledge and desire for it in connection with these matters,—and nine and a half minutes have been placed at the disposal of each in order to deal with this Bill. We are told that is obstruction, and I can see on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite—those hon. gentlemen who are listening to the impression sought to be published abroad that we are obstructionists—that we certainly are obstructionists, and that we certainly ought to be punished on that ground. Most decidedly the people of this country ought to know what kind of obstructionists we are when we tell them that one and seven-ninths of a minute was allowed each constituency in Canada to deal with the subject, and that for only a small part of it, nine and a half minutes constituted the limit. If that did not prove satisfactory we had to accept the odium of being men of little sense, and devoid of any desire to forward the progress and advancement of this country.

The leader of the House (Sir Thomas White), who is not here to-night, went far afield on Friday night to fasten upon us the charge that we were in the hire of some great concern in this country that he suggested, was evidently paying us, either directly or indirectly, to obstruct this legislation, and otherwise that we were putting ourselves up as against public ownership. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) undertook to quote to-night what I said about my own attitude on public ownership. I trust the hon. gentleman would like to be fair to me. and fair to anybody, but when he was giving the quotation he should have stated that it was something I said a year ago. Anything that I might say to-day, since even this discussion of to-day, might be tinged with some partiality, or might amount to trimming my sails to suit the breeze at present. But as to what I said a year ago, when this legislation was not under discussion at all, surely I was not such a prophet as to be able to foresee what is happening at the present time. What I said then is clear evidence that I am not now obstructing the Government ownership of this railway system.

I said then exactly what my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) said to-night. He is a good, staunch supporter of the Government and occupies the first seat in the synagogue when it comes to a question of being a hard, hide-bound Tory. Surely they will not question his confession of faith, they will not deny his orthodoxy? What does he say? Exactly what I said a year ago. He says that we are in this position now, that we have no alternative, we have to make the most of a bad bargain; but if things were at a stage where he could choose between public ownership and private ownership he would be a private ownership man. Surely I may be permitted to walk along the street without any stones being thrown at me when I am in such good company, the hon. gentleman, who is an expert on railway questions—and an expert on most other things that we bring up in this House. When the question was put to me the other night I said I was opposed to public ownership, and I could only repeat what my record was. I am not in favour of public ownership, because I believe in my heart that the energy and best abilities of people in charge of any work are brought out when they are working for themselves and for private ownership. I believe that the same keenness and ability and the same ambition are not brought to bear upon public ownership. That is my reason, Sir. If wrong I am honest about it. But I did say a year ago to the hon. Minister of Railways, when he was putting his Estimates through: You are in this thing now; I would not be in it if we could have avoided it, but we are in it and we have to make the best of it; we will have to help you along to do the very best you can, and I hope when you come to us in a year that you will be able to present a fairly successful statement. That is what I am saying now.

That the Acting Prime Minister should try to make political capital out of this question is to me very absurd indeed. It shows that things are getting to a very low ebb and that everything else out of which capital can be made is getting played out. The war is over and the returning soldiers are damning the Government at every station from Halifax to Vancouver. The Government are finding that they can-

not pass another War-time Elections Act to carry them into power, and they are therefore scouring around for some other breeze to waft them into power. And now they are laughing and saying: "Ha, ha! We have found something new. We will say that those chaps across the way are opposed to public ownership, and we are in favour of it, we will start that racket, and with another new franchise and a few other fake issues perhaps we can sail to harbour once more." The leader of the House told us that he had found dirty babies on his doorstep, and it seems that they are still dirty. I am sorry to say that his babies are not the only things that are dirty in the Administration which the hon. gentleman to-day leads; there are other things almost as dirty. The policy regarding his babies is rather soiled and unsavoury and will afford some work for this Public Health Bill which has been introduced. Then there are other policies—if you will look at the immigration policy policy regarding his babies is rather soiled and its hands needing some bath-tub treatment; and if you look at the finances of the country—well, that is a baby of the vilest, raggedy looking character conceivable.

If the babies were so dirty and unsavoury and so undesirable, why did he pass a paternity order against the Minister of Railways and make him the putative father of another illegitimate child that they brought into the House—and I am told that he is not very well kept or very clean. If the two dirty babies were on the doorstep, and they were obliged to take them in, why pass this affiliation order upon the devoted head of the Minister of Railways to take in another dirty baby? And I find that they are contemplating a regular baby farm, for they propose to adopt forty-five or fifty other dirty babies throughout the West. I also find that the Acting Prime Minister is trying to get a purchaser for some of his land which he had on his hands some years ago when he became administrator of a certain Naboth. It seems that he has Naboth's vineyard on his hands, and it is quite possible that he contemplates founding a home for these dirty babies in the vineyard—and, certainly, if he gets as many of them as he professes to be looking after now, I really am afraid that Naboth's vineyard will not be large enough to hold them all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that we were not dealing with the question of public ownership, that over a year ago I announced what my position was, that I clearly and distinctly understood then the position that we were in by reason of those roads being in our hands, and that the question was: How best to utilize them? The preamble of this Bill settles that question. It says:

> Whereas His Majesty on behalf of the Dominion of Canada has acquired control of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of the various Constituent and Subsidiary Companies comprising the Canadian Northern System, as specified in the First Schedule to this Act, and it is expedient to provide for the incorporation of a Company under which the railways, works and undertakings of the Companies comprised in the Canadian Northern System may be consolidated, and together with the Canadian Government Railways operated as a national railway system: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Canada,—

and so forth. That clearly indicates that we knew we owned those railways and were providing for the best way of managing them. If there should be a difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen to your right and hon. gentlemen to your left as to the best way of managing these roads, does it lie in the mouth of anybody to say that we do not want to have them at all? What would be the sense of saying we do not want to have them when they are already in our possession and we have been operating them now for over a year? I submit, Sir, that it is neither honest nor fair criticism for the leader of the House or any other hon. member on his side to say that we are opposed to, or in favour of, holding those roads, when we are dealing entirely with the question of management. For over forty-five years we have had a Government railway in this country and have been managing it without a corporation of this kind, and a man could be for or against it during that time as he would be now——

The CHAIRMAN: I must direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One could easily gather from the speech of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) that he was very angry with the Government over this Bill, and also that he was quite anxious to escape from the unfortunate position upon which he impaled himself and his party last Friday. But the most eager listener would find it very difficult to ascertain whether he was opposed to this Bill or whether he favoured it, and still more difficult to learn, if he opposed it, on what ground he did so, and what he objected to in it. For almost several hours to-day I have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite who are osten-

sibly opponents of the measure and are complaining of their treatment with regard to it; but all through those seven hours not one has pointed to one clause or one word of the Bill which he opposes or which he says is objectionable. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they have not had time to discuss the Bill. The leader of the Opposition gave us a calculation to show us that if every member wanted to speak on each clause, he would have a minute and seven-eighths, or something of that kind, within which to perform the task; therefore he says that when we moved the postponement of the consideration of clause 20 last Friday we took the Opposition short and did not give them a fair chance to discuss this measure. When we moved the postponement at one o'clock on Saturday morning we had discussed for eight hours that day, and for some time the day before, one single clause of the Bill without making any progress, and with the clearest intimation from the leader of the Opposition that we would not be allowed to make any progress. It did not matter what might happen; if everybody wanted to discuss each clause, so long as two or three hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to delay the Committee in order to delay the discussion of one single clause, we could not get ahead. That one single clause was the most unobjectionable clause of the whole Bill, the most absolutely impossible to take objection to. That was the clause which simply empowered the company, if Parliament voted money for the purpose later, to utilize charters which, while the company was in private hands, were the possession of that private company. Have we heard anything to-day to indicate to us why these charters should not be revived? A listener in the gallery or a member who was not here last Friday might gather from this debate that we who were directly responsible for the measure had sat here all day with hardened hearts and obdurate spirit, had refused to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite, refused to give any information, refused even to take kindly suggestions from them, and that, consequently, the spirit of gentlemen on the other side was such that they had to oppose the Bill whether there was any merit in it or not. Well, it would be interesting to inquire what there is in this complaint about lack of information. The hon. gentleman says that we brought down our schedule only Friday afternoon, giving the exact charters covered by clause 20 and asking that they be revived. That is true. The Bill as it formerly stood provided for the revival of any charters that had been the property of the private company. For the life of me, I know of no reason why the Parliament of Canada should refuse to revive for public purposes charters that were granted for private purposes. Why was the schedule brought down Friday afternoon? It was brought down at the suggestion of the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who asked that clause 20 be amended and that we specify the charters we wished to be revived. Because we accepted his suggestion we were met with the most stubborn opposition all the rest of the day and with a refusal to pass the clause in the form into which it had been drawn at the request of the member for Maisonneuve. Now we are complained of because we dared to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with obstruction. We are complained of also because we accepted no amendments from hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, we had not much encouragement to accept any others, because, having accepted this one, we were delayed a whole day and threatened with indefinite delay unless we applied the only rule of the House that enabled us to proceed. What information was asked for that was denied?

Mr. PEDLOW: May I answer the minster?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose the hon. member can express it better than I can.

Mr. PEDLOW: I asked the Minister of Railways for information which he absolutely refused to give.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was it?

Mr. PEDLOW: Information as to who own lands and the townsites along these railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman need not think that I would forget that; that was really the most amusing of all these requests. One hon. gentleman asked for a map, and for the mileage. The mileage does not matter, because we are not building the mileage. When we come to ask Parliament to vote money to build the mileage, then all the mileage will be given; an estimate will be given as to the amount per mile. That is when Parliament is interested; but we must have the charters, be the mileage long or short. As for a map, I do not know the value of a map dangling between me and the leader of the Opposition. There are maps in almost every room in the building; hon. gentlemen can go to them and see the direction that everyone

of these lines is to take. All the information is available; hon. gentlemen have had three days and three nights in which to gaze on the glory of the map of Canada, if that is any advantage to them. But the main thing is the matter mentioned by the member for North Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow). Why, he says, we wanted to know the names of the people who own the land along the routes of these forty-four lines. He is quite correct; they really did ask for that. Here is what the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) said, although he is strangely silent to-night:

> There has been deposited on the table a list of forty-four lines, charters for which are to be revived. Now, we want to know where those lines are going—

The schedule itself tells exactly where all the lines are going; that is to say, the general direction—and that is all that is known.

> —the counties they will pass through—

There are no counties in our part of the country, so they cannot pass through any.

> —and the owners of the land traversed by the railways.

Here are forty-four charters sought to be revived; the hon. gentleman asks us to tell him who are the owners of all the lands that will be traversed by these railways. How do you know who owns the land until you have the right of way, until you have a plan made out and accepted by the Minister of Railways? That is not the case here. We know the general direction; we know the lines that are built. But suppose we had the plans; suppose we knew every farm the lines went through, do hon. gentlemen seriously suggest that we should employ every lawyer in Western Canada to hunt up the land titles records and ascertain who are the thousands of owners of lands—for there virtually are thousands—along these rights of way? A more absurd, a more utterly ludicrous suggestion, was never offered to a Committee of this House. Who, it is asked, owns the land along the right of way? Are they friends of the Government? Well, I assume they are. You could not build a line of railway ten feet in Western Canada without encountering friends of the Government. Hon. gentlemen told us last Friday that some friends of the Government have townsites and are going to make great profits; that the roads are no good, but that these people are going to make great money out of the townsites. I challenged them then to come here to-day with information on that subject—they would have two days and three nights to think it over. I promised them that they would produce a sensation in the Committee if they gave any such information to-day, and that that information would likely have a serious influence upon the votes of hon. members on this side. Has anybody offered it? Has anybody heard any information as to friends of ours who own townsites along these lines? Well, there has not been very much, and I will tell you why: Ever since the Canadian Northern railway was owned by the Government, the townsites, one and all, have been owned by the Canadian Northern Railway, and therefore by the people of Canada.

That, unfortunately, was not the case with the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is the case with the Canadian Northern Railway Company to-day, and it will be the case with regard to all the townsites along the line built under the charters covered by clause 20. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) does not know for the life of him how to vote on this Bill unless we tell him the name of every farmer through whose property these lines are going to run.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why did the minister not supply that information to us on Friday night when he was asked for it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The information as to the names of the owners? I have not given it to the hon. member now.

Mr. PEDLOW: The minister has answered my question, has he not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the question was to give the names of the owners of real estate along those lines, I have given the hon. member no name at all, but he is apparently quite satisfied. Had I known he was as easily satisfied as that, I would have done so before. We do not know the name of a single owner. For myself, I have never even heard of one and never even suggested one.

Mr. PEDLOW: Why did the minister not furnish that information then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really did not think the Committee was so very much interested in the fact that I did not know the name of an owner along those lines. I assumed that the Committee, hon. gentlemen on this side as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, had sufficient intelligence to know that the lines had to run somewhere; that, wherever they ran, there would be owners along the right of way, and that this Parliament was not influenced in the slightest degree by

whoever owned the right of way along those lines. What we are interested in is this, that the lines have been called for by setlers for years, and that had it not been for the war they would have been built before this. Any hon. gentleman who made any inquiry at all, would know that there is not one of those lines that has not for years been called for. Governments, whether Federal or provincial, do not grant charters for the construction of lines unless good reason is shown why they should be built. These are charters that have been granted years ago, and that have been allowed to die by reason of the war, and we know that they are needed. Indeed, there are before this Parliament 1,500 signatures praying that one of these lines be built.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is afraid that, because these charters are revived and made the asset of the people of this country through the people's road, foreign creditors of Canada are going to take alarm and refuse to lend us any money. That is what troubles his soul to-night. He says they are going to look at the debit side of the ledger of this country, and that because they see these 44 charters owned by the people of Canada without any obligations on them at all, they are not going to lend us any money for our future financing. Is it going to disturb a foreign creditor to see that, although we have the railway mileage we have in those western lands, there are still districts in which farmers are hauling wheat thirty or forty miles? It is a good country, but there are no railways to haul their wheat for them. We could not have a finer asset for this country than for the foreign creditor to read in the body of this Bill that there are 44 charters which the Government of Canada deem should be taken up and made the property of the people, because the people are there and need the lines to serve them.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister explain how the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) knows that the Government are going to build 350 miles this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Nelson has information that I did not have myself, because I have not arrived at the time when the information is necessary. When I come as an hon. member of this House to authorize lines to be built by an Appropriation Act of this House, then I want to know what lines are to be built, how far they are to be built, and what the rate is per mile.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member had no information then. He was guessing?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume he made some inquiries some time before, but we are not concerned with that at the moment. If it were 350 miles or 3,500 miles, what difference would that make as regards the revival of these charters? Will the hon. gentleman answer me that?

Mr. McKENZIE: I presume that all of these charters cover thousands of miles of railway. The people of Canada might be willing to build 1,000 miles, while they might be opposed to building 10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, and they will decide that when they commence to vote the money, but we want the charters whether the lines are long or short, and I vote for the charters, whether the lines are long or short.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did the minister ever, in his experience as a minister, see one vote, once put into the Estimates by the Government, knocked out?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same thing applies to Estimates that applies to any Government Bill: if the Government is defeated on it, the Government resigns. But parliament is then entitled to the information, because the information should affect the judgment of hon. members. That information affects the issue as to whether we should vote the or not, but it does not in the 12 m. slightest affect the issue as to whether we should revive the charters or not, so that every particular item of information asked for that has the faintest bearing on the issue was given to this committee. No information, whatever, was denied, and hon. gentlemen cannot come to this committee to-day and say, with any reason: Our obstruction was on account of the hard-heartedness of the Minister of the Interior. They obstructed this Bill for reasons very difficult for me to define, but they certainly obstructed it by determinedly opposing a decision of this Committee on a single clause for eight long hours one afternoon and evening.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want to interfere with the minister's time, but if he will look over Hansard, I venture the opinion that his own side of the House took up more time than we did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On Friday evening?

Mr. McKENZIE: To-night and every other time that the Bill was under fire.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who would not do that to-night? We have to go on until two o'clock anyway. On Friday evening practically the whole time was taken up by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) himself, and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). We have under discussion this afternoon this Bill that was criticised so much, that needed so much minute examination in Committee in order that every clause might be just right and no clause in it that should not be in, and what do we find? We have had speech after speech from hon. gentlemen opposite, and we find that the leader of the Opposition has discussed government ownership in the abstract, discussed where he stood a year ago, and where he stands now, discussed even somethiing about a sugar refinery—no, I think that was the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). He also referred to the tariff, as did the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who had, moreover, something to say about newspaper advertising, railway ties and the puffing of automobiles outside the door of this building. Every subject in the world has been covered except the clauses of this Bill; not one single criticism has been offered of the wording of a single clause, and no suggestion has been made as to any better way of handling the railroads of Canada, with the exception of that made by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb).

Mr. McKENZIE: This is merely a post mortem examination.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member may be dead, but I can assure him I am not. We have had one suggestion. We have had a variety of opinions, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to fit themselves into the peculiar railway beliefs of various sections of the country they have made desperate efforts. We have had all sorts and kinds of opinions and beliefs as to railway ownership, Government operation and everything else that would satisfy the most fastidious taste in the world. We have the leader of the Opposition, who does not believe in Government ownership as a principle, who boasts that he came to that opinion a year ago. We have the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who says that the Liberal party were the pioneers of Government ownership in this country. What does he think of his leader to-day, now that he has hauled down the flag and set up the standard of private ownership? The Liberal party can no longer, under the leadership of the present incumbent, ever take the stand for public ownership in Canada. Then, also, we have the opinion of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), who is out-and-out opposed to Government ownership from beginning to end, and against that is the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), who is not only in favour of our operating those railways we already own, but who would lay violent hands on the Canadian Pacific as well.

Against them both, we have the hon. member for Maisonneuve who although he has been in public life for some twenty years comes here and confesses he has no opinion on the subject at all.

Government ownership is wise when properly applied, when the circumstances are such that it is sound principle to apply it, and it gets to be a sound principle proportionately as the competitive element is eliminated and the element of monopoly takes its place—in proportion as the industry is evolved into that stage of maturity in which it becomes a monopoly, and essentially for its best operation must be operated by the State. Here we have this case, the Government of Canada owning to-day approximately one-half the railway mileage of this country. We propose to operate that mileage aside from politics in a separate organization responsible to the Government of this country, responsible to Parliament; operating it, I repeat, aside from political influence wholly and entirely. That is what we propose. We have all the conditions here for Government operation. We have first the condition of necessity; we have every condition that can obtain. The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon offers the only alternative. He says: Take the offer of the Grand Trunk. They are ready to exchange traffic with you at North Bay, and to run the Canadian Northern at cost. Run the Canadian Northern at cost? What would that mean? Take the railway paid for by the people of this country, every deficit of which must be met by the treasury of Canada, and place its operation in the hands of directors elected by a section of the electorate of England? Place in the hands of men irresponsible to Parliament, irresponsible to the Government, irresponsible to the people, the disposition annually of millions of money of the people of this country? That is the only concrete suggestion we have

had all afternoon as an alternative to the Bill before the House.

Now, I say, we are going to compete with the Canadian Pacific. The Canadian Pacific has great charter powers and a tremendous organization, and in that competition we shall require the loyal support of every representative of the people of this country. We shall have to hold the balance in our legislative jurisdiction even, between the Canadian Pacific and our own road.

Mr. McCREA: I do not think it is necessary to go into any lengthy arguments as to whether we approve of government ownership, because the roads have been taken over, and it is now a question of the best ways and means of managing them. I think it will be found that the majority of the people of this country are of my own opinion. I do not think they are in favour of government ownership of roads that can be run otherwise. The experience of England and of the United States and other countries that have operated railroads under government ownership in recent years ought to be a lesson to us, unless this Government is of the opinion that it is very much smarter, and more capable than any of those other governments. Canada has had public ownership of the Intercolonial for some forty years or more, and that road has never been able to pay its way. But we need not debate the question of public ownership, because both the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are now in the hands of the Government.

The question which seems to be engaging the attention of the House most is the question of renewing some forty-four charters which have been granted to the Canadian Northern subsidiary companies, wisely or otherwise. I believe there are men on the other side of the House who will agree with me that these charters should go through the regular course before being renewed; they should come before the Railway Committee of this House. The Railway Committee has often had to deal with renewal of charters, and whenever I attended the Railway Committee I never knew of one charter that was not cut down, or remodelled, or revised entirely.

I think one of the things that ought to engage the attention of this House is the reckless granting of charters for the construction of parallel lines. I do not believe there is anybody in this House who has any desire to hamstring or hamper the Northwest or any other part of Canada which is entitled to railroad construction, but I do hope that all hon. members of this House will oppose the renewing of charters for parallel roads. If these charters came before the Railway Committee, the Committee could decide whether the roads would serve a useful purpose or not. I certainly think it is unwise to renew at one stroke of the pen these forty-four charters about which very little seems to be known even by the Government supporters. It has been insinuated that Quebec is jealous of the other provinces. I do not think that is the case at all. I think that Quebec and all other parts of Canada are in favour of granting charters for the development of any part of this country, but I repeat, these charters should come before the Railway Committee and be dealt with in the ordinary way. Plans and maps should be produced and the location shown, so that the Committee can see whether it is a case of paralleling another road and whether any useful purpose will be served by renewing the charter. I am satisfied the Committee would deal fairly with these charters, whether they were for construction in the Northwest or any other part of Canada. I can see no reason whatever for bunching them all together and passing them in that form. While I have some confidence in the Government, I have not quite enough to hand over to them the handling of all these matters, about which their own followers seem to know very little.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is it not true that these charters have all been before the Railway Committee, and some of them on several occasions?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The argument we have just heard from the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) is not one that I take exception to particularly. He is entitled to have the information that he asks for, but I think it has all been given from time to time before the Railway Committee. Possibly some of these acts were passed by local legislatures, but a large number have been before the Railway Committee and all the information that was required for the passing of the Acts was furnished to the Railway Committee and to this House at the time the charters were first obtained. That, I presume, is all in Hansard and on the records of the Railway Committee, and can be found by any hon. gentleman who has doubts as to the wisdom of the location of the lines or anything of that kind. It has been explained by the Minister of the Interior that when these lines are to be built this matter will again come up before the House and hon. gentlemen can object at that time to the voting of money to the building of them if

they are not thought to be to the general advantage of the people. Many of these branch lines are in territory requiring additional transportation facilities. We have heard from the West and hon. members speaking for that section of the country have made a very strong case as to why railways should be permitted to be built in Western Canada to serve settlers who have been waiting for years and now that the war is over and railway construction is about to begin again, it seems only reasonable that these companies should be rechartered. This perhaps would not be the usual procedure were it a private company but under ownership by the people there surely cannot be any objection. I might remind the leader of the Opposition when he asks whether it is not reasonable that hon. members should have all the information necessary that if he will recall the debates that took place in this House when the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific projects were under consideration the then leader of the Government, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, said "We have mountains of information with regard to the building of these roads." Now we know what a mess was made in spite of all these mountains of information. Nothing has ever been projected in Canada that has cost the people so dearly and that apparently was so little needed. The hon. member for Guysborough told us this afternoon that they on his side of the House were pioneers in public ownership, and he instanced the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental as evidences of that contention. He says these railways were built for the people. That surely must be news to all hon. gentlemen in the House at that time. No; they were building them for the Grand Trunk and not for the people. The Grand Trunk undertook to pay 3 per cent on the total cost of construction and I think my hon. friend from Guysborough will realize that it was not public ownership that was in the minds of the Government at that time when they constructed these roads. and it was not foreseen at that time we would be faced with the gigantic proposal on our doorstep to-day. I have not Hansard before me but I think the leader of the Opposition must have repeated the words "dirty babies" from fifty to a hundred times in the course of fifteen or twenty minutes. Might I ask him if as a judge of the court he does not think it would improve his vocabulary if he had occasionally referred to them as soiled infants.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member had better take his leader to task. I was following his language precisely.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I had not the pleasure of hearing the leader of the Government, but I will venture to say that the hon. leader of the Opposition used the term ten or possibly twenty times where the leader of the Government used it once. However, he repeated this expression until it became nauseating. It appears to me that we do not need mountains of information and the question before us is whether it is proper to place in public hands what has been previously owned in a private capacity. I have been on record for four or five years now as being in favour of public ownership of the great utilities. I believe the municipalities should own all their public enterprises such as street cars, electric lighting plants, telephone systems, waterworks, gas supply, etc., and in provincial matters I believe that wherever railways can be projected to the advantage of the province there should be provincial ownership, and the same principle should apply to national enterprises, which should be under public ownership. This may be a comparatively new thing in Canada but nearly all the nations of the world have recognized it for years. Almost every country in Europe and many of the more advanced of the South American republics, and also Australia, have for a long time been owners of their transportation systems. The only question to be decided is: Are the properties that we get such as we would invest our money in if we had our choice? I do not think that public ownership has had an opportunity to prove its value up to the present time. The Intercolonial Railway which has been held up as an instance has been one of the greatest stumbling blocks to public ownership in Canada because it has been constantly unproductive and non-paying. And the reasons are evident. First it was run as a political railway, and secondly its rates were such that no company could afford to haul freights for. Therefore, you cannot hinge a case on the Intercolonial Railway.

The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) advocated the public ownership of all steamship lines plying to our ports. But I do not think this is an opportune time to bring that forward, and I am not going to put myself on record to-night as favouring the acquisition of any steamship lines at the present time; we have plenty of obligations on our shoulders already. This

has come to us, however, not because we were seeking it; it is a legacy from our friends across the way. They must realize that, and if they are familiar with the history of railway construction in Canada they will know that this was thought to be folly some fourteen, fifteen or sixteen years ago. But the Opposition, at that time the Government, won out. These railways were built and they are on our hands. What are we to do? We have to take them over and make the best job we can of it. We know that the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific were ill-advised undertakings from the start, that they have cost more than double the money that should have been put into them, and they have involved very considerable expenditure, especially in the Eastern section. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of wanting information in spite of the mountains of information that we had at the time this road was projected. What did we have? We had estimates varying from $13,000,000 up to $60,000,000 for the cost of these roads. Those were the estimates of what the road would cost at that time. Every hon. gentleman knows what the result has been. They have cost the country four, or five hundred million dollars, and the end is not yet. The Quebec bridge alone, one little link in the Transcontinental, has cost this country $27,000,000. I am glad to see my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) enter the Chamber because he knows that bridge very well. Twenty-seven million dollars is the figure which represents the cost of that enterprise to the people of Canada, and this whole road, as to which we had mountains of information when we started in to build it, has cost the country from three to four times as much as we were led to expect it would at the time the enterprise was projected. Can we, under those circumstances, expect that the roads in this country will pay if we invest in them four or five times what should have been spent? Neither can we make the railways pay in operation unless we set out to handle them as business propositions, and with respect to these roads, now aggregating somewhere in the neighbourhood of fifteen thousand miles, we must have a business administration. We must not pay higher wages than are paid on the ordinary railways of the country. We cannot afford to operate those railways at an excessive cost per mile; we will have to reduce our expenditures to such a point as will justify the freight and passenger charges that are levied upon them. If the wages are not sufficient then the freight and passenger rates must be advanced to a point where they will pay, not only all operating expenses, but pay for all betterments and all that sort of thing that is required.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a business man, does my hon. friend think that it will be possible to pay the same wages in future as in pre-war times?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, I certainly do not. I hope that wages will never go back to where they were before the war. I believe they will not, and I trust that with the best of administration, and with getting the intelligent labour that we have in Canada, that although we pay our workmen perhaps double the wages we did before the war, that they are justifying that payment by the service that they render to the people of Canada in whatever walk of life they are engaged. I believe that we have an intelligent class of men. I believe we have as good railway men as there are in the world, but it must not be forgotten that we have a very difficult climate in which to operate railways, and you cannot, when the thermometer drops away below zero and there are four or five feet of snow on the ground, get the same results as in the southern countries where they have none of these obstacles to contend with. That is one thing that we must not forget.

Before my time is up I want to make a special reference to my own part of the province of Ontario, in regard to two or three of the charters that appear in this schedule: One is the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway, and the other is the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway. That is a section that is the most congested probably of railway enterprises in the whole of Canada. Between Hamilton and Toronto we have only the same rails that we had sixty years ago. It has been double-tracked, but the right of way is the same, and the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk are using the same line. Between those two points there is probably heavier traffic than in any place in Canada. We want another road from Toronto just as quickly as we can get it, and I, for one, cannot understand the opposition of Sir Adam Beck to the project that has been laid down here, and that we have granted charters to the Canadian Northern to build. I say that we want that road and we want it just as quickly as we can get it. I say that, being a strong advocate of the Hydro Electric, and a strong advocate of radial roads where they can be justified, but I cannot understand the opposition of Sir

Adam Beck to Mr. Hanna's proposal that this line shall be run into the Niagara district. We are not opposed, nor is the management of the National Railways, as far as I understand it, opposed to the radials. That antagonism should never arise, and it would not arise if proper thought were given to it. The radials of Canada and the electric roads of Canada, in my judgment, are quite on right lines, and I hope to see that branch of our railway enterprises very much increased. But I would suggest that instead of running these common trolley cars, which are apparently proposed on all these lines, they start out with electric engines that will draw a train and not simply a car. Shippers in our part of the country do not want to send goods on trolley lines and have to tranship twenty, thirty, or fifty miles away from where they started. They want to run from Brantford, Hamilton, or any place where those goods are purchased for the West—and we ship many thousands of cars per annum to the West—on lines that can carry the goods all the way through without transhipment. We want these hydro-electric roads and these radial roads to be feeders of the great national steam roads too. These might be electrified, which would be a great advantage in operation. I have visited New York State and there I found electric engines drawing fifteen or twenty cars and drawing more rapidly and getting headway much quicker than a steam engine can do. I only throw this out as a suggestion. I believe these radial roads, which are for the advantage of Canada, and certainly are an advantage to the district in which they are planted, should be subsidiary and should be feeders to this great national enterprise. I say, by all means, let us have this proposed road down to the Niagara river just as quickly as it can be built, where it will be able to secure international connection. A bridge should be built for this purpose across the Niagara river. Then this road, having proper terminals, and being in a position to feed itself from all quarters and from all parts of the country, it will be a paying enterprise, and instead of public ownership getting a black eye on the ground that it is not a paying enterprise, you will have railways under proper management, with proper freight and passenger charges and I believe you will find public ownership justify itself in Canada the same as it has done in almost every enlightened country in the world.

Mr. VIEN: Among all the measures that were announced in the Speech from the Throne, surely the Bill we are now considering was one of the most important. It purposes to consolidate all the state-owned railways of Canada into one company, and to provide for a new system of management. If I were to accept the figures given the other day to the House by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) we have now a liability of over a billion of dollars in respect of these railways. It is to provide a proper system of management for this property, representing a billion of dollars, that we on both sides have been seeking information during the discussions which have occupied the last two or three days. I do not fear contradiction when I suggest that since the beginning of the session no measure of such importance has been brought down by the Government, and it should by no means surprise anybody if, before committing the country to the policies mentioned in the Bill, we take a little time to study them carefully.

It is surprising, it is even amazing, to see the Government apply the closure at this early stage of the discussion, just to avoid giving information to the House and to prevent free speech in this, the people's forum. The Acting Prime Minister and the hon. member for Red Deer said the other day that there was more Liberalism on the right side of the House than anywhere else.

Mr. McMASTER: They were boasting.

Mr. VIEN: They were boasting, Mr. Chairman. Their very act gave them the lie, for at the same sitting of the House they announced the closure. Surely nobody will venture to suggest that that is a Liberal measure. During the fifteen years of the Liberal administration there were protracted debates, but never did that administration impose the closure; on some occasions they preferred to submit to the people the question at issue. The Minister of the Interior has accused the Opposition of unduly delaying this Bill; he failed to see what objection the Opposition had to put forward to the enactment of any of the sections. Sir, I will only say that there was no objection offered by the Opposition to the main features of this Bill, but we studied carefully and conscientiously how we could improve it. We simply asked for information from the Government, and we were sincere in our desire to help the measure along so far as we could do so consistently with public interest. We were blocked on clause 20 of the Bill, granting authorization to build forty-four branch lines, which lines are enumerated in the

schedule laid upon the Table on Friday last. What did we say? We did not ask the Government to withdraw the clause or the schedule, we did not say that we were against the schedule, but we simply said that we were not in possession of sufficient information to allow us to pass judgment on the clause. Sir, we are asked to incorporate a company and to authorize it to build forty-four new branch lines. The Government says: You have no ground to object to such power being given to the company; we are not asking for power to build, we are simply asking to revive 44 construction charters given by the various Legislatures or by this Parliament, and never will we go on with the construction unless Parliament is asked to vote the necessary monies. I submit, Sir, that that is not so. The very clauses of this Bill give the lie to the Minister of the Interior and to the other Ministers of the Crown when they assert such a thing. They say that even if clause 20 is passed the Government will not be able to go on with the construction work. Let them read clause 26 as enacted. That clause provides that the company, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may issue bonds, debentures and debenture stock from time to time in respect of the mileage of the line of railway which it constructs, acquires, owns or controls to the extent of $75,000 per mile. The Government will be authorized to pledge the whole Government railway system for the building of these additions, and yet the Minister of the Interior and the Acting Prime Minister the other day told the House that never could the Government go on with such construction without asking Parliament for the necessary funds. I submit that clause 26 of this Bill gives the necessary authorization, and that no further power need be sought from Parliament for construction. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization confirmed my opinion when he said that the construction of many of these lines was going to be commenced in a very few weeks by subsidiary companies of the Canadian Northern System, and would be proceeded with, because by the enactment of this law, particularly by reason of section 26, they did not need any further power, and could issue bonds and pledge the whole of the Canadian Government Railway System for the amount of money so borrowed.

Now, Sir, if the enactment of clause 20 gives to the Government the right to construct 44 branch lines, and if clause 26, which has been approved, gives the Government authority to issue bonds to the full amount of $75,000 per mile, pledging the Canadian Government Railway system to that extent, we are surely justified in going into the matter very carefully. We have the Drayton-Acworth report, which tells us that we have been overbuilding railways in Canada, that this country has the greatest mileage per thousand of population of any country in the world, and that we have been foolishly building railways in the past; and the hon. member for Springfield has used that argument time and again in this House. The Acting Prime Minister the other day said that our railway system was overlapping everywhere, that there was a duplication of lines in many centres. Yet we are now asked to give the Government a blanket authorization to build 44 new branch lines, and we are not allowed the necessary time to inquire whether those branch lines are necessary, or whether they are duplications of existing lines. We are accused of unduly obstructing the work of the House if we ask to be allowed the necessary time to inquire into this matter before we vote upon it. The Acting Minister of Justice, pursuing his ordinary method, ridicules the Opposition because they did not venture to offer any policy or any constructive criticism on this clause. What did we say, Mr. Chairman? We simply asked that the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee so as to allow a full investigation of the matter. This was a fair suggestion; this was not undue delay or undue obstruction. When the minister says that no sound objection could be offered against the proposed law, it is evident that he did not pay sufficient attention to what has been said on this subject. He is wilfully leading the House into error.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman withdraw the expression, that a minister is wilfully leading the House into error.

Mr. VIEN: I withdraw the word "wilfully," and I say that he tries to induce the House to believe something that his own Bill contradicts. As a whole, the Bill has some good features. Everybody admits that the present management of the Canadian Government Railway system is poor and inefficient and that it can be greatly improved; in so far as this Bill provides for some improvement in that management, both sides of the House approve of it. But it is only fair that we should not allow the

Government to go on with the construction of these forty-four lines without more careful study and without more information being given to the House. The Acting Minister of Justice says that where these branch lines are to be constructed in the West there is a very extensive agricultural district, the settlers in which have to carry their products thirty or forty miles to reach the nearest railway station. Well, if we are going to build branch lines in every part of this country where the farmers have to travel thirty or forty miles to reach the nearest railway station, the resources of Canada will not suffice. In many sections of the older provinces there are prosperous farming centres the people of which have to travel longer distances than those mentioned to get railway accommodation. Before we launch upon this policy we should look into it very carefully and be able to express our opinion intelligently, with full knowledge of the facts.

The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) said the other day that he was fully conversant with the various charters, because at the time of their enactment by the local legislature he was a provincial minister. But most members of the House have not had an opportunity of going into the question fully. I wish to point out one feature of these charters which is calculated to cast some doubt upon the great utility, and the imperious necessity of building these branch lines. These construction powers were enacted by the provincial legislatures or by this Parliament some years ago, but they have elapsed. Although the provincial governments had held out the inducement of bond guarantees, the interested companies did not think that the traffic possibilities and the conditions generally in the district where these lines were to be built justified the construction of the roads. And now, suddenly, without giving due warning to the House, the Government comes down with legislation and tries to hurry it through without giving sufficient time for members to go into the matter. They want us to give a blanket authority to revive forty-four charters, although the private concerns who originally got the construction powers did not see their way clear to build the lines, and to take advantage of the grants of money that had been offered to them. We are asked to undertake the construction of these lines without taking advantage of these provincial grants. The Minister of Railways said the other night that in connection with the construction of these branch lines they would not call on the provincial treasury to make the grants of moneys even though the provinces would benefit by the building of the roads. The Canadian Government Railway system will depend on Federal resources only.

Section 16 of the Bill provides that all the expenses of the company shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues of the railway, and that deficits will be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That is to say, the company will have the right to apply to all the purposes of the railway, even to the purchase of subsidiary companies, all the revenue and income of these railways, and if there is a deficit they will obtain from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada the necessary amount to cover it. Moreover, they will wait until next session before coming to Parliament to get authorization for and sanction of the payments already made by the minister under this section.

Mr. BUCHANAN: There have been veiled insinuations, if not direct statements, that the extension of the time for the construction of these branch lines would mean a riot of expenditure in Western Canada. From remarks that they have made, it is evidently the opinion of some hon. gentlemen that it is not in the interests of Canada that further expenditure should be made on railroad construction in the West.

Is it the policy of anybody in this Parliament to say that railroad construction in Western Canada should cease. Because if railroad construction in Western Canada is allowed to cease at this moment, there will be a waste of money that has already been spent in the development of that territory. Let me go back to the commencement of the development of that territory, especially the great development that took place under the late Liberal Administra- been in a section of Alberta which I represent, for about ten or more years; they were promised free land, and they were also assured that they would be provided with transportation facilities. People have been in the section of Alberta from which I come, for about ten or more years; they have settled on homestead lands, and up to the present moment they are from thirty-five to fifty or sixty miles from a railway. What will happen if branch lines are not constructed in such sections? Those people will have to leave the country. There are no free lands of any account left in Western Canada, and as those that are left are being limited to settlement for the soldiers, the natural thing is that most of those people will drift back to the United States from which they came, and consequently the

money that was spent in bringing them into and keeping them in this country will be lost to Canada. It is, therefore, in the interest of the development of Western Canada that those lines should be constructed in order to retain the people we have in those particular districts. I know something about the branch lines that are mentioned in this Bill, especially in the part of Alberta from which I come, and I can safely state that every one of the branch lines mentioned is absolutely necessary in order to provide transportation facilities for people who are in need of railroads at the present time. If those lines are not provided, the people will at once have to leave Alberta and go to other places.

Might I point out to hon. members that, in Alberta, from the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway south to the international boundary line, there is only one railroad at the present time? That railway is the Canadian Pacific. If we were assured, under any legislation that this Government could adopt, that the Canadian Pacific would provide all the branch lines that were required in that section, I would agree to the Canadian National Railway constructing branch lines in the section of the country that it particularly serves at present. But at this moment we have no guarantee of that kind, and the people have gone into those districts because they anticipated the construction of branches of the old Canadian Northern railway, and they expect now, since the Government took over that road, that those lines will be built.

We must look forward to the development of the great uncultivated areas of Western Canada, and we can do so only by the provision of transportation facilities. People will no longer go long distances from railroads and settle upon the land unless they are assured that they are to be provided with transportation facilities. That stage in the development of Western Canada is past, and consequently, the existing railroads in Canada must also provide lines in the country that is to be developed in the near future. On many occasions

1 a.m.

in this House I have tried to emphasize the fact that the development of Western Canada, the increase in its population and wealth, are very important considerations to the East. If the West does not develop, if the East is not prepared to share with the West in the construction of railroads, the East is not going to benefit from that great and fertile country west of the Great Lakes. It is just as important to the people of Western Canada as it is to the people of the West that those lines should be built. What would be the state of Eastern Canada at the present time if the West stood as it did in the early nineties? There would not be the prosperity that has existed in the past in Eastern Canada, nor would there be the population. But I have this confidence in the West, and I have the same confidence in Canada as a whole, that if we all bend our energies toward the development of this country east and west, we shall have a country that will very quickly double in population. But if we are going to consider the matter solely from a sectional standpoint, then I am afraid it will not go beyond what it is at the present.

I know of the needs of the people as regards branch lines. I have travelled many miles in that particular section of Alberta where the people are without railroad facilities, and I know the people have been there for ten or more years waiting for a railroad. They have been patient; they have cultivated the land, and they have hauled their grain many miles to a railroad, but they will not continue to do that unless railroads come or are assured to them in the immediate future.

It has been stated that the old "Canadian Northern gang," as it has been called, is still associated with this enterprise. If any evidence was offered to me that that was the case, I would not be inclined to be in sympathy with the nationalization of this road, but no evidence has been offered. It is true, some of the old officials of the Canadian Northern railway are associated with the Canadian National railway. What was the Canadian Government to do when it took over the Canadian Northern railway? Was it to discard all the officials of the Canadian Northern and secure a new outfit entirely? I do not think any business man or any person in this country expected the Government to do that. The Government had to have an experienced railroad man at the head of the Canadian National railway and I think they placed at its head an experienced railroad man. But if they had not taken that experienced head from the Canadian Northern railway, but had gone to the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk, what would have been the charge? It would immediately have been charged that the Government had placed the first real attempt at public ownership in the hands of an official who was in sympathy with private ownership, and if public ownership had failed, the blame would have been

placed on the selection made by the Government. Therefore, it was well for the Government to place in charge of the Government railroad a man who was acquainted with the late Canadian Northern railway, and who, in my judgment, is prepared to give to the service of Canada the same ability and energy that he would give to a private corporation. We at least ought to be fair and give him an opportunity of proving his merit.

The Bill which is before the Committee to-night is merely carrying out a policy that was adopted by this Parliament, a policy in favour of taking over the Canadian Northern railway because it had failed to live up to its obligations to this country. This measure provides for the organization and administration of the Canadian National railway, and surely the new system requires provision for its organization and administration. As this is a Government measure and as the railroad we are taking over is now a Government railway, we shall have an opportunity in the future of discussing this railway; and if it is not being properly conducted, we can say so and criticise the Government. I believe the bulk of the Canadian people are in favour of public ownership; at least, those who live in the Prairie Provinces are in favour of it. They are looking to this Government to operate the Canadian National Railway efficiently and honestly, and if this Government fails to operate the road efficiently and honestly then the people will deal with the Government on the first opportunity; and if this Government does not attempt to keep in touch with the sentiment of the people in operating the railway then it is a Government that is looking for defeat. The Government cannot pander to the old Canadian Northern Railway interests; they have to consider the people of Canada in the matter of Government ownership.

In conclusion I want to repeat as emphatically as I can that this is a critical moment in Western Canada in regard to the construction of branch lines. The population, at least many thousands of them, that we have brought into Western Canada, will not be there in the course of the next few years unless they are provided with branch lines. Many of them have left already and many others are threatening to leave, and it seems to me the Government when renewing the charters should provide that as many as possible of these lines be constructed in order to meet the needs of the people who are without railroads and so develop not only Western Canada but the whole country.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Some of my hon. friends on this side of the House are very candid and naive. For instance, having left the House at eleven o'clock on Friday night, I was not present when the Acting Minister of Justice decided to play his favourite part, and dressing himself in the garb of chief executioner moved the application of the gag. Some of my hon. friends whom I met the next morning seemed to be surprised at what they thought was a very unusual incident. I was not surprised, however, at hearing the news. I thought the action of the Acting Minister of Justice was perfectly natural, and thoroughly in line with the spirit of the weathercock combination which at the present time the people of this country have to suffer as a Government. Why, Sir, if you consider that the Tory element of this Government has never failed yet in the high art of side-stepping issues, and in finding some camouflage or other to hide their spreading sores; if you remember that in 1911 in order to win the election they prevented the people of this country from deciding on the reciprocity issue by branding as disloyalty the simple idea of trade with the United States; if you look back at the conscription policy of 1917, when instead of letting the electorate vote on that issue alone, the Government wilfully and purposely unchained the devils of racial and religious strife;—remembering these things, you will not be surprised that in the year of our Lord 1919 the same element, true to its principles which had proved so effective in the past, is trying to abate the threatening storm of the western demands for lower tariff by fabricating for themselves a cloud of rails and locomotives which will burst at their will at the proper time and flood the western prairie.

This Bill is for the building up of a tremendous machine that will enable the Government to distribute millions of the people's money without the constitutional safeguards to protect the taxpayer against illegal expenditure. Clause 20, and the schedule annexed, will allow the Government or its namesake, the Canadian National Railway Company, to revive forty-four charters which their petitioners have not seen fit to utilize, for the building of railway lines of which we have no particulars and which may involve the spending

of enormous sums of money. And because, as the representatives of the people, sent here for the special purpose of seeing to the proper expenditure of public funds, we insist on having details before voting, we are not only refused the opportunity of giving an intelligent vote but are branded as obstructionists, and the gag is applied.

Sir, it was because the kings of France prevented the voice of the people from being heard that the monarchy went down in blood. The horrors of Bolshevism were caused by the choking of the representatives of the Russian people. When will this Government realize the dangerous unrest in this country? When will it avoid further irritation which may light the match that will start the fatal conflagration?

If the Bill we are now studying had a momentous object, if we were discussing in the hour of danger and stress a question which necessitated an immediate solution, probably we could realize the anxiety of the Government. But, Sir, we are asked not only to deliver without inquiry into the hands of the Cabinet unheard of powers, but to engage upon a policy that will bring Canada into the hands of a receiver. The United States are losing a million dollars a day by Government operation of their railroads. The earnings so far this year have been lamentably below even the guarantee to the companies. In England the gross receipt for last year were $440,000,000 less than the cost of producing transportation, including return on investment.

I am not going to take up the time of the House by reading articles that have been published recently, even so late as to-day, in the Montreal Star, on the question of Government ownership of railways; but yet I should feel guilty if I resumed my seat without giving this House the benefit of the opinion of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) on Government ownership.

Speaking in the session of 1917 the minister said—page 4266 of Hansard:

> My opinion has always been that if a man has opinions of his own he had better assert them and try afterwards to convince the public that he is right. If he is not right, then he can let the public do what they have a mind to do about it. That may be a very independent attitude, but I have always taken that view. I do not believe in public ownership of any kind. I do object to the Government going as far as they are going in respect of the proposed ownership of the Canadian Northern Railway system. The Minister of Finance stated that it was the intention to appoint a Commission that should be subject to Parliament not to the Government. Well, if the Government can do that, it is a wonderful step in the right direction. But no man who has lived in the Maritime Provinces all his life as I have done can honestly say that he is in favour of the public ownership of railways. I know that in Ontario there is a fetish in respect of public ownership. Men are worshipping the public ownership of everything. But it will not be many years before they come back to sound business principles. We had an illustration of that in the House the other evening. In Ontario they have had public ownership of utilities in the way of electrical energy—the greatest administration of electrical energy which the world has known. There is no doubt that the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario has done wonderful work. But they are commencing to get up against the wall. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) was compelled to call upon his supporters to vote for an amendment to the general railway Act of Canada absolutely to put out of existence a competitor to the Hydro-Electric because it stood in the way of this Juggernaut. You would not find a better illustration in the records of Canada, from Confederation down to the present time of the failure of public ownership.

At page 5148 he said:

> Many of my friends from Ontario and the West have been captivated by this public operation fad, I want to point out to them that it is the greatest farce and fallacy that ever was brought forward in any country. It is useless to talk about the Government operating railways or telephones, or electric light systems, or anything else as cheaply and economically as they can be operated by private enterprise. Such a thing is not reasonable. Some of my friends from the West believe that if they can get this road operated by the Government, in some magic way they will get better service and better results. Possibly they think they may get a reduction of rates. No greater fallacy was ever held out to anybody. They cannot beat the roads down below what is a reasonable business basis. Remember, you have another railway there, and you cannot cut the rates down below what is fair. No Government in Canada can operate a railway system in the West and make it pay with any lower rates than are being charged by the Canadian Pacific to-day. If the Government carried on the road for the next ten years at the same rates as the Canadian Pacific are charging to-day, instead of paying a ten per cent dividend as the Canadian Pacific is paying, it would go behind fifteen per cent or twenty per cent every year. No man knows this better than my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who has had the longest experience in this House, with one exception, and who has lived in the Maritime Provinces. He has seen all the bungling and all the mismanagement, he knows exactly the condition of affairs, and he knows that every word I say is the truth. I am rather surprised that he has sat here as long as he has without raising his voice in opposition to the scheme.

Listen to the following sentence, Mr. Chairman:

> Of course he may have been overmastered and overpowered by his colleagues.

Shall we say to-night to the Minister of Public Works that he has been overmastered or overpowered by his colleagues? I am awaiting his vote at 2 o'clock. It will enlighten us on the matter.

Mr. GLASS: The hon. member (Mr. Archambault) has presented a very dismal and pessimistic view of the nationalization of these railways. He says it is a fetish in Ontario where they have more or less adopted the principle of public ownership. I may tell him that the principle is not so new after all even in Canada, because it is recorded as early as the year 1850 at the time the Grand Trunk Railway was being built that the Government obtained permission, if they desired, to build the railway as a government railway. It appears that the opposition to this Bill is largely in keeping with the policy constantly pursued of obstructing and opposing every measure that is brought forward by the Government. The leader of the Opposition gibes the Government because it undertakes to provide, as he says, a home for these forty-four babies. Well, under ordinary circumstances that would be considered rather a philanthropic work, and I would suggest that the Opposition might well establish a school for the co-ordination of Liberal policies. Throughout this debate we have had demonstrated to us the fact that their policy is rather of the Heinz variety—mixed pickles. There are so many different opinions and different policies that there seems to be no hope of co-ordination. The hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency said this afternoon that the Government in 1914 were not justified in giving the assistance they gave to the Canadian Northern, and that the object was to protect the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the bondholders and other friends of the Government. In this connection I desire to quote the leader of the Opposition at that time, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He said:

> I said a moment ago that my intention was simply to summarize my views and the policy which we have laid before the people on this question, and I summarize them in a few words. We must carry on this enterprise; we cannot allow it to go by default; we cannot allow anybody or anything to come in which would imply anything detrimental to our credit in England; this enterprise has to be carried out; but, instead of carrying it out in the way proposed, we propose that we should carry it out by other means.
>
> That we should take absolute control of the enterprises and for that purpose I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley): That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved that under existing circumstances no assistance should be given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company unless at the same time it is provided that the Government have power, within a reasonable time to acquire the ownership of the entire stock of the company at a price to be fixed by arbitration, but not to exceed thirty million dollars.

On August 8, 1917, when the matter of the Canadian Northern was further being considered by the House, Mr. German, a member of Parliament at that time, gave expression to these sentiments:

> I wish to state, however, that I would have been in favour of a broader and more courageous policy, one which would have gone further in the way of public ownership of these railway systems than this proposition goes. Whatever we may have thought in the past in regard to public ownership of railroads, we must change our opinion at the present time, if we are to keep pace with the opinion of the public, because it is an undoubted fact that the wheels of democracy are revolving very rapidly. The democratic Juggernaut is advancing rapidly, and those who stand in the way will be crushed under its wheels, whether they are lords, barons, knights or premiers. . . . . and I tell the Government they must not stand in the way. The people are determined to have public ownership of these utilities, and it will come.

Sir, it would be possible to quote from Hansard for a period of some years back, as this subject has been frequently discussed in the House, showing inconsistency and variation in the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. I therefore can realize how difficult it is to believe that they are sincere in enunciating any policy—and in fact they have enunciated no policy in reference to the subject under discussion. I have not observed, during the few years I have been in this House, that the Opposition have been really from time to time endeavouring to assist by any constructive policy, the work of the Government. On the contrary, it has been their accustomed policy, on every occasion, to consistently oppose everything that the Government proposes; and the only reason that they are not to-day standing unanimously for the principle of public ownership is because the Government of the day has adopted that policy, and, consistent with the course which they have followed in the past, the Opposition are simply opposed to this measure.

We point with pride to the very great success that has attended the management of the Canadian Pacific railway; we are proud of that road, and gratified at the development which it has effected. The Canadian Northern railway, in the opinion of those who know the western country

well, has within it the possibilities of success on its merits, and a prospective earning capacity equal to that of the Canadian Pacific. That road has now been taken over, and the Government of the day is committed to its operation and is interested more closely than ever in its success as a national enterprise. As to these branch lines which have been provided for in connection with the future operation of the Canadian Northern, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the members from the West, those who have a personal knowledge of the different lines, and to the evidence which they have submitted with respect to the importance of the lines in question as feeders to this great system. Hon. gentlemen from Quebec have referred to the large expenditure that has taken place on the railways in the West and to the fact that their province has contributed a considerable portion of the cost. As a man from Ontario, I want to inform my hon. friends that our province, like theirs, has contributed its quota to the national development of our railways; but I desire to say to our friends from the West that we do not begrudge any expenditure, or any effort, that has been made with a view to developing that great western country. Sir, the possibilities which the further development of the West holds for the future lend every hope and every justification to the expansion of our railways—justifying the construction of the laterals, as it were, of these roads running north and south that have been spoken of to-night—until the various parts of the rich prairie lands of the West are provided with that railway accommodation necessary for the sending of their grain down to the trunk lines where it can seek the necessary outlets. I wish to quote some observations made by Mr. E. B. Biggar, a couple of years ago, when he was writing to the press a plea for the nationalization of Canadian railways. He said at that time: :

> To allow matters merely to drift, while immigration is at a standstill and traffic arising from new construction in cities and settlements has largely ceased, and while long stretches of the new main lines are unable to live on local traffic alone, will simply invite a panic whose extent no man can measure. No Government charged with a responsibility for the commercial stability of the country can permit such an outcome.
>
> There are two other main alternatives—further aid to the private railway companies now in difficulties, or the nationalization of the steam railways of Canada.
>
> As to the first alternative, there is a deep-seated conviction that the people of this country have already been too grievously taxed to pay for roads which have been extravagantly built, unwisely located from the standpoint of the general interest, and yet remaining to-day inadequately equipped and deteriorating in that equipment, not to speak of over-capitalization and the evils of railway corporation influence on legislation and on the public morals. Any further aid that would be sufficient to place the suppliant companies in the position that would be deemed safe from their own standpoint will raise a tide of public resentment, which, when added to the burdens involved in the war, will bring about the defeat of the party who imposes those burdens, and if the duration of the war is accompanied by a single bad harvest, this defeat will be all the more disastrous. No amount of blame thrown upon the other party for its past railway maladministration will excuse the error by which the last straw is placed on the camel's back.
>
> Reasons For Nationalization.
>
> The only way out which promises complete justice to the people, which insures a more patient resignation under the load of taxation which they will have to bear, and the method which will tend to the purification of public life by removing the greatest source of our political corruption, is by the immediate nationalization of the steam railway systems.
>
> The following are some of the reasons.
>
> The trend of modern opinion the world over has been steadily in the direction of the State ownership of and operation of railways, until out of the sixty-five countries in the world that have railways, no less than fifty-one have already adopted state ownership.
>
> The character of this movement is remarkable in three respects:
>
> First, the rapidity of the change—up to 1880 the world's mileage showed 10,000 miles under Government ownership, whereas now there are 230,000 miles, not counting military lines built since the war began.
>
> The second feature of the movement is that during all this progress there has been no backwash towards private ownership. There are only three cases in the world of even partial abandonment of State ownership, and these are Peru, Cuba and Newfoundland. In the case of Peru, however, the Government takes the option of resuming possession at the end of a stated period.
>
> The third feature of the drift towards State ownership is that it has been brought about in countries with the most diverse forms of government and types of people—from the absolutism of Turkey and the autocracy of Russia to the republics of South America, the referendum-governed country of Switzerland and the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire. Of the seventeen British Crown colonies and protectorates, no less than twelve operate their railways under direct Government ownership, while of the self-governing dominions, all outside of Canada have state ownership of all but a fraction of the total mileage.
>
> A War Example.
>
> A study of railway history will show an unprejudiced investigator that England, as the pioneer in both railway building and locomotive engineering, gave the world a false start in the direction of private ownership only because the men who composed the British Parliament in 1830 were, with few exceptions, obstinately blind to the possibilities of steam transport and, more pitiful to state, were careless of the needs of the common people. This defect of legis-

lative insight is full of solemn warning to our own legislators in the present crisis of Canadian railway history. However, Great Britain has at last accomplished complete state control, as by a miracle, and it is a certain deduction from the marvelous accomplishments of this State control, not yet revealed to the British public, that private ownership there has ended now and forever.

What happens when a people really wake up to perceive the true purpose of a railway in the national life is well described by A. G. Gardiner in "The War Lords": "We have talked for generations about the nationalization of railways and have found the scheme too vast to tackle. We woke up one morning to find that the companies had been dispossessed of their control, and that the twelve hundred directors had been sent out to play, and that the whole railway system of the country was subject to the Government. And the transition seemed so natural and proper that no one even 'wrote to the papers about it.' At the impact of a great occasion the whole theory of railway ownership and control collapses without a murmur. It is seen that the sole ultimate function of the railway is to serve the State, and that anything that interferes with that function in a time of emergency is brushed aside as lightly as a feather. The lesson will serve for future use. By a flash of lightning, as it were, it has revealed the true relation of the railway to the community, and that relation is as applicable to conditions of peace as to conditions of war."

The Private Stronghold.

With this transformation in mind, it may now be said that among civilized nations of any importance they are but two remaining strongholds of private railway ownership in the world —the United States and Canada. In the case of the United States, it does not require any profound study of railway literature or the drift of economic and political thought to convince an inquirer that the ever-tightening control of railways exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various State Commerce Commissions must find its logical conclusion in Government ownership; and the change is likely to come sooner than most people expect. This observation about the United States is, of course, only a forecast, but the statements regarding the other countries of the world are not speculations but accomplished facts, and if the forecast of the United States proves to be an accomplished fact, where will Canada stand? At the very tail of the procession struggling through a financial cataclysm due to the exploitations of its public resources by private corporations or struggling upwards to complete representative government and the unfettered exercise of its own sovereign functions?

Is it necessary to remind ourselves that the operation of a railway is a function of sovereignity? The public roads in times past were dedicated to the State, and hence the expressions King's Highway and Queen's Highway.

Those observations were made in the year 1916 on the railway situation, and the figures given there, which I presume are correct, show that the nationalization of public utilities is not a feature peculiar to the province of Ontario, but is spreading throughout the world. I do not want to say to my hon. friend from Quebec, when he speaks of our experience in the province of Ontario, that we have no regrets for having adopted the principle of public ownership of public utilities. I have no knowledge of any instance where it has not been an undoubted success; and there is no reason why under capable management it should not be a success. This management must be entrusted to the Government, and is fairly well provided for in the Bill. My hon. friend stated all the dire consequences that may follow on public management. The Government must manage our national system side by side with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the closest competition, and they have got to manage it efficiently or they cannot succeed. If they do not manage it efficiently we must appeal to the country, and the country will return those who will make Government ownership a success. I admit that it is a most difficult problem, but it is not the only difficult problem we have before us. Let me repeat a definition given by Murray Butler of the word "difficulty":

> Difficulty is a mere word indicating the measure of effort necessary to attain certain objects —a bugbear to children and fools, but to men an incentive to greater exertion.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—power to acquire securities of other companies:

Mr. CRONYN: I would suggest that the words which were struck out "and disposed of" at the end of the second line be restored, so that the clause will read:

> The Company may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge and dispose of shares—

It is quite possible that this company will acquire, or has already acquired, certain undertakings which later on it may desire to sell, and it would very much limit its efforts in that respect if these words were not contained in the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am disposed to think that the hon. member is right. He has drawn this to my attention, as has also the hon. member for Three Rivers. The latter gentleman, however, felt that the words "and dispose of" if introduced should be made applicable only to bonds, notes, securities and stocks. What the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) has in mind is the desirability of providing that this company, should it find itself in possession of certain undertakings, such for example as hotels, might very conveniently dispose

of them, with of course, the consent of the Governor in Council, by selling the shares. Certainly the words "and dispose of" should be restored. and therefore I readily withdraw my amendment, which will leave the clause as it was originally.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Government can revive forty-four charters, can undertake the construction of an endless number of railway lines all over Canada, and we are told that our security against extravagance or reckless undertakings will be the fact that they will have to come to Parliament for the money. But this company is vested with the power to issue stocks, bonds, debentures and every form of security known to the devices of an organization of this character; with these they can get all the money they want, and, upon the advice of the Governor in Council, invest it where they please without coming to Parliament at all. What assurance, then, have the people of Canada that these amounts will be put in the Estimates and voted by Parliament, and that the information for which we have been battling for the last four or five days will be given? We shall know nothing about these expenditures until, perhaps, years after the money has been spent and misspent, as much of the money of the people has been misspent in the past.

We on this side have been severely taken to task because we say it is unnecessary to revive these charters. I say now that it is unnecessary to revive them, and that there is no need for them, unless it be the promises that have been made by the Government to members all over the country that roads are to be built. The cat came out of the bag to-night when the member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) told us that 350 miles were to be constructed this year. How does he know that, if the matter has not been discussed? This thing has been understood; the places where politics are to be played by the Government have been laid out, and members know it. The good, honest member for Nelson gave it out. The Minister of Interior (Mr. Meighen) tells us in one breath that the revival of these charters is a mere harmless thing, and in the next breath that work is to be done on every one of them this year. In Manitoba, to which, of course, the member for Nelson naturally gives most of his attention, there is evidently the promise that at least 350 miles will be built. If as many miles will be built in the larger provinces, there will be at least 500 miles in Saskatchewan and as many more in Alberta. If the promises are distributed anything like fairly, the Government will undertake to build this year about 1,300 miles of railway. I suppose they intend to sell these stocks and build the roads with the money they get from them, while Parliament will whistle and have nothing to do with it.

The Liberals of this country have always been anxious for development in the West. I have been in this House nearly fifteen years, and during that period most of the money that was expended in the West has gone through Parliament. I have yet to know of any Liberal who voted against the expenditure of one dollar of the millions that have been necessary for the development of the West. We have never refused anything for the development of that country. Besides what we did in the building of railways, we took our lives in our hands in 1911 and went down to an honourable defeat in a fight for freedom of trade for the people of the West. The policies and the principles of the Liberal party to-day are what they were then. The policy of the Liberal party to-day is honesty and integrity and proper administration of the country's affairs. In the conduct of the great chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who has been laid to his rest, during the years that he led the great Liberal party from 1911 down to the day of his death, what was there to show that he was for anything but for advocacy of the principles that he put forward during the many years that he was in power? Did he, as a leader, depart from those principles in any way? Not at all. He was a Canadian from Scatarie to Vancouver. He was not a sectional man, and we are not sectional men to-day. We are not for Ontario against Quebec or for the West against the East; we are Canadians, from one ocean to the other. If there is necessity for building railways in any province of the West and we have the means, we are here to do it; but we want to know what we are doing; we want to know where we are going to build them, what provinces they will be in, and whether they are going to meet the needs of the people. But the Government is putting on camouflage. We are told: You shall not know where the roads are to be built; it is not our policy to be honest with the people; it would not do for the people to know what is going on. Instead of standing up manfully in this House last Friday night and doing as he should have done when this information was asked for, the leader of the House talked about "dirty babies" and about everything else except the question that we were discussing. He tried to create a camou-

flage by saying to the people: I am for public ownership, but hon. gentlemen opposite are not. He seems to forget his own record, when, by his own will and by his own wrong-doings, perhaps, he became an administrator and had that little property in his hand, like Naboth he was absolutely and entirely for private ownership. My hon. friend is everything by turns, and nothing long; he is godly when godliness pays. It does not worry him very much to change from public ownership to private ownership and back again if that is necessary for him to steer the head of the ship into a safe harbour. I agree with him that the ship is water-logged, that the sails are torn, that the compass is out of order and that the craft is absolutely unseaworthy and should take no further cargo on board. I am not surprised, therefore, that the minister is shifting from one leg to another in order to avoid telling the people what the situation really is.

Why, it is provoking, at least to an old member of the House like myself, who has been voting consistently, whether in Opposition or supporting a Government, for everything that was necessary for the general development of this country from one shore to the other, that we are to be told by the leader of the House, because we questioned closely into the methods under which they are going to handle the railroads of this country: Why, you are opposed to public ownership altogether and we are going to raise that issue in the country and to censure you on your narrowness and lack of intelligence and vision in this great country. If there was vision, if there was intelligence, if this country has become the great country that it has, it was by the vision and energy and foresight and policy of development of the party to which I have the pride and honour to belong.

In 1896, the Conservative party handed us a country that was bankrupt at every turn of the road. We have developed that country in its every policy; we have bettered its railway policy, its financial policy, its immigration policy. We have built it up; we have driven the prairie rabbit and the buffalo out of the country, and we have substituted men, and government, and provinces in their place. If hon. gentlemen are out of their element now until they get back the prairie rabbit and the buffalo, we cannot help that, but we purpose, whenever we have the power and the right to do so, carrying forward that great policy of the Liberal party which we created when we took power in this country and which we carried forward to its very fullest in 1911, when there was no criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite except to leave well enough alone; that every phase of business in the development of this country was going on as well as could possibly be expected; that nothing further could possibly be required, and that we were not wise in trying to better conditions. Every condition for which we fought at that time and every condition which was strenuously opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, have since been admitted by them to be all right. They admit now that our policy on the trade question, that "truck and trade with the Yankees," was a most excellent thing, and they could find no possible fault with it. They are taking it to their bosoms and their hearts now, and they are obliged to go down to the Yankees to get the money which they cannot get elsewhere.

The particular point with which I wanted to deal was about the revival of those charters. It has been continually pointed out that there is a necessity for those charters. If local charters of this kind, or whatever they are, were necessary for the building of roads in the West, I would say: Certainly, revive them. But we have the Government Railway Act, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, which gives every conceivable power to the Government of this country to build a railway anywhere in the whole land from ocean to ocean; we have chapter 37, which is the Railway Act, which gives further power to companies and Governments to build railways; and we have this Bill which we are putting through the Committee now, with sections 13, 23, and 26, all providing for the building of railways by the Government and under Government control, where the Government thinks proper, after Government engineers have laid them out and given us information. What is the matter with that? Why should we be dragging along with us those 46, or 48, or 50, old charters with bargains and encumbrances about them with which we should not be bothered at all? If whoever are going to take charge of this work are going to make a success of it, we must start them out with a clean sheet. If the old management is an encumbrance to them, let us cut out the old management. Mr. Hanna is, I believe, a very excellent man, but circumstances make men, and if it is necessary to have other men and to cut loose from Mackenzie and Mann influence,

surely we can find in this country men who will take charge of the work and do it as well as anybody trained in the school of Mackenzie and Mann. It is a stigma upon our railroads with which we have been dealing for fifty years if we have not one man as experienced as those trained in the school of Mackenzie and Mann. The old saying is: If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for you to go to heaven with your hand off or your eye out than to go to hell with your eye in and your hand on. That is what I say about the influences and combinations and ramifications of Mackenzie and Mann;—cut them off. We are to-day, I am told on the best authority, buying coal from Mackenzie and Mann upon old contracts that were made ten years ago between the Canadian Northern and themselves. One branch of Mackenzie and Mann owns coal; another branch owns a railroad; and Mackenzie and Mann railroad was buying Mackenzie and Mann coal, and we have taken over the contract which they had with themselves. The Minister of Railways shakes his head wisely and says: It is not in the public interest that we should tell that we are getting coal from Mackenzie and Mann. Perhaps it is not. It is certainly not in the interest of Mackenzie and Mann to disclose those things. We should cut off those things and give the new combination of men that are going to take charge of the Government railways a clean sheet. So doing, we should not embarrass them, we should give them no reason for excuses. Otherwise, they will come back here in a year or two and say: This is a failure because you encumbered us with 44 lines of railway which we had to build, which we could not use; we were compelled under an old contract to buy ties at three prices and to buy from Mackenzie and Mann coal that was no good and to pay three prices for it and to haul it hundreds of miles further than we should. We do not want excuses of that kind. Give them a free hand; start them anew, and if they make a success, God be with them.

At 2 a.m. the vote was taken under Rule 17 (b).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall section 29 carry?

Section agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: I move to add as section 31 of the Bill the section which is printed as section 31 in the reprinted copy.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 41; nays, 93.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

On the motion of Mr. Meighen the First Schedule was adopted.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved to add to the Bill as the Second Schedule the Second Schedule appearing on page 10 of the reprinted Bill.

Motion agreed to: yeas, 92; nays, 41

Bill as amended reported, amendments read the first and second time, and concurred in.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 2.15 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 29, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

On motion of Mr. Armstrong (Lambton) that the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines have leave to sit while the House is in session in accordance with the recommendations contained in their fifth report:

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be put by the unanimous leave of the House.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (Grey): Mr. Speaker, before this motion is put I should like to point out that if the motion carries the Railway Committee, consisting of 124 members, will be excused from attendance during the sittings of this House. There are 230 members of the House, but by reason of vacancies and absence overseas, there are only about 220 available, and considering that the members of the Railway Committee are the most active members, their absence would mean the absence of about two-thirds of the members and it would be very difficult to maintain a quorum. The House was counted out the last time for want of a quorum because of a meeting of some 40 or 50 members being held upstairs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I pointed out that the motion could only be put by unanimous leave of the House, and as the hon. member has raised an objection it must stand.

Motion stands.

CONTROL OF AERONAUTICS.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (for the Minister of Naval Service) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 80, to authorize the appointment of an Air Board for the control of aeronautics.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I might very briefly give to the House the chief features of this

Bill on its first reading. It will be necessary owing to the development of aeronautics in Canada and in other countries that there be appointed a body to administer this service in this country. The Bill proposes the establishment of an Air Board to consist of not less than five and not more than seven members to be appointed by the Governor in Council. It is intended that the Chairman shall be a minister of the Crown and that the Department of Militia and the Department of Naval Service shall each be represented on the Board, by one member. The duties of the Air Board will be:

(a) To supervise all matters connected with aeronautics;

(b) to study the development of aeronautics in Canada and in other countries, and to undertake such technical research as may be requisite for the development of aeronautics; and to co-operate with other institutions in carrying out such research;

(c) to construct and maintain all Government aerodromes and air stations, including all plant, machinery and buildings necessary for their efficient equipment and upkeep;

(d) to control and manage all aircraft and equipment necessary for the conduct of any of His Majesty's services;

(e) to operate such services as the Governor in Council may approve;

(f) to prescribe aerial routes;

(g) to co-operate with other officers of His Majesty and to assist in the carrying out of any services under their jurisdiction which may require aerial work of any nature, and to collaborate with the officers employed in existing air services of His Majesty in such extension of their present work as the development of aeronautics may require;

(h) to take such action as may be necessary to secure by International Regulation or otherwise, the rights of His Majesty in respect of His Government in Canada in International Air Routes;

(i) to co-operate with the officers of the Departments of Militia and Defence and of the Naval Service on all questions relating to the air defence of Canada;

(j) to co-operate with the air staffs or authorities of other Governments or countries for any purposes pertaining to air services;

(k) to investigate, examine and report on all proposals for the institution of commercial air services within or partly within Canada, or the limits of the territorial waters of Canada;

(l) to consider, draft and prepare for approval by the Governor in Council such regulations as may be considered necessary for the control or operation of aeronautics in Canada or within the limits of the territorial waters of Canada; and,

(m) to perform such other duties as the Governor in Council may from time to time impose.

It is also intended to give to the board power subject to approval by the Governor in Council:

To regulate and control aerial navigation over Canada, and the territorial waters of Canada, and in particular, but not to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it may with the approval aforesaid, make regulations with respect to—

(a) licensing pilots and other persons engaged in the navigation of aircraft and the suspension and revocation of such licenses;

(b) the registration, identification, inspection, certification and licensing of all aircraft;

(c) the licensing, inspection and regulation of all aerodromes and air-stations;

(d) the conditions under which aircraft may be used for carrying goods, mails and passengers, or for the operation of any commercial service whatsoever, and the licensing of any such services;

(e) the conditions under which goods, mails and passengers may be imported and exported in aircraft into or from Canada or within the limits of the territorial waters of Canada or may be transported over any part of such territory;

(f) the prohibition of navigation of aircraft over such areas as may be prescribed, either at all times or at such times or on such occasions only as may be specified in the regulations, and either absolutely or subject to such exceptions or conditions as may be so specified;

(g) the areas within which aircraft coming from any places outside of Canada are to land, and the conditions to be complied with by any such aircraft.

The purpose of the Bill as I have said is to control and regulate and to prescribe laws for the conduct of aeronautics in Canada. It is deemed advisable to constitute a board for the time being as the most practicable method of dealing with this new subject. Possibly after a year's trial of the proposed legislation it may be found that some other legislation may be considered necessary.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—VOUCHERS FOR OVERSEAS PAYMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS: On Friday last in answer to a question by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) stated, with respect to vouchers for the item of $115,000,000, expenditure by the Overseas Ministry, that these vouchers are possibly in the possession of the Overseas Ministry. In view of the fact that many of these items may form the subject of discussion before the Public Accounts Committee, it is desirable that they should be in possession of the Auditor General in Ottawa and I would ask the Acting Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to see that they are transmitted from Argyll House to Ottawa.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I made a statement on the sub-

ject yesterday which my hon. friend will find in to-day's Hansard.

NOVA SCOTIA FISHING FLEET.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): May I ask the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. A. K. Maclean) a question. In view of the fact that the Nova Scotia fishing fleet, comprising about 100 ships, have sailed for the North bay and the gulf of St. Lawrence and that the ice up there interferes with the fishing, sometimes causing serious damage to the vessels, is it the intention of the Department of Marine to send one of the protective fishery cruisers there to help these vessels in case of danger. I would also like to know if it is the intention to place the buoys in position at the entrances to the harbours of the Magdalene islands, and at other important harbour entrances of Nova Scotia from Canso to Halifax.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (For the Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I presume that the question of the hon. gentleman is directed to myself. I am not acting as Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day. I do not think the matter has been called to the attention of the department, that is, that the fishing vessels of Nova Scotia are liable to accident by reason of ice conditions. I may safely say, however, that if such is the case the department will be very glad to despatch to these waters such ships as are suitable for the purpose of lending aid to the fishing vessels. I shall bring this matter to the attention of the officers of the department, and answer to-morrow, the question in reference to the placing of buoys.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT DEFAULTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHARLES ARTHUR GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): As I do not see the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) in his seat I may direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. It is now seeding time in Quebec and there are some young men, farmers' sons, who have been in jail for two, three, four and even five months, and I would like to know if the Acting Prime Minister will consult the Acting Minister of Justice with a view to having these men liberated in order that they may return to their farms for seeding purposes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be glad to draw the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice to the hon. gentleman's question.

[Sir Thomas White.]

CORRECTION—MR. FOURNIER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): In yesterday's Hansard I am reported as having said:

> I am in favour of public ownership but I want to say to hon. gentlemen who have sat here all through the discussion and some of whom, it seemed to me were almost dead, that before I undertake to support public ownership I want the few pennies in my pocket and my watch put in a place of safe keeping.

This is not strictly correct. Perhaps my insufficient knowledge of English and my bad pronunciation made the error possible. This is what I did say:

> I might be in favour of public ownership of railways if I could be convinced in a proper way but I wish to say to hon. gentlemen opposite, even to those who sat through the discussion as if they had been dead, that before I undertake to support public ownership and before I am forced to go into the room where Mackenzie and Mann are playing the game I want the few pennies in my pocket and my watch put in a place of safe keeping.

I would ask that the correction be made.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved the second reading of Bill No. 52, to amend the Immigration Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when this Bill had its first reading I explained to the House very briefly the effect and purpose of the amendments which it proposed to the existing law. As these amendments are submitted for the purpose of carrying out certain policies which the Government have agreed upon, I think I should ask the indulgence of the House while I discuss in a general way the immigration problem which confronts Canada. Since the outbreak of the war in 1914 our people have had ample time and opportunity to consider a great many of the problems with which we are confronted, and one of these problems in which our people are particularly interested is the problem of immigration. I think it will be generally conceded that in the past a great many mistakes have been made. Our people generally agree that in regard to the admission of people to this country for many years past there have been mistakes made and that care should be taken to prevent these in future.

We have a great many complicated problems on our hands to-day. We have many social, educational and industrial

questions. These in a very large measure, to my mind, reflect the policy which has been pursued in this country for twenty or thirty years. If the Canada of to-morrow is to be what it should be, the first essential is that this House should very carefully consider and weigh what our policy is to be in the future.

Since I have become Minister of Immigration and Colonization a great many suggestions have reached me from people throughout the length and breadth of Canada; letters and petitions have poured in from many sources. All sorts of suggestions have been made. To my mind this indicates very clearly that our people are taking a deep interest in this matter and that they are anxious that this Parliament at this session should review the whole situation with the object of strengthening our immigration laws in order that we may avoid in the future the mistakes which have been made in the past.

The suggestions which have come to me may be roughly divided into two large classes. In the first place, there are those who hold that Canada should be reserved for Canadians—for Anglo-Saxons. They maintain that this is a British dominion, that it must remain British and that only those who are British should be permitted to knock at our doors and enter. There are many who hold that view. On the other hand, there are those who hold the view that we should maintain the open door, not as wide open as in the past, but that there should be certain clear-cut and definite restrictions. They say there should be restrictions applicable to all people as regards health, mentality, earning power, character, and matters of that kind. There are those who hold that, in so far as certain nationalities are concerned, they should be absolutely excluded. Then again, some contend that, as regards still other nationalities, they should be admitted to Canada only in limited numbers; in such numbers as the country is able to absorb and assimilate. In reference to these three suggestions, I am sure that there will be very divergent views in this House and differences of opinion as to the policy that should be pursued. I am sure that every hon. member recognizes that throughout the country very divergent views are held on these points. The problem is an exceedingly complicated and delicate one. It is not one easily solved; nor is it easy to satisfy the great majority of opinions on account of the very great diversity of thought that exists with respect to what should be done.

Just for a moment or two I would like to speak of the necessity for increased population in Canada. I am sure it must be self-evident to every one who understands our economic situation that our greatest need is population. I might cite only a few reasons—in the first place, we all know that as a result of the war we have piled up, to say the least, a very considerable national debt.

It means increased taxation, but as to our being able to take care of the burdens which have been placed upon us as the result of this war I have no doubt whatever. The other belligerent nations have similar debts, and our position in comparison with their position is favourable. Our debt is no larger in proportion, and when we consider our vast resources and the opportunities presented for their development, I have no hesitation at all in saying that we should be able to take care of that burden.

The question, however, arises as to how that burden can best be taken care of. We have been preaching economy, increased production, thrift, and all those things will help very materially. But notwithstanding all the talk about thrift, to what extent have our people been saving during the last two or three years in order that this situation might be met? So far as I can see there has been very little done in the way of saving, and it seems to me that if our war burden is to be taken care of it can best be done by an increase in our population and an increase in our production. Every additional person who comes to Canada will help to lift the burdens of those who are now here. During the course of the next few years an extra one or two million people will in a large measure make the situation very much easier in so far as taxation is concerned. Therefore I think it is essential that our efforts should be directed to a large extent during these coming years to attracting as many settlers as we possibly can.

During the last few days we have had a discussion on the railway situation. The burden the nation is carrying in that respect is a colossal one. There is no doubt that our transcontinental lines are over developed. We have more railways in a sense—I am speaking of transcontinental railways—than we actually need at the present time. I do not say that they should not have been built. Do not misunderstand me. I have faith in Canada and in the future of these lines, and the time will come in my opinion when every

one of them will pay. But at the present time they are a burden on the country. We are called upon to pay out millions of dollars every year in excess of earnings, and that condition will continue for some years to come.

What is the solution? There is only one solution in my judgment—people and production. We must create traffic for these lines, and that traffic can only be created by filling up our vacant spaces, thus insuring increased production of all the various commodities which this country can produce. We have had some discussion in reference to branch lines. Branch lines are very essential throughout all sections of Canada, in my view, if we are to secure the increased production to which I have referred. In Western Canada production has been retarded enormously, simply because we have not sufficient branch lines. Undoubtedly, if our enormous railway obligations are to be properly taken care of there is only one way to do it, I repeat, and that is by increasing our population, which will be naturally followed by increased production.

There is another reason why we need population. In addition to the obligations which the Federal Government is carrying, our provinces and our cities are carrying very heavy obligations, more particularly our cities. In Western Canada, and I am sure the same is true of Eastern Canada, most of our urban communities have mortgaged their future; they have made civic improvements and carried on large undertakings ahead of their actual requirements, and they are feeling the burden of taxation. There again I think we can look for only one solution to that problem—unless the lands back of these cities are settled, which settlement will bring in its train increased production, these cities will have to continue to bear their present heavy burdens. So for that reason it is very essential that we should see that our rural population is increased just as rapidly as possible.

I might refer also briefly to the situation as it exists in respect to our manufacturing and industrial concerns. One of the main reasons why our industries are not established on as firm a basis as they should be is because we have a very sparse population, and consequently our home market is very restricted. If we had a greater population we would have larger markets for our products at home and abroad—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. CALDER: —and these industries would be established on a sounder basis. In the case of our smaller industries their overhead charges are excessive and on account of the smallness of their output they cannot compete with larger industries. So the more people we bring to this country the larger home market we will create to say nothing of a more extensive foreign market all of which will tend to place our industries on a proper basis.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are you speaking of the farming industry too?

Mr. CALDER: I am speaking of all industries. We all know that we have enormous national resources of all kinds the products of the field, the forest, the mine, and the sea. These have been developed to a certain extent, and I think it can be said generally that they are developed in proportion to our population. We have billions of dollars lying dormant in our natural resources, and if those resources are to be developed for the good of the nation, there is only one way to develop them: we must in the first place have the necessary capital, and in the second place we must have the necessary people. At present we are all busy in various directions, and these natural resources will never be developed as they should be until the necessary population is brought into the country. Our population at present is too sparse.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend any idea of the approximate population of Canada at the present time?

Mr. CALDER: It must be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 8,000,000. I am sure that every one realizes the necessity that exists for a greater population so that it is not necessary to dwell on that aspect of the situation.

The question whether we have room for this population needs only to be asked to be answered. We have in Canada ample room for abundance of population. Probably no country in the world is situated as advantageously as we are. We could absorb millions of people; so that there is no reason why we should worry on that score. The main question which this House and the country should consider is not the necessity for immigration, not whether we have room for a greater population, but what class of people we are going to get, where they are to come from, what steps should be taken to see that they are properly absorbed into the life of the community, how we may pick and choose these people who are to become citizens of Canada, and how we can place them in the

life of the nation with the greatest advantage to themselves as well as to Canada.

I think the House will agree that at the present time and for some time to come we should avoid at all cost the overcrowding of our cities, especially during the reconstruction period. Employment conditions are such as to make this absolutely necessary; we must do everything we can to avoid aggravating the situation that exists now, and that will likely exist for some months. I am inclined to think that ever since Confederation too much attention has been paid to city building in Canada. There are too many people in our cities. We have failed to recognize as a people that Canada is essentially an agricultural country, and the efforts of Governments in the past have not been sufficiently directed towards the placing of people on the land. As I have often said, we have paid too much attention to erecting tall chimneys and not enough attention to getting people at ploughing the land. I have always held the view that our cities will very largely take care of themselves if we look after our agricultural production. The tendency, east and west, has been to boom our cities and to build them up before meeting the requirements of our rural population. In my opinion, that should cease; the main efforts of the Federal Government, and of Provincial Governments for some years to come should be in the direction of developing the rural parts, not the urban centres, of Canada.

In the past, broadly speaking, Canada and the United States have followed the policy of the open door in the matter of immigration—and it has been a pretty wide open door. Probably there has been good reason for following that policy. America was looked upon as the land of hope and liberty, a land of freedom for the peoples of Europe and Asia—the overcrowded countries across the Atlantic. During the last century or two, millions of people have come to America from these countries. We now have on this continent somewhere in the neighbourhood of 125,000,000 Europeans. Their coming to this country has constituted the greatest migratory movement in all history. The door, I say, has been pretty wide open. All nationalities have been invited; millions have been spent in assisting these people to come to this continent. I doubt whether we should criticise severely the policy of the past; there may have been good reasons for it. But in Canada the time has come when we should consider very seriously whether or not that policy of the wide-open door should continue. The war has brought home to us certain lessons.

We have learned during the course of the last two or three years that the people of to-day have a trust for the people of to-morrow. We have learned that we must at all costs protect the citizenship of our country.

We cannot afford to take any chances as regards our citizenship, not only for the sake of those who are living to-day, but those who will follow. That must be borne in upon all of us as a result of conditions which have sprung up during the last two or three years. In other words, we cannot, as a people, afford, in adopting an immigration policy, to have it of such a nature that our citizenship will be swamped by elements coming in from outside which will destroy or at least tend to destroy it. The feeling that is running throughout the length and breadth of Canada to-day is that we have been too liberal in the past; that we have not safeguarded our own interests as we should; that we must be more careful in the future; that we must admit only those who can be readily assimilated—people who are prepared to become part of us and not merely to live amongst us. We must be careful to see that the ideals of those peoples who come to us from all parts of the world are such that they can become good Canadian citizens. That is the basis that must, it seems to me, underlie any immigration policy adopted by the Government or by Parliament at the present time.

I am not going to criticise what has taken place in the past. All Governments have, I think, been at fault; or rather, let me put it this way: our people themselves have been at fault. They have never stopped to consider what the effect of following a certain course of action might be. Little attention has been given to the problem, and as a consequence things have happened that would not have happened had people given more thought and study to this question. All the people of Canada are very largely to blame for the situation that exists.

I should like, just for a moment or two, to draw the attention of the House to one phase of the situation that is liable to escape notice, and that is this: What have we done to help those people that we invited to Canada—spending hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars in bringing them here,—to become loyal, true Canadian citizens? There is only one answer: we have done practically nothing.

We invited those people here; we sent across the seas our agents who went into their communities and explained to them the possibilities of this country of ours; how they would be welcomed here, how well they could get along and all that sort of thing. And when we brought them here, and scattered them throughout Canada, we left them entirely alone. Our policy in that regard has been nothing short of a tragedy. We have done very little to familiarize them with our laws; we have no policy in our country to Canadianize them; we have simply let them drift, and, therefore, we should not blame them. Thousands of those people came to Canada with the very best of intentions, and we know that they left their homes across the sea because they looked upon this democratic country as one in which they could make their homes and become Canadian citizens. But what have we, as a people, done to familiarize them with our institutions, to improve their habits and customs, to increase their earning capacity, their productive power? We have done practically nothing.

Let me give a very simple illustration. There are in this House men who know whereof I speak. We have in Western Canada somewhere in the neighbourhood of fifty or sixty or seventy-five thousand people called Galicians, of whom hon. members have heard, and who are sometimes called Ruthenians or Ukrainians. They come mostly from Austria where we sent our agents and spent large sums of money in inviting them to come here. We brought them to Canada, carried them on our trains away out into the West and dumped them down on the prairies, giving them homesteads. Those people were absolutely unfamiliar with our laws, our customs, our mode of living, our methods of carrying on business. They did not know how to farm; they knew nothing about farm machinery; they knew nothing whatever about our municipal and school systems. What did the Government of Canada do to help those people? Again I say, practically nothing. I was in their settlements in the early days, and many of those people were exceedingly poor, most of them in the early stages living in mud houses. Some of them actually dug holes in the ground and lived in those holes until they got a little ahead and were able to put up mud houses. They struggled along without any assistance from any one; nobody went near them. Instead of being helped, protected, advised, and assisted, they were the prey of every shark in the community. They were simply allowed to drift. The wonder is that they ever got along at all, that they ever succeeded. It was only by hard work year after year that they eventually did succeed, but no credit for that is due to the people of Canada who invited them to come to this country to be Canadian citizens. That illustrates the policy that has been followed for the last 25 or 30 or 40 years, by all Governments in this country as regards those foreign-born people, and it is no wonder that we have trouble on our hands at the present time.

The proper policy that should have been pursued in the past and that must be pursued in the future if people of that class or of any class coming from foreign lands are to be assimilated, is that we must see to it that every possible assistance is given to them to become Canadian citizens and that steps are taken to make them familiar with our laws, customs, municipal, and school systems.

I do not wish to leave a false impression upon the House. During the course of the past few years our people have wakened up to the situation, and some work is being done. In Western Canada the whole situation has, in some respects, been changed during the last three or four years. The war in its very early stages brought home to our Governments, our municipalities, and our people in the West that they had a real problem on their hands and that they had to get down to business if that problem was going to be solved. As a consequence, steps have been taken, and measures are now in course of preparation that will go a long way towards Canadianizing the foreign-born people settled in Western Canada. When we go into Committee on the Bill, I shall, if the question is raised, be only too glad to give to the House some information that I am sure will be quite new to hon. members who are not familiar with the existing situation in the West.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Do I understand the minister to say that the Galicians have not made good citizens?

Mr. CALDER: I did not say that. When one considers the handicaps under which these people have laboured for a good many years, the material progress they have made in the way of production is amazing. Thousands of them have made good settlers, from the purely material standpoint, but from the standpoint of good citizenship the situation is very largely a failure.

I come now to the question: where shall we look for our immigration in future? What people are we to admit to our citizenship? That is not the easiest question in the world to decide. No nation lives absolutely to itself: all nations are more or less inter-dependent upon each other. The flow of trade and commerce and the relationships that exist between the various countries of the world are such that it is not an easy matter to close the door absolutely against any class, no matter how much we might wish to do so. Hon. members know that all nations are very jealous of their citizenship, and of the rights and privileges of their nationals wherever they may go. Moreover, all nations claim equality; they claim that no nation should be specially favoured over other nations, and that element naturally enters into any discussion of this problem. I had intended to bring this Bill down earlier, as I know the interest that is taken in it both in the House and in the country. There was a possibility, and there still is one, of the question of immigration being considered by the Peace Conference and of certain conclusions being reached by that Conference. I had intended not to bring down this measure until we knew definitely what the Peace Conference was going to do in connection with this matter. But from my reading lately I do not think there will be anything in the Peace Treaty regarding the question of immigration. Apparently, it is to be left to each nation to determine its own policy. Our people have been, shall I say impatient. They have been very anxious for the Government to get busy on this question, and with reason. I should like to remark, however, that there is just a possibility at the present time of our being swayed and perhaps swept off our feet by our feelings. I think we should endeavour to avoid that at all costs. We should approach this question in the broadest possible way, and whatever conclusions we may reach we should endeavour to see that they are sane conclusions. I think that is very important, because otherwise we might make mistakes that would have far-reaching effects. Let us bear that in mind throughout all our discussion, and let us try to make a law of such a nature that it will not give unnecessary offence to the people of any country in the world.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend explain why there has been such a pronounced objection, at all events in the press, against the admission into Canada of the Hutterites?

Mr. CALDER: I shall come to that in a moment. I was going on to say that in framing our immigration policy the underlying principle should be briefly this: We should have the absolute right as
4 p.m. a nation to determine for ourselves what our future citizenship shall be, and while we lay that doctrine down for ourselves we should be prepared to concede it also for every other nation. We should know best what classes of people we need in this country and what classes we can best assimilate. We should know best what numbers of these people we can take care of. We should not be asked to throw our doors wide open to receive any number of any class of people who may desire to come to Canada. We cannot afford to do that. If we are to protect our citizenship we must be most careful not to attempt to absorb more of these people than we reasonably can. I would also go this far: We should not be tied down by any treaties or agreements that may exist of which we have had no knowledge or to which our consent has not been given. If there are any such treaties or agreements in existence, it seems to me we should endeavour to get them out of the way just as quickly as possible. For this is a domestic question affecting Canada, and we, and we alone, should determine the class of people that we are going to ask to become citizens of this country. I do not think anything should be allowed to stand in the way of our carrying out that policy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But we are not bound by the treaties of Great Britain?

Mr. CALDER: Yes. I say that if any treaties or agreements of that nature—I know of none—stand in the way, we should endeavour to have these treaties or agreements removed in order that we may determine this question for ourselves. That doctrine was agreed to when we were dealing with the Hindoo question at the conference last year. The British Government and all the Dominions assented to the proposition that this was a domestic problem, which the self-governing Dominions should have the right to determine for themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend might go further. Some years ago we had Great Britain denounce certain treaties curtailing the rights of Canada.

Mr. CALDER: Bearing these things in mind, the Government has endeavoured

to determine what shall be our immigration policy to meet the existing conditions in this country.

In the first place, as regards all nationalities and races the world over, including Great Britain and the Dominions, our existing law and this Bill provide for the exclusion of certain prohibited classes, which include persons suffering from some loathsome disease, or who are otherwise unhealthy, and those of weak mentality, or of bad character, and criminals and others of that kind. The existing law, and it has been extended by this Bill, provides for the creation of prohibited classes, and we think that so far as all nationalities are concerned these undesirable people should be excluded from Canada. I do not think that any objection can be raised to that. We purpose to extend those provisions and to establish the necessary administrative machinery to ensure that that law shall be effectively and efficiently carried out. This is going to cost some money. One of the reasons why in the past some have entered the country who should not have come in is simply because the necessary money was not expended to provide the machinery adequate to keep them out. If the law in this respect is going to be properly effective then this country must be prepared to expend money for the purpose. We must provide the necessary machinery and the necessary experts, and we must have a sufficient number of inspectors and other officers to see that the doors are properly closed against the prohibited classes. It is the intention to extend to five years, as is the case in the United States, the time during which undesirables who may get into the country, or who may prove to be undesirable after they have entered, may be deported. Heretofore the period has been only three years, but I am sure the House will agree that the extension is proper. We are going to adopt that five-year period here, not because they have it in the United States, but simply because we think it is necessary that there should be a longer period than three years in which to ascertain whether or not many of these people who get into the country are desirable.

A very large portion of the Bill is taken up with provisions for greater responsibilities so far as transportation companies are concerned. We are increasing the responsibilities which rest upon them and the penalties to which they will be liable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you provide for adequate health inspection on the other side of the water?

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. CALDER: That is a matter I should like very much to discuss in Committee. There are two sides to that problem.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will understand that when an immigrant is brought over the Atlantic to Canada if he is not acceptable to the health authorities on this side it is a hardship to send him back. It is better to prevent the evil than to have to cure it.

Mr. CALDER: As the law exists it is not very hard to send them back. There is no trouble in sending them back, because if a transportation company brings a person of that class to Canada, and we stop him at the border, or if he enters and it is discovered that he is undesirable, we throw upon the company the responsibility of taking him back. They are doing that every day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But it is a hardship you can prevent.

Mr. CALDER: It is a hardship to the transportation company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And to the emigrant—you separate him from his family.

Mr. CALDER: That is a question we may very well consider in Committee. The best method of dealing with that phase of our immigration problem is a question worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to infringe on the rules of the House, but the reason I call the minister's attention to that particular phase of the subject is that I once saw in Quebec a case of great hardship. I saw a family composed of several members, two of whom had to be deported because they could not be accepted by the health authorities, and it was a heart-breaking scene.

Mr. CALDER: We can go into the details of that in Committee. In addition to prohibiting the entry of undesirables, we must take steps and we have taken steps to protect ourselves against increased unemployment conditions in Canada. At all our ports of entry since the armistice we have been discouraging the entry of skilled and unskilled labour. We have been shutting them out on every pretext and righthly so. Some months ago an Order in Council was passed prohibiting the entry of skilled and unskilled labour from Asia to British Columbia. That Order in Council is still in force and it is proposed to keep it in force.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Japanese immigration?

Mr. CALDER: I will come to that presently. As far as that Order is concerned owing to labour conditions then existing in the country, I must confess that for some months it was not as rigidly lived up to as it should have been. The conditions, however, since the signing of the armistice have been quite aggravated on the Pacific coast and I recently gave very explicit instructions that in so far as the carrying out of that Order was concerned, it should be enforced to the limit. We know the aggravated unemployment conditions that exist at the present time and particularly on the Pacific slope. The Government propose to continue that Order in Council and to rigidly enforce it.

If the Bill now before the House is approved, measures will have to be taken to admit, at least for some time to come, only such people as can be readily assimilated. There is a great deal of complaint throughout Canada to the effect that we have admitted many races and nationalities that are not easily absorbed by our population. There are those who claim that, in so far as particular sections of our country are concerned, the population is of such a character that the problem is an exceedingly acute one. That is particularly true of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta where the major portion of our foreign-born population lives. Those in authority there simply claim that this problem has become so great that they cannot cope with any more of these people at the present time. When we come to the discussion of one of the sections of the Bill the House must very carefully and seriously consider what shall be done in that respect. The Government believes that the time has arrived when we must put up the bars, or limit the number of people of certain classes that shall go to that part of Canada.

In the immediate future, and for some years to come, it seems to me that the efforts of the department will be directed chiefly towards securing experienced farmers who have the necessary capital to enable them to establish themselves in Canada. Our homesteading areas have very largely disappeared. We cannot go to the people of the world and hold out to them the invitation that we have in the past. Our free lands are largely gone. In the future, if we are to have people go on the land—I am speaking largely of Western Canada—it is very necessary that they should have some capital. We still have large areas in northern Quebec and Ontario and in the hinterland of the West available as homesteads, but these areas are far removed from railway facilities and it is going to be very difficult to get people to go in and settle upon them. On the other hand, we have some millions of acres of the finest land open and ready for the plough held by people who are not making use of it and if we are going to get people to go on these lands it is very essential that they shall have the necessary means to make a proper start. There is also room in this country for farm labour, both male and female. I think we should endeavour to get as large a number of that class, properly selected, as we can. Holding that view, we are reaching out to secure agriculturists from Great Britain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the land grants that were given to the Canadian Northern railway for the purpose of building the branch lines of that system? Now that the railway system is the property of the Government, do I understand that these lands will become a part of the public domain and be available for immigrants?

Mr. CALDER: These lands, I understand, are still handled by the railway company. They are, it is true, the property of the people of Canada, but the railway company has its own lands department. They are handling these lands and seeking settlement for them. They are settling these lands just as was done by the railway company but they are doing it for the people of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Practically the Government?

Mr. CALDER: Practically the Government. The lands have not come back to the Government itself and they are not administered by any department of the Government but by the railway company.

Mr. VIEN: These lands have reverted to the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. CALDER: They have in a sense; they are the property of Canada.

Mr. VIEN: Should they not be under the administration of the Department of Immigration?

Mr. CALDER: That is a question of policy and it is one that might very well be considered and discussed. These lands are being held by the company itself for settlement purposes. Whatever moneys are derived from these lands that are sold will

belong to the people of Canada. The question of whether the land shall be transferred to one of the departments and administered by it is one that might very well be discussed and considered.

I desire to point out as briefly as I can what the position is because I find there is a great deal of misunderstanding in the country regarding some features of our existing law. Many people have a very erroneous idea in regard to this and for the information of the House I would like to give some information along these lines.

When the armistice was signed an Order in Council was put through, under section 38 of the Act, prohibiting the entrance of all persons from enemy countries—Germany, Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey. That order is still in force and it is intended to keep it in force.

I have already pointed out that an Order in Council is in existence prohibiting the entry of skilled and unskilled labour from Asia; at least skilled and unskilled labour is not permitted to enter our British Columbia ports, which means that, in so far as this class is concerned, we are excluding it. I will come in a moment to the Japanese and Chinese. The prohibition that now exists enables us to shut out all nationals of all countries who do not come directly to Canada from the country of their origin. That is the existing law. I might explain that by means of an illustration—a man we will say, leaves Portugal, comes to the United States and then desires to enter Canada. We can stop him from doing so because he does not come direct to Canada from Portugal. Recently—and we intend to continue that system—we have been shutting out people of that class. All persons of enemy nationality residing in the United States, and who have not become United States citizens, are shut out under that order because they do not come direct to Canada from the country of their origin. Consequently, nationals of enemy countries have not been entering Canada during the war or since the armistice has been signed. It is intended to keep that Order in Council in operation.

At the present time the department is carrying on propaganda, or publicity work only in two countries—Great Britain and the United States. Some very exaggerated reports have appeared in the press in relation to the work which we propose to carry on in the United States during the present year. I have seen it repeated time and again that we proposed spending a million dollars on advertising in the United States. There is not a word of truth in it. We are not proposing to carry on our work there to any greater extent than has been done in the past.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not in Belgium?

Mr. CALDER: As far as the continent of Europe is concerned, we, early in the war withdrew our agents and closed our offices. The question has been asked: Why should we not re-open them now? The answer is very simple. We might go in there and carry on publicity work to educate those people as to the advantages and possibilities of Canada, but I think there is very little possibility of getting them to come to Canada for many months yet owing to shipping conditions. There are thousands upon thousands of British people who would like to emigrate to Canada if they had the opportunity, but conditions are such as to make that absolutely impossible. Until our soldiers and their wives and children are brought home we must utilize all available ships for the purpose of bringing them home. It is estimated that there are in the neighbourhod of 30,000 soldiers' dependents still in Great Britain; we have brought home about 15,000; so you can understand the problem that we have on our hands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The answer given by my hon. friend is quite plausible, I am aware that shipping conditions would not at present permit of any exodus from continental Europe. But the reason I mention Belgium is that I gather from a report made by the agent for the province of Quebec that there is a possibility of a very strong tide of emigration from Belgium to America, and that many Belgians are ready to settle in this country if they are offered proper facilities; and, as my hon. friend is aware, they are a good farming class.

Mr. CALDER: Yes. I am quite sure in so far as the northern countries of Europe are concerned we will be able, if we so desire, when the proper time comes to secure many thousands of first-class settlers, but I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the time is not yet ripe. We will have to consider shortly what we will do in the way of carrying on publicity work in those countries, looking to the future rather than to the immediate present.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the hon. minister say why he has not extended his publicity work to Ireland? Is it because of the Sinn Fein movement there just now?

Mr. CALDER: No. I mentioned we were carrying on publicity work in—

Mr. JACOBS: Great Britain.

Mr. CALDER: Ireland is part of Great Britain. As a matter of fact we have two important offices in Ireland, one in Dublin and one in Belfast. I mentioned the fact that we have closed all our offices and withdrawn our agents from continental Europe. There is a desire on the part of a good many thousands of British soldiers to come to this country, and I think they will make very excellent citizens. The problem, however, of placing them upon the land will be somewhat difficult. Many of them will not have had previous training in farm work, and on account of the provision made for our own soldiers I am inclined to think that until we have succeeded in placing a larger number of our men on the land, we must go a little slow with the other problem.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Lord Grey some years ago had a plan for settling British sailors in British Columbia. I wonder if the department has acted upon that plan.

Mr. CALDER: I have not heard of it at all. The House is aware of the fact that some years ago an arrangement was made whereby a limited number of Japanese would be permitted to enter Canada. I have gone into the situation very carefully, and I can tell the House that the agreement has been lived up to by the Japanese Government to the letter. As a matter of fact, taking the figures for the last four or five years, there are in the neighbourhood of 400 or 500 fewer Japanese in Canada to-day than there were in 1914. Recently I have been in constant touch with the Japanese consul here, and he is very anxious to co-operate with the Government in every way possible in order to prevent the situation on the Pacific coast becoming any worse than it is. In fact, he has taken the matter up with his Government in order to insure that as few people as possible shall come from his country during our period of reconstruction.

In so far as the Chinese question is concerned, personally I am inclined to the view that a very great mistake was made in arranging for a head tax. It seems to me that by so arranging we have simply commercialized the business of bringing in Chinese immigrants, and I believe we would have fewer Chinese coming in if that head tax had never been imposed. As it is, individuals and companies have become interested in advancing this head tax to young Chinamen desirous of coming to this country, and, if my information is correct, these young men live in semi-slavery here until such time as that head tax is paid back probably twice over.

An hon. MEMBER: That is true.

Mr. CALDER: When we go into this matter it may be found advisable to abolish that head tax and do what has been done with the Japanese Government, endeavour to make some arrangement whereby the number of their nationals coming to Canada can be restricted. That can very well be considered when we get into Committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I notice the Bill excludes immigrants who believe in the overthrow of the Government of Canada. I do not know how far the country is ready to endorse that, but my purpose in rising is to ask the hon. minister: how is he going to ascertain what a man's political belief is?

Mr. CALDER: I think that question can be best considered when we come to the clause in the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the hon. minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind hon. gentlemen that the great bulk of these questions ought to be submitted when the Bill is in Committee. The minister has the right to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I just wanted to say that if the clause in question is directed against Irishmen, every Irishman is "agin the Government."

Mr. CALDER: The hon. member for Maisonneuve sometime ago referred to the question that has arisen recently in Western Canada with reference to the admission of a class of people known as Hutterites. The matter has interested a very large number of our people, not only as regards that sect but other peculiar sects, such as Mennonites and Doukobors, and the Government has given a good deal of attention to that problem. It appears to me that the policy to be laid down is this: We should be free to shut out any class of people that we do not think can be readily assimilated.

If there are any peculiar peoples the world round whose customs and beliefs, whose ideals and modes of life are dissimilar to ours and who are not likely to become Canadian citizens, we have the right to put up the bars and keep them out. Without discussing the matter further, I may tell the

House and the people that the Government proposes to do that so far as these peculiar classes of people are concerned.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Since the signing of the Armistice, Western Canada has been agitated about the coming into Canada from the United States of Hutterites and Mennonites. What does the Government intend to do with regard to those who are now in the country, and will they take action immediately by Order in Council to prevent any more of these people from coming in?

Mr. CALDER: Briefly, the position is this: Unless we take action under the War Measures Act—which we might do—there is no power under the existing law, as I understand it, to exclude these people at this time. As soon as this Bill is approved by the House we propose to put through an Order in Council under section 13 which will provide for their exclusion. Those who are now in Canada have come in under existing law, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will advance the idea that under those conditions they should be deported. That is a matter upon which there may be differences of opinion, but personally I do not think that people who have come into the country under existing laws should be excluded simply because some new law is to be enforced against people of that class.

Mr. TWEEDIE: These people are coming in, and I think it is the duty of the Government, pending a settlement of this question, to take action under the War Measures Act with a view to preventing any more of them from coming in.

Mr. CALDER: That is a matter which will be taken into consideration, and a decision can be reached with reference to it.

I have covered the situation in a very general way, and I have suggested some of the proposals that the Government has in mind. I simply repeat, in closing, that for some years to come, it seems to me, our policy should be directed along two lines, first, towards increasing our agricultural population; second, towards providing, under the existing law and under the Bill now before the House, for the exclusion of certain classes of people who cannot readily be absorbed into our population at the present time. We must protect ourselves so far as the future is concerned. We have a very large problem on our hands now, and its difficulties should not be unduly increased. What the policy of this country will be two or three, four or five, or ten years from now, can be settled by the Parliament of those days. For the present, the Government believes that we should put up the bars to a very considerable extent. I am quite sure that when we get into Committee and hon. members who know the situation in Canada have opportunity of thoroughly discussing the matter, the view which I have presented will be the majority view of the House. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—definitions:

Mr. CRONYN: While I thoroughly agree with the remarks the minister has made, it seems to me that the principle upon which our Immigration Act is based is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I will have to ask the Committee to give its unanimous consent if the hon. member intends to discuss the principle of the Bill upon Clause 1. If the Committee are willing to give consent, I have no objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. CRONYN: I had thought that some hon. gentleman on the opposite side would speak on the second reading. When the motion was put I was not prompt enough to rise, and it was declared carried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister made such a fair explanation of the Bill we thought the sooner we got into Committee the better.

Mr. CRONYN: I shall try not to delay the Committee. The system that this country and perhaps every other country has adopted is to start out by saying that the country is open to the world, that any one is welcome to its shores, and then immediately to raise bars excluding this nation or that nation. That method produces at once in the mind of the nation debarred a feeling of irritation; it has from time to time given rise to difficulties, and it may in future produce international complications. I prefer to see the positive method adopted. Let Canada state that she is prepared to admit the people of such and such races, nations, or countries; and when others desire to enter it will be their privilege to make application and have their claims for admission duly considered by this Parliament.

As the minister has said, the subject is of importance, Canada is in reality entering upon a new era, and is able, even by the proposed amendment, to remedy some of the defects of our former legislation. The

minister so far as I can recall his remarks did not mention the clause to which he had special reference when he spoke of the powers of exclusion, but if section 13 was that to which he referred, it seems to me it would be wiser, instead of vesting the power of exclusion, as set out in that section, in the hands of the Governor in Council, to settle the question by the Bill itself. I hope at the appropriate time, to have the Committee consider an amendment to that end.

The point of view from which we consider this question is of importance and has already been stated by the minister. It is, unfortunately, a matter of almost tragic import—perhaps those words are too strong—that the arguments in favour of unrestricted immigration appeal with particular force at the present moment. As stated by the minister, our financial, transportation and industrial problems demand an immediate increase in population, but must we not in spite of these pressing needs, have regard to the future, to the end that the welfare of this country may not be imperilled in générations to come?

It may be interesting to consider for a moment or two the figures regarding immigration in the past. For a term of ten years prior to the war, there entered Canada over 2,500,000 immigrants, of whom about 1,000,000 came from Great Britain, 850,000 from the United States of America and 675,000 from other countries. While this total figures out at an average of 250,000 a year—enough considering our total population—as a matter of fact, the tide was a rapidly rising one. For instance, in 1905, the total in round figures was 146,000. That total rose five years later to 311,000. The next year, 1912, it was 354,000, and, in 1913, we reached the top of the wave with 402,000, although, in 1914, the number was nearly as great. Of the 675,000 coming under the classification "from other countries"—and in that list nearly fifty races are specified—the leaders are Austrians with 150,000, Italians with 100,000, and Russians with 80,000. It is significant that in the last year of the decade the leaders above quoted very largely increased their entries. Speaking from memory, in 1914, of Austrians, 28,000 entered the country, of Russians, including Finns, almost as many, and of Italians, over 24,000. It is, therefore, well to remember that the inflow of immigrants from Southeastern Europe is a rapidly increasing one.

The figures as regards immigration into the United States of America correspond to those just quoted. During the same period of time about 10,000,000 immigrants entered the United States. When we compare the relative population of the two countries, it will be admitted the effect on Canada of this onrush of new peoples must be far greater than the entrance of even four times the number into the United States. In the year 1914, the year the war started, eighty out of every one hundred immigrants into the United States came from European countries, and as many as sixty of those eighty were from three countries only, namely, Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia. In 1914, Italy sent 295,000, Austria-Hungary, 286,000, and Russia, 262,000.

Mr. MORPHY: Has the hon. member the figures for Germany?

Mr. CRONYN: I doubt if I have the German figures available. German immigration fell off quite markedly in the last five years of that decade. The figures are in tabulated form in the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration. It would delay the Committee too long to add them up, but they are strikingly smaller than they were in prior years. Indeed, that feature is most noticeable when one looks into the question of immigration into the United States. There is plainly running through the history of this subject a distinction between the old immigration and the new immigration. Up to 1880, or 1882, the bulk of immigration into the United States came from Northwestern Europe. Speaking in a general way, about three-quarters of the immigrants from Europe up to that time came from Northwestern Europe and one-quarter from the Southeast. Since that date, and particularly for the last ten years prior to the war, the situation was completely reversed; three-quarters of the immigrants coming from Southeastern Europe and only one-quarter from the Northwest. This condition has brought about in many respects an unfortunate state of affairs in the United States, and it would be well for us, in considering this Bill and our own situation, to endeavour to profit from the experience of our neighbours.

If we are to continue our present policy of allowing European nations generally to enter Canada, we shall undoubtedly experience more and more the very result from which the United States has suffered, and for that reason I believe we should most carefully consider a strict limitation, at least for a period of years, of immigration from certain sections of Europe.

After all, the main reason for immigration nowadays is purely an economic one. The condition of the immigrant in his own home country and the hope held out to him of an improvement in that condition by coming to a new country is beyond everything else the main motive for his move. Provided times are good on this continent, immigration takes place from Europe without much regard to the conditions there, and it is a curious fact that the curves of imports and of immigration into the United States correspond with wonderful regularity. Then, too, the situation has been taken advantage of by many agencies, chief among which are the steamship companies and the labour agents, to stir up and exploit this movement. The result is that instead of attracting, as in the old days, the man of adventure and independence prepared to face the hardships of a new land, the way has been made to appear easy and the unfortunate immigrant has been deluded, with deplorable results in the end.

The minister has referred to what, to my mind, is one of the gravest results, and that is the overcrowding of our cities. The figures obtainable from the census department of the United States are striking in this respect. Their last census was taken in 1910, and shows that while forty-six per cent of the total population of that country was to be found in the cities, almost three-fourths of the foreign-born population was so located. New York being the port of entry for the greatest number of immigrants, naturally shows this concentration in a more striking degree than any other city. The Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States, in his report published in 1916, says of New York:

> At the taking of the last census it contained as much as one-seventh of all our foreign-born population, in contrast with only one-nineteenth of our total population. This one-seventh represented 1,945,000 foreign-born, of which more than one-half (52 per cent), came from Russia, Italy and Austria, the three combined having a total of more than one million. The amazing growth in the population of our cities has been predominately in the foreign-born element and their children, while the slight increase of the native-born population of native parents in cities is hardly observable.

The next striking feature of this enormous tide is its effect on the industries of the United States. The latest authority on the subject, F. J. Warne, quotes the following figures:

> More than four-fifths of our recent immigration, which is most largely from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary is going into the north Atlantic states. Of the total increase of more than three million in our foreign-born population in 1910 over 1900, approximately sixty per cent went into these north Atlantic industrial and manufacturing states. Thus the Slav, Hebrew, and Italian, is being drawn by the industrial development of the country into manufacturing and mining and is settling in the larger industrial centres. This flow of recent immigration into the industrial states is as striking as was that of the earlier immigration into the agricultural sections.

Another striking and unfortunate feature is that the bulk of this new immigration is composed of single men, and less and less as the years go by do the married immigrants attempt to bring in with them their wives and children. It is quite true that families which at first are left behind are brought across to join the immigrant if he prospers. Here again the figures of the United States are enlightening:

5 p.m.

> In 1914 as many as two-thirds—as many as 799,000—were males between the ages of 14 and 44, one-half of whom were unmarried. Even among those who were married, large numbers left their families at home and came only for temporary stay.

And that temporary stay is perhaps the next feature of the new immigration to be noted, because the 'birds of passage', as they are termed, have become in some ways an all-important part of the incoming and outgoing tide. Speaking from memory, in the ten years up to 1910 some 9,000,000 immigrants entered the United States; that is a million less than the number entering that country in the ten years prior to the war. During the same period 3,500,000 immigrants left the United States, and the statement is made that two-thirds of those who returned to their native country never revisit America. As the same writer puts it:

> They do not come with any intention of making this country their future home. This characteristic development of recent immigration alters completely the essential meaning to us of immigration as conceived in the past, although the word name of the economic phenomenon is the same. In consequence, immigration to-day requires a different avenue of approach if we are to understand its true significance to the American nation. This significance lies in the fact that a large volume of our immigration does not come here to be assimilated into our national life.

The report of the Commissioner General of Immigration on the next phase to be considered—the mentality of the immigrant—should be brought before the House. He says in his report for 1914:

> Medical science had demonstrated that many if not all, of these serious mental deficiencies are handed down from generation to genera-

tion, with steady increase in the strain; so that the importance of rejecting and expelling aliens of this class, even to the extent shown to have occurred, can hardly be overstated. The law on this subject should be even more strict; and the bureau urgently recommends that legislation supplementary to the excellent provisions of the existing law be enacted at an early date, so that the people of this country may be fully protected against the introduction here from abroad of additional strains of latent but none the less dangerous cerebral deficiencies, as well as against the introduction of such strains actually developed into acute stages. Why should our difficulties on this score, already sufficiently great, be increased by immigration?"

I take the liberty of reminding you that there are more insane in institutions in this country than there are students in colleges and universities. There are more insane in the country than there are enlisted men of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps; and in addition to these, each year, there is being added to this great army, an army practically equal to the army of the United States, approximately sixty thousand new cases every year. The cost of conducting these institutions in which this vast number of persons is cared for is so great that in several states it is exceeded only by the amount expended for education.

The effect on the standard of living by the injection of so vast a number of people is the last feature to which I shall refer. To examine into the question of immigration the United States Government some time ago appointed a commission which sat for four years and at an expenditure of $800,000 produced a report contained in forty volumes. On the standard of living the commission says:

> The measure of the rational, healthy development of the country is not the extent of its investment of capital, its output of products, or its exports and imports unless there is a corresponding economic opportunity afforded to the citizen dependent upon employment for his material, mental, and moral development.

The majority report states that evidence presented to it is a basis for the following findings:

> 1. The immigration policy of the United States has created a number of our most difficult and serious industrial problems and has been responsible in a considerable measure for the existing state of industrial unrest.
>
> 2. The enormous influx of immigrants during the past twenty-five years has already undermined the American standard of living for all workmen except those in the skilled trades, and has been the largest single factor in preventing the wage scale from rising as rapidly as food prices.
>
> 3. The great mass of non-English-speaking workers, who form about one-half of the labour force in the basal industries, has done much to prevent the development of better relations between employers and employees.

President Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labour has presented this view quite clearly. He says:

> The American-born wage earners and the foreign wage earners who have been here long enough to aspire to American standards are subject to the ruinous competition of an unending stream of men freshly arriving fro foreign lands who are accustomed to so low a grade of living that they can underbid the wage earners established in this country and still save money.

And the various organizations of labour including the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors and the Brotherhood of the Railroad Trainmen emphasize their views by resolutions which they have passed from time to time. The farmers also, as organized in the Farmers' National Congress, the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union, the National Grange, and like associations have stated that they are "unalterably opposed to the present foreign influx from southeastern Europe and western Asia, and to its proposed distribution and diversion to the South and West."

I have taken the liberty to put these facts on record as briefly as I could, so that when we come to the sections in question, there may be some basis in support of the limitations which I trust will be put in the Bill. Happily our experience has not been that of the United States, or at all events it has not been so acute, and we are now fortunately able, with proper thought, to safeguard our future—

Mr. FOSTER: You speak of three and a half million people coming to the United States and going back. Have you any idea of the length of time they remained, or the amount of money they took away when they returned for good?

Mr. CRONYN: I do not recall having seen any statement as to the length of time they remained. A computation was made by the commission of the amount of money which they sent away. It was in the hundreds of millions. I am speaking again from memory.

Mr. FIELDING: May I make a suggestion to my hon. friend? Assuming that all that he has proposed is wise—and with nearly everything that he has said I heartily agree—I think it would be very much better if he could give us a revised Immigration Act rather than the Bill that is presented. The amendments here are very numerous. Where there are a few amendments to a large Act it is desirable that we should have an amending Act, but where the amendments are very numerous it might be the wiser policy to give us a revised Act, instead of having numerous

amendments striking out a few words here and putting in a few words there, and striking out a clause here and substituting a new clause somewhere else. If we have to have this measure and a general Act also there will be a danger of confusion, and the wayfaring man, though he be a member of Parliament, will have some difficulty in following the law, while the immigrants coming in will certainly never understand it. I think we might discuss the Bill in its present form in the light of the minister's speech, and he might instruct the proper officials to embody these amendments in a consolidated Act, so that before the matter is concluded here he might present a substitute Bill which would not require further discussion.

Mr. CALDER: I gave instructions to draft the Bill in such a way that the House would have the least possible difficulty in understanding it. A reading of it will show that there are very few sections in which, as suggested, a few words are struck out and others substituted. In the main, whole sections have been struck out and others substituted even where the changes are very slight, the object being that hon. members may clearly grasp their purport. I think the House will have very little difficulty in following the provisions of the Bill. On the other hand, I quite agree with the view expressed by hon. gentlemen that we should have a consolidation of the Act. The intending emigrants, of course, see very little of the law. They have very little opportunity of reading it. They do not obtain their information in that way; but for the use of our officials who have to carry out the administration of our law, I think a consolidation should be made in order that the provision might be very clearly apprehended by every one. I have no doubt that measures of this kind are usually consolidated by the department when an amending Bill goes through. I do not know what the practice is here, but I know that in our own legislature, when we amend a Bill we have an office consolidation of the law so that the consolidation will be available to every one interested. If the Committee wishes it I will give instructions that a consolidation shall be proceeded with at once so that members may have the advantage of having it before them. On the other hand, I think there will be very little difficulty in following the provisions of this Bill. If thought advisable I will have a number of copies of the existing Act brought to the House so that, if we find it necessary, we can refer to the provisions of the existing law.

Mr. FIELDING: I would not suggest that there should be any delay in regard to the consideration of the matter. I agree that we can discuss the Bill very intelligently with the minister's explanation of it before us. But I think that, before we dispose of the matter finally, for the information of the officials, and of the public generally, there should be a consolidation of the Act. A man who is asked to become a settler in Canada may say: I would like to have a copy of your Immigration law, and if you are able to send him a consolidated Act it is more convenient, not only to the intending immigrant, but to the officials of the department.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations to make on the general tenor of the Bill that should have been made earlier, and I am afraid I shall have to ask the Committee for the same indulgence they gave the hon. member (Mr. Cronyn). The substantive part of this Bill is contained in the three or four first sections; the remainder deals mostly with the way in which the Act is to be put in force and is more for the guidance of transportation and other companies than for the information of the immigrant. Therefore, it will only be with the first few sections that the House will have to deal.

I must congratulate the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) upon his excellent address. I have not much fault to find with anything he has said, nor with the Bill as a whole, with the exception of perhaps one or two sections, which ought to be amended radically or struck out completely. I will refer to them in a moment or two. The minister stated in his address that things have happened in the matter of immigration in this country which should not have happened if the previous Governments had been alive to the entire situation. I am sorry the minister did not see his way to tell us what the particular things were that had happened and which should not have happened. We know that under the Liberal Administration of this country, from 1896 to 1911, we had a vast immigration and that the foundation of the prosperity of Canada was the immigration which came in at that period. Whatever may be said about Sir Clifford Sifton, no one will deny that his policy of immigration was the right policy at the time. and that if we have had this large immi-

gration into the country it was entirely due to his foresight.

I would judge that the test whether immigration would or would not be satisfactory to the country would be the reports from the various penitentiaries, insane asylums and houses of correction. By reading those reports we can judge whether immigration is or is not proper for the country. I have not the figures from these institutions before me, but I think I can state without fear of contradiction that the figures will show quite clearly that this country is relatively ahead of any other country on this continent in regard to the small number of people detained in these institutions. I think you will find that the population in the insane asylums is very much less than it is in the United States, in England or in other countries per capita. So it is with regard to the jails and penitentiaries. Speaking for my own particular race, I can point with pride to the Montreal jail, where you will not find a single person of the Jewish race at present incarcerated. The poor chaplain, who has been paid a small stipend of $300 or $400, fears he is going to lose his position unless something is done. So it is in regard to the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, where conditions are nearly as satisfactory. Of course, some of the people who are opposed to Jewish immigration take the ground that it is because these people are too clever to be caught, but I do not think there is very much in that. Our police forces and other departments are capable of looking after all classes.

The open door policy to which the minister referred incidentally is one which I think ought to commend itself to the people. Canada is not at present in a position to pick and choose. We must absorb into this country very large numbers of immigrants before we can begin to pay the interest on the debt which we have upon our shoulders at the present time. I have figured out that every man, woman and child will have to pay something like $50 per year in taxes to pay the interest on the debt which we have rolled up. It does not require an arithmetical problem to demonstrate the fact that if 7,000,000 people are required to pay $50 per head, 14,000,000 would pay just half that amount, and so on. So long as we can assure ourselves that the people brought into this country are law-abiding citizens, healthy, and able to take part in the work of developing the country, that is all we require. Whether they come from alien countries, or from other countries, amounts to little. It is of no significance to this country. The alien enemy of to-day will be the friendly alien of to-morrow and possibly the friendly alien of to-day may become the alien enemy of to-morrow. I doubt very much, from the point of view of international law, whether, when we have made a durable and lasting peace with the countries with which we have been at war, we can legally say to the peoples of those countries: You cannot come into this country because at some time in the past you were our enemies. I question that very much. It seems to me that so soon as peace has been signed we have no longer any quarrel with these people and we cannot, on the ground that they have been alien enemies in the past, refuse to allow them into this country or bar their entrance. The minister made the point that some people whom we had brought into this country—Galicians—were living in the same conditions in which they had been living in Galicia from time immemorial.

Mr. CALDER: I did not say that.

Mr. JACOBS: I understood the minister to state they were living in Canada in the same conditions as they had lived in in their own country.

Mr. CALDER: As a matter of fact, the Galicians or Ruthenians who are residing in Western Canada, and who settled there fifteen or twenty years ago, have made very substantial progress in so far as their habits and customs are concerned.

Mr. JACOBS: Did I understand the minister to say that it was at some time while they were here that those objectionable conditions prevailed?

Mr. CALDER: I stated that after their arrival in Canada they were left to struggle for themselves without any assistance or advice of any kind.

Mr. JACOBS: They made good subsequently?

Mr. CALDER: Yes, from the material standpoint, and I can also say that from the social standpoint they have made considerable progress.

Mr. JACOBS: I understood the minister to say that they lived in mud huts and in a way not consistent with civilized conditions.

Mr. CALDER: Originally.

Mr. JACOBS: If they are not doing so now it seems to me that is one of the very

best reasons why we should take men who live in mud huts and make good citizens out of them. That is the white man's burden. Those Galicians have worked out their own salvation in this country and have certainly become an asset. They came from Austria, and if they had not come in their thousands from that country they would have been fighting our own soldiers during the war that has just been concluded. We have taken them out of Austria and made most of them fairly good citizens, and I have no doubt that many gave a good account of themselves on the field of battle when fighting for the Allies. It is part of our duty to assume some of the burden, which Kipling says the white man must shoulder, in regard to those who are less advanced than we are. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is making a serious mistake when it presumes to legislate to keep out people from different countries simply because their habits before they come here are not quite the same as ours. We ought to encourage them in every possible way, not only for their own sakes, but for the sake of ourselves, and in that connection I am reminded of a story told to me some years ago by Commissioner Coombes, of the Salvation Army. He instanced a case in London where a man the back of whose shirt was badly torn used to carry crippled people across the street in wintry weather. Commissioner Coombes congratulated this charitable individual, but received for reply, "That is no charity at all. While I carry them across the street they warm my back." That was the object, and both parties were benefited. I do not say that we have got down to those straits yet, Mr. Chairman, but I mention the incident for the purpose of illustrating that while we are doing the other man good we are at the same time benefiting ourselves.

It is part of our duty to teach these people our laws and customs in order that they may become good Canadian citizens. We may not be very successful with the parents, but through our public schools we can reach the children, and the second generation will develop into citizens as good as many of those who belong to the so-called better class. I have only to cite a case in the history of my own race. You will remember that when the Israelites left Egypt they escaped from slavery and they wandered for forty years in the wilderness. Not one of those who left Egypt was permitted to enter the Holy Land, but their children did, and the Bible tells us these made good. The same thing applies in the present day. You cannot expect to do very much with people who come to this country in the matter of changing from the old manners and customs of Europe, but with our magnificent public school system we can teach the second generation our Canadian social life, and they will develop into citizens as capable and efficient as the descendants of those who have lived here many generations.

Mr. CALDER: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question, because it goes to the very heart of the situation? In Western Canada, more so than in any other part of the Dominion, the prevailing opinion is that the number of foreign born is so great in proportion to the balance of the population that it results in a difficult social and educational problem. Does the hon. gentleman advocate that we should keep our doors wide open in order that thousands upon thousands of these people shall have the privilege of going in there to intensify the problem of those Western Provinces? Or should we endeavour to keep a balance between these foreign born and our own people, in order that we may grapple with that problem as it exists from time to time? He can readily understand what might result if we were to follow his policy. We could probably arrange to carry on propaganda work in Europe which would bring hundreds of thousands of these people to Canada. Does the hon. gentleman think it advisable to do so under the circumstances I have mentioned?

Mr. JACOBS: If they are decent, respectable people, why not? Take the state of Wisconsin. I understand that practically the whole state is peopled by Scandinavians. Take the state of Louisiana, that originally was settled exclusively by the French. Why should foreigners coming here grow up in ignorance when we have such a splendid educational system? As the hon. minister pointed out, a few years ago these Galicians were living in mud huts; to-day they form a very important part of the community. In fact, they were considered so important that when the War-time Elections Act was passed a provision was inserted withdrawing their franchise rights.

With regard to the peasantry which you must expect will immigrate to this country, you cannot get any but the poorest class from Great Britain or any other part of Europe, for it is their poverty which causes them to emigrate. Who ever heard of a man of wealth leaving his home in Europe and coming out to Canada either to live in a large city or to go on the land? It

is the poverty of the peasantry and other classes in Europe which promotes emigration, and you cannot expect to receive any other class of immigrants. They go to the West and have to scratch the earth for a living ;they have very little means and cannot engage in agriculture on a large scale like the American immigrants, they cannot buy tractors and other up-to-date agricultural implements; they must continue to live in a primitive style until such time as they are able to make enough out of the soil to improve their position. Therefore it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a short-sighted policy on the part of the Government to simply restrict immigrants because they happen to come from this or that country, or because they do not happen to have the means which immigrants from the United States possess.

I regret that the Government should have decided at the present juncture to introduce a Bill of this character, because it is bound to create considerable discussion among the people of this country. The returned soldier problem is upon us. The returned soldier who has failed to find a job will consider every immigrant as coming here for the purpose of taking away employment which should go to the soldier, and in that way we may accentuate a feeling against the newly arrived which would not exist were this Bill brought down a year or two hence. I do not believe there was any particular urgency for this Bill. We have in the Immigration Act many of the provisions which are incorporated in this Bill, and we could have got along with it very well, particularly as the regulations under the Orders in Council carefully see to it that only a good class of immigrant is permitted entrance.

I have had a good deal to do with the Immigration Department, and I must say that its work is being done most efficiently; all the officials, from the highest down, are interpreting the Act with intelligence. When a case of hardship is brought to the attention of the department, an appeal is had, and when the matter is finally disposed of the immigrant receives justice. That being the case, I cannot see why this Bill should be introduced, unless it be for the purpose of barring the alien enemy. I shall certainly oppose the section which introduces that provision into our law. It is undemocratic; it is wrong in principle; I have very grave doubts as to its legality under international law. For these and many other reasons I think the section should be left out.

Mr. CALDER: The provision under which we debar alien enemies from entering Canada is a regulation under the existing law. The purpose of this Bill is not to exclude the alien enemy.

Mr. JACOBS: But the alien enemy is excluded under the War Measures Act?

Mr. CALDER: No, I think it is Section 38 of the present law which provides that the Government, by Order in Council, may exclude any persons of any nationality, race, class or occupation.

Mr. JACOBS: It was right and proper that that should be so. But it is wrong to introduce into the substantive part of a new law a clause to provide that every person belonging to alien enemy countries shall not be permitted to enter Canada.

Mr. CALDER: There is no such provision in the Bill.

Mr. JACOBS: Paragraph (p) of Section 3 says:

> Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies and who were interned in any part of His Majesty's Dominions or any allied country on or after the eleventh day of November, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen.

Mr. CALDER: That refers only to interned alien enemies.

Mr. JACOBS: What distinction does the minister make between a man who has been interned in any part of His Majesty's Dominions and a man who comes direct to Canada from Germany, Austria, or any other enemy country? I do not see that there is any distinction. A large number of persons who came from alien enemy countries reside in Canada. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) in answer to a question I put to him the other day, said that 2,117 alien enemies only had been interned during the war. This shows that thousands of them were considered good and valued citizens and were in no way molested or interfered with.

Another clause to which I intend to take serious objection is that which provides for a literacy test. That clause does not appeal to me at all; it is wrong to debar a man from this country because he cannot read. If that rule had been applied in the United States in the time of Abraham Lincoln, Lincoln's own father and mother would have been debarred from entering the United States because they could not read. I do not know where the minister got his warrant for introducing a rule of this kind. We want all the immigration we can get. If a man is respectable, industrious and

honest he should be permitted to come into this country; if he is unable to read, that is not his fault, but his misfortune. In the remote parts of England, Scotland and Ireland, the countries from which you expect to get your best class of immigration, I venture to think large numbers of the people of the older generation cannot read. We know the difficulties under which people labour in Europe. Many men have not had a chance to go to school and learn to read or write; they have been ground down by poverty and heavy work almost from the days when they could scarcely walk. Now, when they want to improve their position and come to a new land, they will find they cannot come here on account of this misfortune of being unable to read. The House should not concur in any legislation which makes a distinction as to entry in Canada between the man who can read and the man who cannot. You are not going to keep out Bolshevists by such a provision; the Bolshevists and people of that ilk are able to read and write. You are keeping out the poor man who, through no fault of his own, has been unable to secure even an elementary education. If people who cannot read and write are permitted to enter Canada, the minister will at least have the assurance that they will not commit forgery; so that one thing would be guarded against at all times.

On the whole, were it not for these two clauses I would be heartily in favour of this Bill, particularly as I know that the law will be administered with intelligence by the very capable department over which the minister presides. I trust that before the Bill is through the Committee stage the minister will see his way clear to strike out these objectionable passages and give satisfaction to all elements of the community.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The greatness of a country must be measured by the standard of its people; a nation's greatest asset is the people of whom it is composed. In view of the immigration restrictions which are being imposed by the United States, it is important that legislation of the nature of this Bill should be brought down by the Canadian Government. Otherwise, Canada would be the Mecca for the outcasts of Europe to whom access to the United States is refused. But to my surprise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) has made a plea for the alien enemy, for the people with whom we are at war—because peace has not yet been declared.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. JACOBS: May I correct the hon. gentleman? I said: the people with whom we "were" at war.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That is exactly what I said. We are still at war with those people, and yet the hon. member makes a plea here to-day that we should grant them concessions and that we should forget the things they have done, and forget the principles to defend which some of our men are still overseas waiting for peace to be declared before they can return to Canada. The ink was not dry on the signatures to the armistice before we heard the leaders of the Liberal party in Canada apologizing for the things that had been done by alien enemies during this war and referring to the Germans as one of the noblest races in the world. We heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific about the so called iniquitous Dominion Franchise Act which disfranchised people of alien birth in this country during the war. But to-day I think the limit has been reached when an hon. member makes the plea in this House for alien enemies; that we should not exercise any precautions with regard to ourselves as against those people coming into Canada under our immigration laws. To my mind the matter is so serious that a statement of that kind should be considered an unpardonable offence. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) may smile, but the brave men who have been offering their lives for the cause for which we have been contending during the last five years will not smile at the statement I make. Since the signing of the armistice we have been told by some people that we should forgive and start over again. There is, I admit, much to be forgiven, and personally I have not yet reached the stage when I am prepared either to forget or to forgive the horrible offences that have been committed.

Mr. JACOBS: I am a better Christian than the hon. member.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not boasting as to that, but I do not think the hon. member's attitude is very much evidence as to his Christianity.

I should like to say a word or two with regard to the exclusion under present conditions in Canada, of skilled and unskilled labour of a desirable class. It has been pointed out that Canada needs population; that we have great undeveloped resources in this country, and that our hands are practically tied, because we have not the people to develop those resources. Some people anticipate a very unsettled condition

of affairs in the labour market, because those hundreds of thousands of returned soldiers will again have to take their place in civil life.

The Government have made a reasonable provision, although perhaps not as liberal as it might be, to take care of those men at least for a short time after their return, and I have not the slightest doubt but that, in a short time, there will be in Canada a great demand for labour both skilled and unskilled. I cannot conceive of a country, with the resources which Canada has, being in any other condition than short of labour, and I want to issue a warning to the Government that many of those measures that are on foot with the object of restricting desirable immigration, are not in the public interest. Some labour unions have been taking the stand that legislation of this kind should be enacted. The minister has pointed out the necessity for getting men on the land in order to develop our agricultural resources, and I quite agree with him in that regard; but how are you going to meet the demands of the country in that respect unless you permit desirable immigrants to enter. Because, by reason of the labour organizations fixing the hours of labour and regulating the scale of wages, if a man can get a greater remuneration for his services at some other occupation than farming, he is going to engage in that occupation instead of working the land? That is the very thing that is taking place throughout Canada at the present time, and has been for many years, that is the chief reason why, notwithstanding all the great natural resources we have at our disposal, the cost of living is bound to remain very high in this country. The policy of the labour unions as regards hours of labour is, in my opinion, a very short-sighted one. I may seem somewhat reckless in making such a statement, but I am quite sincere in making it and I do not believe they will gain the end they have in view by organizing along those lines.

Agriculture in this country is suffering to such an extent that it is simply deplorable that something is not being done to stem the ravages and depredations that are being made upon our resources as a result of bad farming. The result of bad farming is evidenced on every hand throughout the country, and as the years go by, it is becoming much worse, and, unless there is a material change in labour conditions I see no prospect of its becoming better. It will be found that a feeling has been engendered against the people of the rural districts by the people in the towns and cities; indeed, that feeling exists right here in Ottawa. The citizens are calling meetings and passing resolutions with a view, they claim, to bringing down the cost of living, by bringing into competition with the legitimate business of the agriculturists of this country something that will meet their selfish purposes, but they lose sight of the fact that agriculture is going to suffer to a great extent if they succeed in carrying out the views they express. This may be getting away from the Bill somewhat, but what I have in mind and what I wish to emphasize is this: that the Government must be very careful in not excluding from this country desirable, industrious immigrants, even although they have not one dollar in their possession.

The hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) criticised the minister because, although he said that mistakes had been made in the past, he did not point out where those mistakes had been made, but simply condemned them in a general way. He also eulogized Sir Clifford Sifton and what the Liberal party had done in peopling the plains of the West. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) has lived in Western Canada for many years, and I have no doubt that he, being of an observant nature, has followed the question of immigration in the West as a careful student would.

It is not very many years since we witnessed in the Parliament of Canada an effort to find out who it was that was bringing out to Canada from the alien enemy nations of central Europe hundreds of thousands of people under bonus. It was claimed that it was done by a certain corporation but you coud not find out by hook or by crook who constituted the notorious North Atlantic Trading Company. That company located these people on large blocks of land in Western Canada, and instead of these people being assimilated, the people of British birth who did not wish to live close to them moved further away, and the boundaries of those alien settlements were extended. But that is a thing of the past, and I should not have referred to it had it not been mentioned by the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs). I believe it was not good policy to permit thousands of people of foreign birth to congregate in settlements in Western Canada and maintain there the language and traditions of the country from which they came. If we want Canada to become a great country within the Empire, we must both feel and act as if we were a part of the British Empire, and the

people who come here should be made to observe British laws and institutions. But that is not being done in many places in Western Canada to-day.

Just imagine hon. gentlemen opposite, with peace not yet declared, saying that we should not debar these people of alien enemy countries, many of whom are now interned in Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Those interned are here already.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: But they will go out just as soon as it is possible for us to get them out, and I hope they will be kept out for the rest of their lives. We have had that menace to contend with, and we have not received much sympathy from hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with questions of this kind during the last few years. But our boys from overseas will soon be home and they will see to it that never again in his counry shall such a condition of affairs exist as has been the case in this Parliament during the past few years.

Progress reported.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): With the permission of the House I should like to withdraw the motion I made this afternoon asking that the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines be granted leave to sit while the House is in session.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I now beg to move:

That the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines have leave to sit during the sitting of this House to-night.

There are several delegations from the Western Provinces who are anxious to be heard before the Committee and as it would be impossible for us to hear them for some days to come, I trust the House will agree to the Committee sitting to-night in order to accommodate these gentlemen.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

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

Militia and Defence—Allowances—Active Militia, $50,000.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Major-General MEWBURN: In preparing these Estimates it was very difficult to determine just how far to go in getting back from war to a peace basis. These Main Estimates were prepared on the same lines as last year, as we did not then expect the armistice. In the Supplementary Estimates, therefore, there will have to be included some amounts in addition to those now before the Committee. The question of what is to become of the active militia in the future is a matter that will have to be given very serious consideration, probably at a later session. In the Supplementary Estimates there will be a larger amount in connection with certain grants, in one or two items which I will explain later on. In the Estimates now before the Committee there is a total reduction of $26,130 as compared with the previous year, the expenditures having been cut down to the lowest minimum possible. Some amounts that have been previously charged to war expenditure will now have to come out of the Estimates by vote. It is proposed to recruit the permanent corps as a temporary measure up to 5,000, which is the number laid down in the Militia Act. It is considered essential that that force should be built up, at least, to the number mentioned.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does this $50,000 cover?

Major-General MEWBURN: That $50,000 covers allowances for general purposes for all militia units throughout the Dominion. During the war that amount was required to keep the active militia units in some semblance of an organization. It was distributed among all the various units in Canada for the care of arms and for matters pertaining to the active militia regiments including all branches of the service. The pre-war vote in connection with that was something over $100,000. During 1917-18 it was $70,000 and last year $50,000. I do not think it is possible to manage with an amount less than that. In the Supplementary Estimates there will have to be a vote if it is considered necessary to train the militia or any part of it this year. Whether that is advisable or not I am not prepared to say, but we have to make provision.

Mr. POWER: To whom is this money usually paid?

Major-General MEWBURN: It goes to the officers commanding the militia units, to the credit of the units, for command pay,

care of arms, drill instruction, postage, and so forth.

Mr. POWER: And salaries?

Major-General MEWBURN: No. There are no salaries at all. The militia units have not drawn a cent of pay practically for four years.

Mr. POWER: What is the command pay?

Major-General MEWBURN: The command pay is estimated on the basis of 60 cents for each man actually trained. A very large number of militia units in Canada have retained their organization and have actually trained their men. In one military district there are over four regiments of infantry that have kept up their regiments—men who were over age or medically unfit. These regiments trained in the spring and fall and never drew pay. They were kept as a nucleus. A great many of them spent enormous sums of money out of their regimental funds. One regiment, the 48th Highlanders in Toronto, spent over $23,000 in connection with recruiting for the overseas units, and that organization is magnificent to-day. The same is true of the 5th Royal Scots and the Victoria Rifles, and the 65th, the 8th and 9th, Quebec; and in Winnipeg the 90th and the Grenadier Regiment, and one in Vancouver.

Mr. COPP: What advantage is this to the country?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is every advantage, and I do not think that the country would be satisfied to have the militia units wiped out of existence.

Mr. COPP: But of what advantage is it to keep the units?

Major-General MEWBURN: I think it is absolutely essential that the militia units should be kept up. It is not for me to say whether their services will be required again or not. If it is the intention to wipe them out of existence that is a matter for Parliament, but I cannot for a moment imagine that they have not been of advantage in the past and may not be of advantage in the future.

Mr. COPP: The minister misunderstands me. What do they do?

Major-General MEWBURN: During the war they were the backbone of recruiting for the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and I think that the units, if they are kept on a peace basis, are very essential in aid of the civil power.

Mr. POWER: Will any definite policy be formulated with regard to the future of the Canadian militia?

Major-General MEWBURN: No definite policy has been formulated but considerable thought has been given to the matter. It would be premature for me even to suggest at this time what will be done; I have felt that until the Canadian Expeditionary Force is demobilized it would be unwise to state any definite policy. We organized and sent overseas a very large number of units. In the infantry we recruited in Canada something like 258 battalions. I shall not criticise the way in which it was done but a large number of them were broken up. A large number of units that were at the front are now coming back and are being practically disbanded, and the only thing we have on the statute-book is what is known under the Miliita Act which provides for a permanent and non-permanent force. There is the nucleus of a committee that has been giving a great deal of consideration to this matter and it is proposed to add to that committee some officer or officers who have served with distinction at the front representing the permanent corps—those who were neither in the permanent or non-permanent but served with distinction at the front. It is proposed that the committee shall visit the eleven military districts in Canada to get the views of the various officers who have served in the war as to the situation, and also to consult with people in certain centres who have been behind the militia in the past. Probably at a future session some proper scheme will be laid before the House as to the reconstitution of the militia, as a great many people feel strongly that these fighting units should be perpetuated. The 16th Battalion was a regiment that was raised originally in British Columbia and has now become a Manitoba battalion. There are others: The 15th which was ostensibly fathered by the 48th Highlanders in Toronto, the 13th and the 5th Royal Scots. There is considerable feeling that these units should be perpetuated, and I think there is reason for the view, as they have made splendid history for Canada and I would like something to be done to continue them. I am not prepared to say how far the country intends to go in the future in maintaining a military organization. It is premature at present to lay down any far-reaching policy until we know what our responsibilities and cares

will be, but in the meantime it would be wise to try and keep the units in existence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am certainly not a militarist, but I approve of some of the remarks made by the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn). There is no doubt that the success in recruiting in Ontario was largely due to the splendid military organization which was in operation there for many years. When I was Postmaster General I remember having been twice at Niagara camp in the summer and I was impressed with the splendid militia force on the grounds there. It was on the occasion of the establishment of the postal unit for the various regiments. I met on that occasion my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace). I have followed that somewhat closely in our province for the last twenty-five years. The time for the annual drill in camp was certainly too short and there was not an opportunity, with all the other duties that the militiaman had to perform, to make of these boys real soldiers. The personal expenditure involved, if the officers wish to maintain their battalions is sometimes beyond their modest resources and if you are to have in the future an active militia organization, one that will be efficient in the case of emergency, the Government should revise the methods of the militia organizations throughout the several militia districts.

I said a moment ago that I am not a militarist, but I believe, especially after the magnificent part Canada played in this war, that we should be proud of our militia and that we should maintain, within proper limits, a militia organization on a sound footing. In order to perpetuate that organization I think we should begin at the beginning. After all it is a manly sport. Reviewing my college experiences, I have observed that the students who turned out best were those who had joined the cadet corps. Just to give an example, I was reading some statistics on Sunday in a Montreal daily. The minister knows that possibly the best cadet corps in Montreal is that of the Mont St. Louis College. Because of the organization which has been maintained for years and years, and which has been a source of pride to the citizens of Montreal, during the war, from that institution alone, 325 boys joined the colours. I attribute that to the fact that they were trained as cadets in that institution. As much as possible in our colleges, academies and high schools all over the country, without spreading any militaristic spirit we should have cadet organizations in which the boys would take pride and which would give them an opportunity of taking part in a manly sport.

I find much to commend in the Swiss system. In Switzerland every man knows how to handle a rifle, and we had evidence of that during the war. Although Switzerland was not engaged in the war, from the end of July, 1914, the whole Swiss army, which means practically the male population of age, was under arms in order to guard the boundary of Switzerland. In Switzerland, from the earliest moment of a man's life, he is called upon to practice all the military exercises. Yet it is a democratic country, probably the most democratic in Europe, and the entire organization is carried out with little expenditure. I am not for a carnival of expenditure in what I am propounding this evening; I think with a minimum expenditure you can have our young men fairly well trained in their country's defence. I think the militia organization should be maintained on a proper basis, because it is a school which will bring the best results to our young men. It is, I repeat, a manly sport, and some of our best men have belonged to this organization.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is pleasant to know that at times, Mr. Chairman, I can agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), and to realize that the gulf which separates this side from the other is not one that at all times cannot be bridged. I am pleased to associate myself with the hon. gentleman in his remarks in regard to the cadet corps, and we will have an opportunity to discuss it more fully, I suppose, on the next item. But I want to say one word in regard to the active militia. I do not know whether there will be any annual camps this year or not; I heard it intimated that there would not be.

Major-General MEWBURN: This amount does not provide for them.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is quite true that in recruiting men for the front, the old militia those men who went out to camp year after year, did splendid service; a great many of those who were associated with the militia joined up and went overseas and did their part nobly. There were some, however, who for years had been connected with the militia but who never showed any disposition to enlist for active service. I know some men in my own part of the country who used to strut about with all the gold lace and brass buttons they could decorate

themselves with, who for a great many years used to go out to the annual camp for fourteen days and take all the salutes that those under them could give, priding themselves on their rank in the militia, but who did not go overseas and did not want to go overseas. In any reorganization of the militia it would be a very great mistake if those gentlemen were given their old rank; that would be something which the country generally would resent very strongly. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken stated that fourteen days' annual drill was too short. In my judgment, if you have that annual drill conducted by men who have had experience overseas, you will get more benefit from the fourteen days' training under their guidance than you would get in four years under the old system. I would cut off every one of those men who paraded as militia officers, but did not prove themselves of the right calibre when the testing time came. The men to carry on the instructional work are the men who went overseas and did their bit, not those who were content to remain at home and who now, no doubt, will again haul out their uniforms from the dusty closet and strut about just as gloriously as they did for thirty-five or forty years before the war began.

Mr. McMASTER: I have little experience in military matters, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to express strong support of the attitude adopted by the Minister of Militia, which I understand to be this: He does not intend to launch a scheme of general reorganization of the militia until the present situation clears up. The great statesmen of the world have been working for months past in Paris to see whether the scourge of militarism can be removed from the civilized nations of the world, and on their success or failure will depend very largely whether this country, with other countries, will have to look forward to the burden of maintaining military establishments, or whether a reign of peace and harmony can be established throughout the world. I am hopeful for the future because the present situation is so awful. Possibly we have not realized it on this side of the Atlantic as much as the people have on the other side, but I fear the crushing weight of military establishments will be found too much, along with the tremendous load of national debt heaped up during the war, to be borne by a world which has been impoverished by four, aye, almost five, years of bitter conflict. I believe we are fortunate in having at the head of the Militia Department a gentleman who, although a general in the Canadian army, is of an essentially civilian turn of mind, and who is not desirous of seeing great military establishments formed in this country. May I be allowed to ask the House to approve and support the idea which he has set forth? I think we should not allow our militia organization to fall to pieces, I am quite at one with him there; but I would reduce the expenditure on the upkeep of our militia to the smallest point consonant with the maintenance of a skeleton organization. The load of debt which we have in this country does not for business reasons permit us to do otherwise. But there is something much greater than business reasons—the heart of humanity is crying out for release from mitilarism. In so far as we can do so consistently with national safety we should endeavour to meet that demand, which is uttered by the whole human race.

Major-General MEWBURN: I am delighted to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite. I have been pressed to lay down some immediate policy regarding our militia organization. We have been keeping very closely in touch and endeavouring to get information from Paris as to the future military organizations of the world We are also getting information from a commission which is sitting at the British War Office to-day dealing with post-bellum war conditions and reorganization of the British army, on which we have one of our most distinguished officers, General McBrien, who has been an outstanding figure throughout the war. He has been transmitting to us a lot of valuable information. Also we have been keeping in close touch with the reorganization in the United States. They started out with the idea of maintaining a permanent standing army of some 500,000 men, but I think they are modifying their views. I have felt, as I have already stated, that it would be very foolish for us in Canada to launch into a big military scheme at the present moment, and therefore we came to the conclusion that this suggested committee should go into the matter very carefully and get the views of various parts of the Dominion on the matter, and next session the whole matter could be fully considered.

I take issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) in his reference to members of the militia who, he considers, have not done their duty. No doubt in many militia units throughout Canada there were men of that calibre, but I think I can safely say that of most of the militia units that were in exist-

ence in 1914, every officer, non-commissioned officer and man who was of military age and medically fit has served at the front or is over there now. I speak particularly of the city corps. The peace establishment of an ordinary city battalion was something like 445. Not an officer, non-commissioned officer or man drew one cent of pay from the Government. The pay they got for annual training went into their regimental funds and they paid out of their own pockets for the extra uniform and equipment to keep these units up to their establishment. I believe most of the men of these city corps, without one exception, served at the front. The officers took a great many military and staff courses, paid their own expenses, gave up their holidays in order to train. The money devoted to these city corps really came back into the coffers of the Government for the benefit of the country. They maintained their own bands and other organizations at their own expense. I do not wish to speak boastfully, but of my own battalion in Hamilton some 124 officers and 3,800 men went overseas; 20 officers were killed; 12,000 men from Hamilton went overseas. While these men have been overseas the organizations have been kept up so that when the men come back from the front they have a home to go to. That is creditable, so it is advisable to keep up the nucleus of these organizations. But it is premature for us to launch into some big military scheme now; the matter will have to be given very serious consideration.

Mr. POWER: We have had almost a love feast here this evening. First the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) congratulates the minister; then the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster); and now I have my word of endorsation to add to what the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) had to say. I agree with the member for Frontenac that there have been in Canada during the last three or four years a large number of militia officers who should have gone to the front. but did not. They have walked around in uniform for several years, and I do not think they should be in a position now to hold high commands in the militia. If the militia is re-organized, it should be the business of the minister to see that men who have been at the front are put in charge of the battalions. Further, if a man did not go overseas because he was medically unfit, but still remains in the militia, he should be retired, because if he is not fit to be a soldier in France I do not see what use he can be here.

Major-General MEWBURN: In the present reorganization, the senior officer in the militia unit concerned who has seen service overseas, will take command of the regiment and will make his recommendation with regard to new officers in that regiment. This will eliminate all those who have not been overseas.

Mr. POWER: When officers who were in the militia units and who proceeded overseas, return and are demobilized, what will be their rank?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is one of the policies that we have not definitely settled. What we have done is this: In many cases officers who held the rank of lieutenant in militia regiments went overseas and rose to the rank of lieutenant-colonel. As these officers return from the front and are struck off the strength, they are placed on what is called the Canadian Expeditionary Force Reserve of Officers, with the rank that they held overseas or obtained at the front. Of course, they may still appear on the rolls of the old militia units, because, as we have not yet settled upon a definite policy in this regard, we are not in a position to disband those militia units.

Mr. EDWARDS: What would be the rank, say, of a major who reverted to go to the front and did not succeed in regaining the rank which he originally held?

Major-General MEWBURN: The rank which he originally held would be restored.

Mr. MOWAT: What is the scope of the inquiry which is to be conducted by the Sir William Otter commission?

Major-General MEWBURN: Sir William Otter has been requested to organize a commission or committee to go into the matters of which I have spoken. As yet he has done nothing beyond collecting an enormous amount of data in connection with headquarters here and compiling a lot of information. In the meantime, he is awaiting the return to Canada of some officers from overseas. The commission will inquire into and report upon the future reorganization of the militia. A great many people in Canada—I frankly say that I myself am in favour of it, although I do not know whether I shall live to see it—advocate universal military training in this country. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) spoke of the Swiss system, which is undoubtedly one of the best systems in the

world, the cheapest and most satisfactory system ouside of conscription, in all the continental countries. Personally I think that the youth of this country should be induced in some way to put in a certain amount of training; it would be better for the youth, and better for the country. How far the country will care to go in that regard I cannot say. But this Committee will be able to give an expression of opinion from other countries as to what should be done.

Mr. MOWAT: I am in favour of universal training. Apparently General Otter's commission will inquire only into the best method of consolidating or co-ordinating the militia units overseas and at home on the old basis of pay. To my mind that is not the most advantageous system for Canada. Canada's soldiers should serve without pay; it is because pay has been attached to the service that many of our troubles in the past have arisen, and that difficulty has been experienced in getting men of the proper spirit into the militia. I would not like this item to pass without having had the minister say that this matter will be thoroughly discussed at the proper time when his other Estimates are up. I am delighted to hear the expressions of opinion which emanated from my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). I am sure that my hon. and gallant friend from Quebec East (Mr. Power) will take part in this discussion to the great advantage of the Committee and of the country. The trouble is that during the last couple of years a difference of opinion has arisen between Ontario and Quebec on the question of "conscription." As regards universal training of young men from eighteen to twenty-five, of whom there are some 336,000 in Canada, if they would train voluntarily, that is, receiving nothing more than mere pocket money, that would be of great advantage to their physical and moral well-being. Speaking of that, which I purpose advocating at another time, I think it is not unnatural that expressions of opinion in favour of it coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, should come from those living in Quebec, because that province first gave Canada the idea of universal service. As long ago as 1808, that province passed the first Militia Act which made every man then fit to carry arms in the province of Lower Canada a member of the militia. The only members of the militia to-day are those who are full of an ardent military spirit or who take the annual training for a holiday or for the money that is in it. That was not, however, the case with the men of Quebec in the early times. They joined because they felt it was their duty as well as a pleasure to do so, and I am quite sure the spirit which animated them in passing that Act still exists in Quebec to-day, and when we come to discuss this question, I am sure we shall have many supporters from that province.

If one looked through the militia list, one would find page after page, for almost hundreds of pages, of names of members of cadet corps established in the schools and seminaries of Quebec, a greater proportion in Quebec than in any other province, so that there must have been that idea prevailing throughout Quebec in the last few years. Those things all conduce to the idea that we can get rid of the pay system in the militia, which system has been to its detriment, and for which before the war in 1914, we paid $10,000,000. We can escape a great part of this enormous expenditure and get a much more efficient, loyal and better trained army of citizen soldiers as they have them in Australia, South Africa and New Zealand and as they are now to have in the United States. We cannot be behind the United States of America in this great idea because, if we are to live beside them in our present friendly manner, we cannot say to the world: We are going to drag behind and have no efficient force and be, to a certain extent, under an obligation to our great neighbour to the south. That would be beneath the pride of Canada. In the state of New York a system of universal training has been adopted for boys up to nineteen, and a boy cannot only not get a graduation certificate from a school, but he cannot get employment unless he has a certificate to show that he has been trained. That measure was passed in the state of New York last year after thorough debate, and I believe the same idea which made the legislature of that state come to that conclusion will be found to exist in Canada. Similar legislation is now before the United States Congress at Washington, with very good prospects of being passed there. Therefore, we are gradually accustoming our young men to the idea that as they pass through life they must recognize that some military force is necessary. We cannot do without it altogether, and the best way will be to accustom every man to think that not only must he go to school to educate himself in the ordinary rudiments of learning, but that he must look forward to taking part, if the call should come, in the defence of his

womankind and his country, although we hope that he will never be called upon to do so. He will not be a paid soldier, a mercenary; he will be a man who is full of the best patriotism, and who will be willing to give a few weeks a year in order to take up arms if arms are necessary.

Cadet services—for pay of instructors, expenses of teachers qualifying at military schools, and contingent expenses, $75,000.

Major-General MEWBURN: I am sorry the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is not in the House just now. I agree with everything the hon. gentleman said as regards the cadet corps throughout Canada, which have a wonderful record. I have here a memorandum which I have not been able to complete, but for the benefit of the committee I should like to give these figures which are much less than the actual numbers, because we have not the returns from all parts. The figures I have show that the number of young cadets, that is, members of cadet corps in Canada, who enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for overseas service, was over 40,000. Of these, 2,319 were killed in action; 11 obtained the Victoria Cross; 857 received other decorations; and 401 obtained commissions. The record is a most creditable one. The vote of $75,000 is just the same as last year. The pre-war expenditures in 1913-1914 for cadet services was $392,000. Personally, I should like to see the appropriation increased a little this year, and I may ask later on in the Supplementary Estimates for an increase. The present vote is barely enough to keep the organizations going, and even now many of the schools throughout Canada are anxious to continue their cadet corps and build them up again.

Mr. POWER: What is this money expended on? For instructors?

Major-General MEWBURN: For pay of instructors, expenses of teachers qualifying at military schools, and contingent expenses. It includes the pay and allowances and transportation of all the organizers and inspectors, and also an instructional allowance of one dollar each for the first fifty cadets, and fifty cents each for the excess over fifty, in each corps. They furnish their own uniforms.

Mr. POWER: Is that amount per annum?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes. A certain amount is paid for physical training instructors.

[Mr. Mowat.]

Mr. POWER: Is the cost of rifles and other arms included in this vote?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Engineer services and works, ordinary repairs and works, Halifax defences, Quebec defences, Esquimalt defences, $430,000.

Major-General MEWBURN: This is for all the care and upkeep of the various armouries and general engineer services. It does not cover the extraordinary amounts. That would come under Public Works.

Mr. POWER: Does this cover building the armouries?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, that would come under Public Works.

Mr. POWER: Is this not a large item for ordinary repairs and works?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, it has been pared down. The pre-war expenses ran over a million dollars.

Mr. POWER: What has been done to the citadel at Quebec?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is a re-vote of $20,000 for that. The whole vote was not expended.

Mr. POWER: What is it for?

Major-General MEWBURN: The upkeep of the walls of the citadel.

Grants to associations and bands—for grants to artillery and rifle associations, military bands and military institutions, $25,000.

Mr. PEDLOW: Does this cover grants to rifle associations?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

Mr. PEDLOW: I was not aware that any grants had been allowed during the last four years, but I see that the same amount was in last year's Estimates.

Major-General MEWBURN: Only about $5,000 of last year's vote was spent, but we expect to expend the money this year. We have already had applications from several rifle associations, which want to reorganize and to go on with both Dominion and provincial rifle association matches. Even the Bisley matches are going on again in England, and the authorities overseas are anxious that we should send a team over, and it is suggested that some of the men who have been overseas should form a team. A number of civilian organizations would like to organize again.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it in order for rifle associations to send in applications for grants as before the war, and for rifles and other equipment?

Major-General MEWBURN: It is quite in order, and we would be very glad to take the matter up.

Mr. PEDLOW: This year?

Major-General MEWBURN: I hope so. I would be very glad to encourage rifle associations in every way.

Mr. PEDLOW: Are rifles available now if asked for?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes, there would be no difficulty in getting them now.

Mr. POWER: What military bands are included in this item?

Major-General MEWBURN: Regimental bands of the various city corps. A maximum amount of $180 was given to city corps for bands. I think I am safe in saying that nearly every city corps in Canada kept its band in some sort of organization, and many bandsmen went to the front. Quite a large number have come back and are going into the regimental bands again. They have, indeed, been a perfect God-send to the troops coming back, and many of them are turning out to welcome the returned soldiers.

This does not in any way maintain the organizations, as they are maintained by the regiments themselves.

Headquarters and District Staffs, $225,000.

Mr. COPP: What staffs are these?

Major-General MEWBURN: The Headquarters staff here, and the staffs at Military Districts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13. The staff includes the officer commanding the military district, general staff officer, the Deputy Assistant Adjutant and Quartermaster General, the officer in charge of administration, and the district intelligence officer.

Mr. COPP: Does the vote pertain to the headquarters staffs in the military districts where men are being demobilized?

Major-General MEWBURN: The bulk of those are only temporary appointments, changing almost every day. They come under the war vote.

Mr. COPP: At the proper time I wish to say something about these staffs in the different military districts, particularly in the province of New Brunswick. At the present time there is a sort of guard at St. John, N.B.

Major-General MEWBURN: Those men are all drawing Canadian Expeditionary Force rates and allowances.

Mr. POWER: I want to call the minister's attention again to the fact that in these headquarters' staffs for the military districts there are a large number of men who did not see service overseas. These good staff positions should undoubtedly go to the men who have seen service at the front. I drew the minister's attention to this matter last year, and he promised that at the earliest opportunity he would see to it that the overseas men were appointed to important positions on the district staffs. Shortly after that I put a question on the Order Paper asking who were employed on the headquarters staff at Military District No. 5. There were twenty officers, if I remember correctly, only four of whom had seen service at the front. The amount paid out in salaries per month was $4,000, of which something like $800 was paid to returned soldiers, and the general in charge of the staff also drew his salary out of that $4,000. Obviously, the returned soldiers of that district were not getting the positions to which they were entitled. At the beginning of this session I put another question on the Order Paper with reference to the headquarters staffs, but through delay from some cause or another, I have not received an answer yet. From the information that I have obtained here and there, however, I have come to the conclusion that most of the district staffs are in the same position as Quebec. There has been a slight improvement, I am told, since last year, but not to the extent there should have been. I do not like to bother the minister about this all the time, but I really think that the people of this country expect good staff positions to be given to returned soldiers.

9 p.m.

Major-General MEWBURN: Since I have been Minister of Militia and Defence I have not made any permanent appointments in the Militia Department, and so far as I am concerned every appointment that is made will be given to a man who has seen overseas service. With respect to the officers who have been employed and are employed to-day on district staffs through the period of demobilization, I am only too glad to retain the officers who have done faithful work during this war. A large number of officers have been unjustly abused for holding down what is called Government or militia jobs who were unable to go overseas. In the early period of the war a great injustice was done to some of our Canadian soldiers. When the

war broke out some of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the permanent corps were prohibited from going overseas; they were held here, and rightly so; and these men felt very keenly because they could not go. They were willing to take their chances, and it was not cowardice that kept them back. If we had not had officers and non-commissioned officers in Canada we should not have had troops in France. It was absolutely necessary that they should do the work which had to be done here, and I think all credit is due them. Some people say that because they have not been overseas they should get out. That is not the proper spirit. I know hundreds of officers in the country were disappointed at not being allowed to go overseas, and before and immediately after the signing of the Armistice I received the resignation of many officers who wanted to make room immediately for officers from overseas. We have had the greatest difficulty in getting officers to stay and help in the problem of demobilization. The work that is involved to-day with the return of the troops is of great magnitude. We have to deal with 40,000 to 45,000 troops every month, and every man has to be dealt with individually. We cannot simply let the men go home, but every account has to be made up as well as the paysheets and it is like a run on a bank. I think that the people will appreciate, even if they do not say so, the loyal faithful way in which these officers have done their work. As regards permanent appointments all these districts staffs will be reduced to the minimum, and in some districts there will not be more than four or five permanent positions which I hope will be filled by officers from the front. Officers coming back are not anxious to take up civil life again, and I have made it a point to see as far as possible every officer returning to Ottawa and urge him for his own good to get back into civil work, because military jobs will no longer exist for many of them in two or three years' time, and it will be much harder then than it is at present for the men to resume civil occupation. Every important position in the Militia Department should be given to a returned man. But why should this not apply to all the departments—Customs, Post Office, Railway and everything else? And if it is suggested that those in the Militia Department who have not been overseas should get out, the same principle should apply to the other departments. We have an organization of railway troops, the Canadian engineers, the finest that the world has ever known, men of outstanding deeds in the war. In the United States the army engineers take charge of public works, and why should the engineers not take charge of public works in Canada and build canals and highways. We all say we want to give the returned soldiers jobs. Well, why not let them carry on the public works of Canada? I believe the country would save money and get better work and the returned soldier would get a better show.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the department disposed of the rifle ranges at Rockcliffe?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In my opinion these were the most magnificent rifle ranges in all Canada. Some years ago the department bought a farm in the county of Carleton and new rifle ranges were built. I happened to visit them three or four years ago with my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy), and I observed that there had been a vast expenditure of money at that place. Of what use is this rifle range to the department at present? Is it intended to make use of it in the future?

Major-General MEWBURN: An hon. member asked me last year about the Connaught rifle ranges.

Mr. COPP: He will accept the answer now.

Major-General MEWBURN: The Connaught rifle range was a property bought by the Government about five miles from Britannia. It is probably one of the finest rifle ranges, I was going to say almost in the world. It was laid out for a very large range, and considerable work was done on it. It was never quite completed, all the work having stopped with the war, but it could be completed with a very small expenditure. It is within a mile of the train. The Rockliffe rifle range is a beautiful place and if shooting develops as in the past, and a great deal of interest is taken all over Canada in the Dominion Rifle Association, it will come into being. The Connaught rifle range would be the proper place to carry out rifle shooting. It is a magnificent property. It could also be utilized for camp purposes. But during the war it has lain dormant and no use has been made of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I suggest, in view of the expenditures which were made for the acquisition and equipment of these ranges, that it would be in the interest of

the country to sell the other property as a pure venture in real estate? I can assure my hon. friend that the Rockcliffe rifle ranges are worth money. You could get a very fine price for that property, and in that way recoup yourself for what has been spent on the Connaught ranges.

Major-General MEWBURN: I quite agree with my hon. friend. I understand it was the intention that the Rockcliffe ranges should be put on the market. But during the war and up to 1917 the Rockcliffe ranges were used for instructional purposes for officers going overseas. If the Connaught ranges had been completed, I understand the other would have been on the market.

Mr. COPP: Is the land comprised within the Connaught ranges cultivated land?

The CHAIRMAN: If hon. gentlemen would allow us to pass the vote now under consideration, this discussion would be perfectly in order under the next item, which concerns rifle ranges.

Mr. COPP: The hon. gentleman brought this question up himself.

Mr. NICKLE: I happened to be up in the Railway Committee so I am not aware of what may have taken place since this item was called. There are one or two points to which I would like to draw the attention of the minister, as I come from one of the military district headquarters in Ontario. I quite agree with what the minister has said that there were a number of men on the district and headquarters staffs who would have been glad indeed to have gone overseas if the opportunity had offered, but the necessity of undertaking the mobilizing and training of the men who volunteered and who were subsequently called under the Military Service Act obliged them to remain in Canada, and without doubt they did good work. In the progress of the war very many men in connection with the district and headquarters staffs attained, as was natural, very rapid promotion, with the result that the emoluments of their offices were very largely increased. At the present time they have the exalted rank incidental to war activities. It occurs to me that when Canada returns to a peace basis it would be well that the minister and his deputies should be active to see that there is a readjustment of the staffs, so that the Consolidated Revenue Fund is not unduly called upon to meet large expenditures for men of exalted rank who will be discharging duties of no very onerous character and involving no very great responsibility. In other words, what I am asking is that the minister should proceed as he has been doing in connection with the demobilization, as promptly as possible, to clear the service of all superfluous officers of high rank, unless these gentlemen are prepared to accept much less remuneration than that to which their present rank would now entitle them. I believe the people were quite willing to give remuneration in proportion to the responsibilities borne during war time, but I do not believe that they will be content, particularly when the strain of the war debt comes upon them, to have a large number of men of high rank engaged on the district and headquarters' staffs paid salaries—unless the suggestion I am making to the minister is put into effect—not commensurate with the duties that they will then be called upon to perform.

Major-General MEWBURN: I explained that pretty fully before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nickle) came in.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many officers are there at the headquarters staff at Halifax, district No. 6?

Major-General MEWBURN: There are on the actual headquarters staff only five officers. There are in addition the officers in connection with the hospital situation there, the dental service, and the officers in connection with the fortifications that we are closing up. There are also in connection with demobilization the dispersal areas and the army service units. They are all temporary appointments.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: How many are there altogether?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not like to say. There is a garrison regiment, the discharge depot, and the officers in connection with transportation and disembarkation at Halifax and who are temporary.

Mr. PECK: In the event of an officer of high rank, who had served in the army and who in the olden times had belonged to the permanent force being assigned to a military district, I presume that his salary would not be reduced?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is a difficult problem. There is no provision in the law for dealing with a case of that kind. Take the case of a Major General commanding a division in the field, or a permanent corps officer; when he comes home the only appointment he can get is

at headquarters here or command of a military district. I am afraid that such men will have to come and take the salary of pre-war days unless Parliament is willing to increase these salaries. They would not receive the Canadian Expeditionary Force pay and allowances, because the pay and allowances will cease at the conclusion of the war. I appreciate the position of a lot of these officers who have attained high rank at the front, who have rendered distinguished services and who have commanded divisions in the field.

Mr. PECK: There are only three or four such cases?

Major-General MEWBURN: There are to my knowledge, three who have been Generals in the field and they are entitled to the first consideration. But there is no provision in the Militia Act authorizing us to deal with their cases. To-day they are drawing the pay and allowances of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. PECK: At present the commander of a military district is engaged for only three or four years?

Major-General MEWBURN: The usual tenure of command is four years. There is nobody in any military district who has a permanent appointment.

Mr. POWER: Is there no special allowance for a G.O.C. of a district?

Major-General MEWBURN: His pay and allowance covers everything. The Canadian Expeditionary Force pay and allowance overseas are greater than those of peace times here. In the permanent corps there were certain allowances.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON: Is it possible for some of the medical men in the Canadian Army Medical Corps to be released in order to procure the positions which are going to be created in connection with the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment? I believe that most of these appointments are being made from amongst civilian practitioners for the very good reason that others are not available.

Major-General MEWBURN: That is one of our most difficult problems. I would not like to make the positive statement, but as near as our estimates can indicate we figure that we ought to be pretty well through with our hospitalization work in connection with the soldier patients about next February. I would not like to state that positively. The Civil Re-establishment work will go on for a great many years. At the time of the armistice our casualties overseas were 45,000. We brought back a large number of patients for treatment in our hospitals, and it was a most difficult problem to figure out our requirements. We estimate that some time about the first of May 18,000 Canadian patients will have been brought back to Canada. That indicates that the number is being reduced very rapidly. After that I do not think there will be more than 14,000 to bring back. They are gradually recovering; in fact, they are recovering more rapidly than we expected. They are coming out of the hospitals and going back to civilian life. Therefore, the medical profession, those magnificent men who went overseas, and even those who served in Canada in the hospitals, giving up their private practices in order to do so, are naturally anxious to get back and pick up their practices or to get some employment with the pension commissioners, or with the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Commission, which will be of a more permanent nature. We are endeavouring to cope with that situation and to release these medical officers as rapidly as it is possible to do so. We do not want to retain a medical officer one minute longer than we must. A large percentage of the medical officers and members of the dental profession are staying on out of a pure sense of loyalty to duty, in order to look after the patients in the hospitals. It is a most difficult problem, and it is most embarrassing for us to have to ask these men to continue. They are working for a mere pittance compared with the emoluments of their private practices, and although they are most anxious to get back and pick up their work, they are staying on the job simply because they think it is their duty to the returned soldiers who have been wounded.

Mr. BOYCE: Does that include the Connaught rifle range?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think that has anything to do with the rifle ranges.

Mr. BOYCE: I find here:

For grants to artillery and rifle associations,—

Am I out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: No, sir.

Mr. BOYCE: The Connaught rifle range is one of the finest properties in that section of the country, and I suppose that about half a million to a million dollars has been spent on it. At the present time it is used as a cattle range. There are some-

thing over 2,000 acres in this property let at a rental of 50 cents an acre. That is a very small sum of money for such a large piece of land. I only discovered that after a great deal of trouble. I also discovered that the department employs a caretaker to look after the property at $1,200 a year, and as it is only getting about $900 in return it seems to me not to be a very paying speculation. I do not think it is very much to the credit of the country to keep such a large tract of land for the benefit of a few cattle dealers. That property could be laid out as one of the best rifle ranges on the North American continent. Why does not the department rent the land to some farmers? A farmer tried last year to rent it, but he was turned down. Those few cattle dealers have been making a fortune fattening cattle on that range, and I think it is time something was done to stop this mismanagement. But that is not the worst part of it. I went several times to try to get some person a job and was asked: Was he a returned soldier? If not, he could not get the job. Is there a returned soldier on the job now?

Major-General MEWBURN: No; there is to be one.

Mr. BOYCE: Why does not the department put a returned soldier on it? It is giving a man who is not a returned soldier $1,200 a year for doing nothing. I was turned down last year on this item, I was told I was out of order, and I was beginning to think I would be out of order tonight, but I was determined to press my question. I hope the gentleman in charge of the department will see that something is done to improve this condition of affairs.

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand the range is let for grazing purposes. I did not appoint the careteaker, but I gave instructions some time ago for the appointment of a returned soldier directly the present man's contract is up. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has drawn my attention to the matter, but it had been already dealt with and the change he suggests is going to be made.

Mr. BOYCE: What are you doing with the timber?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think there is any intention to cut the timber. We do not know for what purpose we may require the property.

Mr. BOYCE: Some timber was cut down for firewood last winter.

Major-General MEWBURN: A certain amount of fallen timber was taken by the Militia Department last winter and used in various barracks for fuel.

Mr. BOYCE: I have it on the best authority that a hundred cords of good green standing trees were cut.

Mr. DEVLIN: There are some fine farms over there.

Mr. COPP: I could not hear all my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) was saying, and he might have been giving to the minister the information I want to get. What money has been expended so far on this rifle range?

Major-General MEWBURN: I could not give exact figures now, but I think about $780,000 up to 1916.

Mr. COPP: And the work was not completed, was it?

Major-General MEWBURN: No. I think the balance of the contract at the time work was stopped was something like $40,000. It was stopped in 1916.

Mr. COPP: Has the land been cultivated by any person, and have any returns been received by the department from the sale of crops.

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand the only revenue derived is about $960 for grazing rights; there is no land cultivated.

Mr. COPP: Was it let by tender to one individual or more?

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand three or four tenders were received. The highest tender was accepted.

Mr. COPP: How many years has that been going on?

Major-General MEWBURN: Two years ago I believe, and the rights have been renewed.

Mr. COPP: I have not exact figures, but I understand a large quantity of valuable timber was cut and carried away by others than the Militia Department or any other department of the Government.

Major-General MEWBURN: I understand that the only timber cut was cut and utilized by the Militia Department in connection with one or two camps. I do not know that any good sound timber was cut.

Mr. BOYCE: That property includes 500 acres of the finest land in that part of the country, and I think advantage ought to be taken of it.

Mr. COPP: I would like to know if there is any correspondence in the department with regard to the mismanagement of this property?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not say there is none, but none has been brought to my personal attention.

Mr. BELAND: Mr. Chairman, how many rifle ranges are maintained in the Dominion? A range was established a few years ago at the instance of the Megantic Rifle Association. It is situated in my own riding, although the members of the association live in the county of Compton. I attach special importance to this range, because on the day that it was opened I was invited by the members of the association to be present, and, although I never before had held a rifle in my hand, I demonstrated, by recording a bull's-eye at six hundred yards what a simple art the handling of a rifle is. Is this range still being maintained?

Major-General MEWBURN: I cannot say off-hand: probably it is a regimental rifle range. There is a range in every military district, in some cases more than one. In some parts of Canada rifle-ranges are organized in connection with militia units and maintained on leased private property.

Permanent force, $2,575,000.

Mr. POWER: Is the permanent force not now part of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Major-General MEWBURN: The permanent force pay and allowances have, during the war, been paid out of this vote.

Mr. POWER: Was not an Order in Council passed last summer or autumn to the effect that every unit in Canada was to be part of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Major-General MEWBURN: They are all part of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but the permanent force has always been kept on separate pay and allowances.

Mr. POWER: Is it intended to keep up the permanent force as it has been during the war?

Major-General MEWBURN: We hope to be able to build up a permanent force of 5,000. If that is done, the amount of this vote will have to be increased in the Supplementary Estimates.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Mr. EDWARDS: I assume that the pay and allowances of the permanent force would include pay and allowances to permanent officers located in Ottawa?

Major-General MEWBURN: It would include a few of them here.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is said that some of these officers who were too old to go overseas, or who, at all events, were required here, changed their uniforms to khaki when the war broke out and began to receive subsistence allowance, field allowance, and so on. Perhaps there is a good explanation for that, but it does not occur to me.

Major-General MEWBURN: During the war these men got this extra field allowance. A great many of them should have had their pay doubled, considering the hours that they worked. The men at district headquarters worked day in and day out, Saturdays, Sundays and nights. Last week the staff at headquarters worked until midnight Saturday night, and all day Sunday without going home to lunch —and they do not ask extra duty pay. There is very little criticism of officers working on Canadian Expeditionary Force rates of pay and getting this field allowance.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have no doubt that these men were doing practically double the work that they did in peace times, and were entitled to more pay. Perhaps this was the proper way to give them increased remuneration; it does not strike me that it is the proper way. For instance, the Department of Justice wanted to increase the pay of a certain man connected with the department, and they could think of no other way of doing it than that of making him a lieutenant and having him draw a lieutenant's pay as well as the salary of his official position in the department. That looks like a roundabout way of doing the thing; it looks as if there was an attempt to cover something up. If a man deserves an increase in pay, give it to him in a straight and above board manner. I do not say that these officers were getting more than they should, but I do not see the necessity of giving them consideration by sending around a roast of beef or bag of potatoes and calling it rations or subsistence allowance or something of that kind. It looks to the ordinary layman as a way of getting graft.

Major-General MEWBURN: The practice which has been followed, has prevailed in the army for a great many years.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, and there has been a certain amount of graft in the army for a number of years, too.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do I understand the minister to say that we have a permanent force at the present time of 2,000 to 3,000 ?

Major-General MEWBURN: The strength is a little over 3,000, and we hope to build it up to 5,000, the establishment authorized by the Militia Act.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Under present conditions, a permanent force of 5,000 men for Canada is the least that any one should contemplate. I do not know what our responsibilities may be in the matter of the league of nations; perhaps the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) can tell us. I understand that the United States have announced that they are prepared to organize a standing army of 500,000 men, if necessary, in order that they may take upon themselves their share of the responsibility of policing the world. Canada may be called upon to do a little of that from time to time, and surely the modest estimate the minister gives for the permanent force should be attained in the very near future. We have excellent material coming back from overseas at present, and amongst those men and officers will certainly be found some who desire to follow soldiering as a career. I trust the minister will get at least 5,000 men as soon as possible, and that they will be maintained as a permanent force in Canada, so that we may preserve our self-respect as a very humble member in the great League of Nations that is being proclaimed as practically the millennium of the world. After all, whether the League is an ideal, or something of a concrete formation, its ultimate resort will evidently be physical force, and we cannot expect to maintain the position of Canada in the League of Nations unless we have at least a few men upon whom we can call, who are, at any rate, ready for eventualities, I am heartily in accord with the prospect that the minister holds out, that we shall have 5,000 officers and men in the permanent force in the near future—and in my judgment it cannot come too soon.

Mr. POWER: Will the minister explain the procedure as regards purchasing provisions and supplies?

Major-General MEWBURN: Everything is done through the War Purchasing Commission.

Salaries and wages—for pay of caretakers, messengers, barrack labourers, boat crews at Halifax, engineers and firemen for the drill halls, and all other civil employees in the districts not provided for elsewhere, $260,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does this cover?

Major-General MEWBURN: It covers salaries and wages of caretakers, messengers and so on in the various military districts, at the dock yards at Halifax, and also in the barracks and hospitals throughout the Dominion. For instance, it includes all the caretakers at the rifle ranges.

Surveys, $35,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What are these surveys?

Major-General MEWBURN: They are military topographical surveys made all over Canada. The item has been gradually cut down, and we hope to get the work completed eventually. Salaries in connection with this work amount to about $24,500; transport and sundry expenses in the field and maintenance, $3,700; freight and express, $130; miscellaneous, $870.

Mr. POWER: On what scale are the maps?

Major-General MEWBURN: One inch to the mile. The total area surveyed amounts to 28,000 square miles.

Mr. COPP: What is the purpose of these surveys?

Major-General MEWBURN: To prepare a regular military topographical map, showing the water features; the boundaries of counties, townships and cities; the timber, and other features of military value. The maps, while ostensibly for military purposes, are most complete and can be utilized for almost any other purpose.

Mr. COPP: Are they sent out promiscuously?

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. COPP: Are they filed in the department?

Major-General MEWBURN: It would not be in the public interest to distribute them, but they are always available.

Mr. COPP: I cannot see what advantage they are to military officers if they are filed away in the department, and if the maps are of public importance they ought to be made public.

Major-General MEWBURN: It certainly would not be in the public interest to distribute these military maps.

Transport and freight, $25,000.

Mr. CANNON: Can the minister explain why the transport of the staff is estimated

at $15,000 and the transport of the permanent force, which would include the whole permanent force except the officers, at only $10,000? Apparently it costs more to transport the officers than the rest of the army.

Major-General MEWBURN: We have cut the item down by $10,000. It is to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with transport between the different districts. A lot of shipments are made between the different districts.

Mr. CANNON: But my point is this: How does the minister figure out that it is going to cost more to transport the officers than the rest of the army?

Major-General MEWBURN: The men are not moving from one station to another as the officers are.

Mr. CANNON: It does not include the transport of a battalion to a training camp?

Major-General MEWBURN: Oh, no.

Training areas, $35,000.

Mr. POWER: In what district are these training areas?

Major-General MEWBURN: We do not propose spending very much this year. It is estimated that $900 will cover the cost of the site at North Sydney required for defence work. The site at Beaumont was selected early in August, 1914. This item is mainly to cover unforeseen expenditures in connection with the training areas, and there will be no particular expenditure on the training areas themselves.

10 p.m.

Mr. CANNON: I judge from the minister's answer that the department does not intend to buy any more property around Valcartier camp.

Major-General MEWBURN: No.

Mr. CANNON: Is that camp going to be closed down?

Major-General MEWBURN: I would not like to say it is going to be closed. I hope it will come into being again, because it is one of the best camps in Canada.

Miscellaneous—amount required to pay Consular officers abroad for services, $300.

Mr. CANNON: Is this to pay our own Consuls? I understand we have Consuls now.

Mr. ROWELL: No, Canada has not her own Consular officers. This item is simply to cover the expenses that may be incurred by a Consul in some foreign country in procuring information requested by this Government. This item is similar to last year's. It is to pay the Consular officers appointed by Great Britain to whom we might write to procure information on certain specific matters, the procuring of which would entail some small expenditure.

Mr. CANNON: If they are officers of the British Government, should not the British Government pay them? Why should we add to their salary?

Mr. ROWELL: I speak from a very general knowledge of the matter, but I understand that this is not compensation for their services, but to repay small expenses they may have incurred in procuring information for us.

Mr. CANNON: Can the minister give the House a concrete example?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot to-night, but I shall be glad to get one. However, the item is very small.

Mr. CANNON: But the principle seems to be bad. For instance, if the Canadian Government has certain work to perform through the British Embassy in Washington, would the minister maintain that this Government should pay for services rendered by officers of the British Embassy?

Mr. ROWELL: No. I have already said that that was not the character of the expenditure. It is simply to provide for the payment of expenses incurred by a Consular officer at our request.

Mr. JACOBS: I think there ought to be some reciprocity between the two Governments. Suppose we obtain information for the British Government, do we charge them for the expenses incurred? They would only be trifling amounts.

Mr. ROWELL: This vote is only for a trifling amount.

Mr. JACOBS: The point I wish to make is this: If the British Government asked us to procure certain information we would surely do that without exacting from them the small outlay entailed.

Mr. ROWELL: There would be no charge for services rendered, but if an expenditure was made by us at the request of the British Government I presume an account would be rendered. If the British Government incurs an expense at our request, I presume an account would be rendered, and it would be paid out of this small appropriation.

Mr. CANNON: But the minister must have some facts on which this estimate is based. Why should we vote this $300?

Mr. ROWELL: It is the same amount as last year. If my hon. friend wishes the item to stand I am willing, and I will get him a concrete example.

Mr. Béland carried.

Salaries and expenses of the Paris Agency, $28,000.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Canada is represented in Paris by a Canadian Commissioner, Mr. Philippe Roy, who has charge of the office there and is rendering very efficient service. I think it was wise to open a Canadian office in Paris, and I believe it is being very satisfactorily administered by the present commissioner. Owing to the increased cost of living I expect it will be necessary to bring down a supplementary estimate making some further provision for the expenses of the Paris office. The vote is the same as last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I agree with what my hon. friend says in regard to the Paris office. In former years we had but a small office, and although the incumbent, Mr. Fabre, was a man of very great attainments, owing to the small amount which he had at his disposal for the maintenance of the office he could not do very much. There has been a great improvement, however, since the appointment of Senator Roy who has undoubtedly rendered most valuable service to the country. All our public men who have visited France during the last four years can testify to his ability and his earnestness in looking after the interests of Canada in Paris. He is a splendid representative, a man of great education, and, what is more, he is a business man. I think he will play an important part in developing our trade with France. I have read in the Revue France-Amérique and in other journals some of the speeches delivered by Mr. Roy at meetings of business men in France, and I was proud of our representative there. Evidently the cost of living in Paris as well as in London, Brussels, and elsewhere on the continent has doubled if not trebled, and I am glad to hear the President of the Privy Council state that he will see that our representative and his staff are treated fairly. Formerly the office was on rue de Rome, a by-street of Paris. Today, however, it is on the Boulevard des Capucins in a conspicuous situation, standing as a striking advertisement of Canada. I understand that the interior appointments of the office are modern and up-to-date and are a credit to the country.

Allowance to Mr. W. J. Stewart, Chief Hydrographer, for services performed under Order in Council of the 19th October, 1912, in relation to questions under consideration by the International Joint Commission, during the year 1919-20, $1,000.

Mr. CANNON: What was this Order in Council?

Mr. ROWELL: Under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain under which the International Joint Commission was appointed, the commissioner is authorized to investigate and consider questions relating to boundary matters between the United States and Canada. Mr. Stewart is one of the experts of the department here and is entrusted with special duties as adviser to the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission. In regard to a question which arose last year with reference to water-power, Mr. Stewart investigated the whole matter on behalf of the Canadian section of the commission in order to inform them of the facts from the engineering and scientific standpoint. I am advised that he is a very capable man, and is rendering efficient service in protecting Canadian interests in this important regard.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister be good enough to lay on the Table as soon as possible the award or judgment which was rendered by the commission on this question of the St. Lawrence water-power? He knows what award I am referring to. Yesterday I brought up the question, and the Minister of Railways stated that the arrangement was that the company in question would be allowed to exploit that water-power during five years after the war. I do not object to the exploitation of that water-power on a basis which would be acceptable to both Canada and the United States, but I would not like any particular industry to have a monopoly of the power. The judgment, which I think has been published in book form would be very useful for future reference.

Mr. ROWELL: I shall endeavour to lay it on the Table to-morrow. My present recollection of the judgment differs slightly from the view given by the Minister of Railways and my hon. friend, but it is no use discussing it until we have the actual order here.

Mr. COPP: Is Mr. Stewart a regular employee of the Government?

Mr. ROWELL: I believe he is, although I am not familiar with the particular branch of the work he is engaged in.

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. W. J. Stewart was a distinguished graduate of the Royal Military College, and for about thirty years he has been engaged in work of this nature.

Mr. COPP: What department is he working in?

Mr. ROWELL: I am told that he is in the Department of Naval Affairs, but I am not sure.

Mr. COPP: This is a special allowance. But what does he do, and what is his regular salary?

Mr. ROWELL: In the absence of the Minister of Naval Affairs I cannot say what his work in the other department is. I can only speak as to his work in this department, which is undoubtedly very important and valuable. All those who have to do with Mr. Stewart have spoken in the highest terms of the service he is rendering on these important questions.

Mr. COPP: I have no doubt of that, and I am willing to accept the statement of the minister and of the other hon. gentleman in regard to this distinguished man. But that does not give us the information we desire. If this man is well paid by the Government for doing regular work and this is in his regular work, I do not see why, because he is distinguished, we should vote an extra allowance. If he has done extra work for which he is entitled to be paid, let us know what it is and we will be prepared to consider the question.

Mr. ROWELL: This is not a new allowance. On the general principle I am in accord with what the hon. gentleman has said; I think it is wiser that officials should be paid one salary only. But here is a case where an officer has been in receipt of a salary from two departments. He has been dividing his time between the two. Had he not been receiving these amounts from these two departments, and had he been devoting himself to the work of one department only I have no doubt that his salary would have been increased. The practice has been for each department to pay him a certain salary.

Mr. COPP: Has this been done for more than one year? What my hon. friend says may be absolutely correct he may be getting a salary from both departments. But I feel that we should call a halt in regard to a system of this kind. Every once in a while we have some minister getting up and slipping through a $1,000 for a man here, and $500 for another there, and we know nothing about it. Members of the House should have some information in regard to what these men are getting from the public treasury. If officials are not paid enough, I do not believe there is a man on this side of the House or the other but is perfectly willing to give them what they are entitled to.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why has the minister delayed the payment of this item since 1912?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is not correct in that. The payment this year is the same as last year. This is the allowance he gets for the service he renders to this department each year. According to the Civil Service list he gets a salary of $4,000 in the Naval Service department; with this $1,000 his total salary is $5,000.

Mr. COPP: He has been getting this salary since 1912?

Mr. ROWELL: All I can say is that he got it last year. I understand he has been getting this salary for some years.

Mr. JACOBS: Why is this not included in the Estimates of the Naval Service Department?

Mr. ROWELL: Because this work is not done for the Naval Service Department but for the International Joint Commission which comes under the department of External Affairs.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the Government pay the cost of that commission?

Mr. ROWELL: It pays the cost of the Canadian section.

Mr. JACOBS: The appointments to the commission, I understand, are made by the British Government.

Mr. ROWELL: The appointments are made by the British Government on the nomination of the Canadian Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: One of the last acts of the Laurier Government was the appointment of Mr. Aimé Geoffrion, K.C., as one of the commissioners. The recommendation was made and sent by the Canadian Government to London in order to get the ratification of that nomination by the British authorities. Meanwhile a storm passed over Canada and, unfortunately for this country, the Government which my hon. friend and myself supported so strenuously in 1911, was defeated. That was a very sorry day for

Canada. A new Government came into office. The first thing that new Government did was to nullify the Order in Council recommending Mr. Geoffrion as one of the commissioners. His Majesty's Government was informed that the recommendation had been made in a moment of weakness, and they recommended Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, K.C., as commissioner. The Home Government accepted the recommendation of the Borden Government and Mr. Casgrain, who later on became Postmaster General, acted as commissioner. Then, when he was sworn in as a member of the Cabinet, he had to resign and his successor was Mr. P. B. Migneault, K.C., who was appointed to that same position following the same appropriate procedure. Then Mr. Migneault was appointed a few months ago a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. Since that time there has been a vacancy on the International Waterways Commission. I am informed that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), on behalf of the Canadian Government, offered the appointment to Mr. F. J. Bisaillon, K.C. Mr. Bisaillon is one of the leading King's Counsel in Canada. He has been engaged in all the big legal cases and is well known throughout the country as a man of great ability. He certainly would be a credit to our country on that commission. It appears that the Minister of Justice informed Mr. Bisaillon that he had been recommended by this Government to the Home Government in succession to Judge Migneault, but since then nothing has been done and the vacancy is there. I hold no brief for Mr. Bisaillon, who is a political opponent, and than whom no one certainly is more deserving of recognition by the Union Government because he has always been—

Mr. McMASTER: May I interrupt the hon. gentleman? This Government has abolished patronage, and such an appeal as this is absolutely beside the point and rather insulting to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This is not an appointment by this Government; it is an appointment by the British Government on the recommendation of the Canadian Government. Mr. Bisaillon was one of the lonely old Conservatives who in the last general election gave a generous support to Union Government. He was told that he had been recommended by the Minister of Justice, and that the recommendation had been forwarded to London, yet nothing has been done. Could my hon. friend enlighten me on the subject?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend, I think, has been misinformed. No recommendation has been so far made to the Imperial Government to fill the vacancy due to the resignation of Mr. Justice Migneault. I imagine that none will be made until the return of the Prime Minister, as it is a matter for the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. CANNON: I would like to know how many sittings took place last year of the Commission and what kind of work the gentleman did for whom this vote is asked, and how long he was engaged on it?

Mr. ROWELL: This gentleman is not a member of the Commission; he is its technical adviser. I cannot state how many sittings of the Commission were held, although I recall a number. His work consists of looking into any question that comes before the Commission, and it may involve a large amount or a small amount of work, depending on the character of the question; but if he is not working on this branch he is working on the other. His total salary is in respect of his position with the Naval Department and his work on this Commission.

Mr. CANNON: We are paying this gentleman $4,000 a year in the Department of Naval Affairs, and $1,000 a year in this department. I would like to know exactly what he did to be entitled to the $1,000. If he was working exclusively upon naval matters he was getting $4,000 a year, and was not entitled to a cent more. If he was working all the time for this Commission, and got only $1,000, he was not getting enough. But you cannot have a man in two positions if he can only occupy one at a time. I would like to know whether his work is done in Ottawa or in Washington, and how much time he devotes to it every year.

Mr. ROWELL: Of course, my hon. friend will understand that I cannot give him those details to-night, but I can tell him the general character of the work. I know during the past year this gentleman made a study of the St. Lawrence power situation and reported on the application of the American company to build a dam, and attended hearings of the commission when the matter came up. That came under my personal observation. Any other matters of a similar character he would advise upon and would carry on his work whenever the necessities of the case required. I imagine that the matter I spoke of involved his visiting the site of the proposed dam

and looking into the situation, and attending a hearing in Washington and a hearing in Montreal. When not engaged in this particular work he was engaged in work for the other department.

Mr. DUFF: Can the minister tell us what particular work he does for the Naval Department to earn $4,000?

Mr. ROWELL: His title indicates the character of the work he is doing. Personally, I have no knowledge of his work there.

Mr. JACOBS: If the vacancy on the International Joint Commission which has been referred to still exists, how it it possible for the commission to carry on its work? I understand the personnel consists of three American and three Canadian commissioners. It would be manifestly unfair if this commission sat with only two Canadian members in attendance as against three American. Have any sittings been held since Mr. Justice Migneault retired?

Mr. ROWELL: I believe some sittings have been held, but no matters of a controversial character arose where there might be a division of opinion.

Mr. JACOBS: Sittings have been held with three American and only two Canadian commissioners present, although three Canadians were appointed?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes; but, as I say, no question of a controversial character has come up where full representation was necessary.

Mr. JACOBS: Could the minister tell us when the vacancy will be filled?

Mr. ROWELL: I have already stated that it will be filled when the Prime Minister returns. I do not expect it will be dealt with until then.

Mr. CANNON: Is the absence of the Prime Minister the only reason why it is not filled?

Mr. ROWELL: It is in the Prime Minister's Department and is a matter for him to deal with.

Mr. JACOBS: The Prime Minister at the present moment is just in the place where the appointment is to be made. I understand it is made from London.

Amount required to meet expenses of the Lake of the Woods Technical Board and the Lake of the Woods Control Board, $6,000.

Mr. ROWELL: This is a board constituted as a result of an investigation carried on by the International Joint Commission to regulate the waters of the Lake of the Woods in order to conserve the interests of navigation and to prevent the waters falling below a certain level. As my hon. friend is aware, the Lake of the Woods is an international waterway, and people living on the American side have rights in it. We have to maintain the level, but as that level is influenced by the outlet, which is wholly in Canadian territory, and is not the work of an international commission, we regulate the level in our territory, but we are doing it pursuant to the orders of the International Joint Commission.

Mr. CANNON: Who are the commissioners?

Mr. ROWELL: The commission consists of two members appointed by the Dominion Government and two appointed by the Government of Ontario. Its duties are to look after the level of the waters of the Lake of the Woods and the proper conservation and control of the waters in the interests of navigation, water powers, etc., and to make regulations for the control of the same. The members of the commission appointed on behalf of the Dominion Government are: W. J. Stewart, who is chairman, and J. B. Challies, secretary.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is that the same Mr. Stewart?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. This is not for salaries; it is for expenses in connection with the work of the Commission.

Mr. CANNON: How much did Mr. Stewart get last year as a member of this board?

Mr. ROWELL: Nothing. The Commission was not constituted until January of the present year.

Mr. CANNON: How much of this vote goes to Mr. Stewart, and how much to the secretary?

Mr. ROWELL: None of it goes to Mr. Stewart. As I have said, this vote is purely for the expenses of the Commission.

Mr. CANNON: What expenses?

Mr. ROWELL: They must do this work through men employed for the purpose.

Mr. CANNON: Who are the men?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot give my hon. friend that information at present.

Mr. CANNON: When this item was prepared by the officers of the department

surely they knew exactly what it covered. The minister should have this information and give it to the Committee.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend thinks it important to have the details, I shall be very glad to get them from the officers of the department.

Item stands.

Canadian War Mission and Representation at Washington, $50,000.

Mr. ROWELL: When this item was up before, the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) and the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) asked for some information. If the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) desires it, I will let this item stand, as the time has come when I said the Committee would rise.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want to obstruct my hon. friend's Estimates, but he does not seem to be as well informed as usual, and he might as well take a little more time to go over the items.

Mr. ROWELL: I can give my hon. friend information with regard to this one.

Mr. McKENZIE: We will have the happy anticipation of getting it at the next sitting.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House adjourned at 10.40 p. m.

Wednesday, April 30, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

PORTRAITS OF CANADIAN GENERALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Have any portraits of Canadian Generals been painted under the direction of the Government or any department thereof?
2. If so, what are the names of the generals?
3. What has been the outlay in connection with these portraits?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

H.M.C.S. TUNA.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Were the boilers removed from H.M.C.S. Tuna before that vessel was sold as a bulk?
2. Were the condensers removed?
3. If not, how many remained on board at the time of the sale?
4. Were the pumps removed?
5. If not, how many remained on board?
6. What became of all the other equipment belonging to the ship?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. No; owing to heavy expense entailed.
2 and 3. One condenser of no use to Service remained on board and one removed.
4 and 5. Two small pumps of no use to Service and not worth cost of removal remained on board, all other pumps removed.
6. Equipment of use to Royal Naval College of Canada was shipped to Esquimalt for use therein.

Equipment of use to Niobe was handed over to that vessel, remaining equipment was placed on deposit charge at Halifax dockyard.

WIRELESS OPERATORS IN NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Do wireless operators in the Naval Service now receive benefits of separation allowance?
2. If so, from what date?
3. Why was Separation Allowance not paid wireless operators from the commencement of the war?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. 1st November, 1918.
3. The Wireless Branch of the Naval Department is a permanent organization undertaking in peace time a commercial service and providing aid to navigation, and in war time providing wireless service for naval purposes.

At the outbreak of hostilities this service was placed on a war footing and the operators and staff were given a naval rank in the R.N.C.V.R. at rates of pay practically identical with those they were already receiving and they continued to carry out their duties as operators at the different stations as before.

In the summer of 1918 the increasing number of patrol vessels called for the detailing of a much greater proportion of operators for duty afloat and having regard to this and the increasing cost of living, it was considered desirable to authorize the payment of separation allowance for this branch of the service. The same was approved and placed in effect on 1st November, 1918

CANADIAN MISSION IN LONDON.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Who is the chairman of the British War Mission?
2. Who compose this mission?

3. What are their duties?
4. When and how were they appointed?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Mr. Lloyd Harris is chairman of the Canadian Mission in London, to which it is assumed that this question refers.

2. Mr. Lloyd Harris. While no other members of the Canadian Mission have been appointed, Mr. Harris has the following Canadians associated with him: Mr. William C. Noxon, Toronto; Mr. R. J. Younge, Montreal; Mr. Hugh McColl, Ottawa, and Mr. Geo. J. Hearn.

3. To represent the Government of Canada in connection with the purchase and distribution of Canadian agricultural products and manufactured articles by governmental agencies appointed by the United Kingdom and other allied nations; and to keep the Canadian Government and its departments more directly in touch with such activities; and to render important service generally with the purpose of securing for the agricultural and other productions of Canada their appropriate share in the markets of the world during the period of reconstruction.

4. Mr. Lloyd Harris was appointed by Order in Council of November 8, 1918. The other persons above mentioned have been engaged by Mr. Harris.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PURCHSE OF COAL.

Mr. COPP:

1. What quantities of coal, if any, have been purchased for the Canadian National Railways since the 1st of April, 1919, from whom purchased, and at what price?

2. Is the Government aware that large numbers of miners and returned soldiers who are miners are at present out of employment because no demand for the product of the Maritime Province mines?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to use Maritime Province coal exclusively on the Eastern Division of said National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The following companies have orders for daily deliveries of coal subject to price per ton to be fixed as a result of negotiations now pending:—

Dominion Coal Co.	580 tons.
Inverness Ry. & Coal Co.	250 "
Acadia Coal Co	740 "
Melford Coal Co.	33 "
Intercolonial Coal Mining Co.	450 "
Dominion Coal Co., Springhill	260 "
Maritime Coal Railway & Power	671 "

2. The Canadian National Railways are taking delivery of all coal that is required for the operation of the railway, and in fact, to help the temporary depression, a certain quantity is being stock-piled.

3. Negotiations are now pending between the Executive of the National Railways and the Mining Companies and if satisfactory prices can be arranged the National Railways will use Maritime coal, exclusively, on the Eastern Division.

MEDICAL OFFICER TO INDIANS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Who was appointed medical officer to the Indians of Cacouna and Riviere du Loup, following the decease of the late Dr. Kane, and by whom was the appointment made?

2. What representations were made to the Government respecting said appointment, and by whom were they made?

3. Why was not the medical officer, who had temporarily replaced Dr. Kane and had given treatment to the Indians upon request of the Cacouna Indian Agent, chosen?

4. Did the present incumbent apply for the position?

5. If not, by whom was he recommended?

6. Was not the present medical officer a Conservative candidate in the general elections of 1908 and 1911, and a Unionist candidate in the elections of 1917?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Dr. Luc Lebel; the appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission.

2. The only communication this department is aware of is a letter from Mr. C. A. Gauvreau, M.P., who urged the appointment of Dr. Parrot. The department has no power to make appointments.

3. The Indian agent had no authority to engage a temporary medical officer, and none was engaged by the department.

4. Yes.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. The department has no information on this subject.

MR. JUSTICE McLENNAN.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Does Honourable F. S. McLennan receive a salary, fee or any other remuneration when acting as Deputy Judge of the Admiralty Court for the district of Montreal? If so, what amount has he been paid therefor since his appointment?

2. When was he appointed to the said position?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Mr. Justice McLennan is paid not by the Government but under a general order of the Court, and the fees of the judge form a part of the taxed costs in each case. Amount of such fees since his appointment $1,787.

2. January 9, 1917.

CONTRACTS FOR CARS AND RAILS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

Referring to the statement in the Canadian Official Record of December 17, 1918, that the Government had, during the year 1918, contracted for 8,500 freight cars and 100,000 tons of rails.

1. What are the names of the companies with which these contracts were made, and the rates paid, respectively?
2. What was the gross amount of these contracts?
3. How many of the said freight cars have been delivered?
4. How many tons of rails have been delivered?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. (a) For rails: Dominion Iron & Steel Company.

(b) Contract provided for determination of price by Minister of Railways and Canals; second quality rails to be 5 per cent less than first quality.

Settlement has been offered by the minister at $65 per gross ton for first quality and $61.75 per gross ton for second quality.

This price has not been accepted and payments to date have been made at rate of $55 per gross ton on account until price is setttled.

(c) For cars: Canadian Car and Foundry Company, National Steel Car Company, Eastern Car Company, Pressed Steel Car Company.

(d) Box cars, $2,750; flat cars, $2,370; coal cars, $3,179.50; refrigerator cars, $4,097; stock cars, $2,271; water service tank cars, $3,793.56; general water service tank cars, $3,926.

2. Dominion Iron and Steel Company, (Payments to date) $6,281,098.53; Canadian Car and Foundry Company, $15,461,720; National Steel Car Company $2,750,000; Eastern Car Company $3,944,475; Pressed Steel Car Company, $192,989.

3. 7,670 Freight cars delivered on April 15, 1919.

4. 98,954 gross tons first quality (No. 1); 15,247 gross tons second quality (No. 2), total, 114,201.

ASSISTANT REGISTRARS.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Is the Government aware that the majority of assistant registrars who were employed in the electoral division of L'Assomption-Montcalm, in connection with National Service Registration, in the month of June, 1918 have not yet been paid for their services?
2. If so, why have these accounts not been paid?
3. Will the Government pay the said accounts without further delay?

Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

COST OF HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR LOAN.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

Including interest, commissions,, exchange, and all other outlay of every description arising out of the loan of one hundred millions borrowed in New York, what per cent per annum will the said loan cost the country at the due date thereof?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: 6.90 per cent per annum.

FAIR WAGE OFFICER.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Who is Fair Wage Officer for the province of Nova Scotia?
2. What is his salary?
3. Who recommended his appointment?
4. Has he jurisdiction over the whole province? If not, what part of it?

Mr. MACLEAN:

1. There has never been a fair wage officer assigned to Nova Scotia.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

PURCHASE OF STEAM SHOVELS FROM C.P.R.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. Did the Department of Militia purchase two steam shovels from the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of the Canadian Overseas Corps in 1916?
2. If so, what was the price?
3. Who purchased them?
4. Were they new?
5. Who recommended the purchase of these shovels?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. $6,500 each, with an extra charge of $2,030 for tools, extras and spare parts, $120 for painting, and $550 for freight. The total cost, including these items, was $7,940 for one shovel, and $7,760 for the other. The first cost of these shovels is stated to have been $13,000 each.

3. The Department of Militia and Defence, by authority of the War Purchasing Commission, and an Order in Council dated March 10, 1916.

4. No.

5. Colonel Maunsell, Director General of Engineer Services; Brig.-Gen. Elliot, Master-General of the Ordnance, and Lt.-Colonel C. W. P. Ramsay, Commanding Canadian Overseas Railway Construction Corps.

SEPARATION ALLOWANCE TO WIDOWED MOTHERS.

Mr. BOURASSA:

Does the Government intend to pay separation allowance to widowed mothers of soldiers who are aged and poor, and whose sole support was an only son before enlistment; and will said payments of separation allowance be made retroactive, notwithstanding the fact that the claim for said separation allowance was not made within the prescribed limit of sixty days after enlistment, in the following cases; (a) where the mother of the soldier could get no information regarding Orders in Council to the contrary, and (b) where she was unable to apply for said separation allowance?

Major General MEWBURN:

P.C. 3173 deals with Separation Allowance and provides for payment of Separation Allowance to widowed mothers, if soldier is sole support, and, in certain cases, if soldier is main support. This Order in Council specifies that application in the cases of widowed mothers must be made within 60 days after enlistment of the soldier. In any case when, for any reasonable cause, it can be shown that the mother could not make the application within 60 days, the case can be dealt with as a special application by the Pay and Allowance Board under P.C. 2801.

*Mr. LEMIEUX.

1. Is the Government aware, as stated in the Financial Post of the 26th instant, that Sir Clifford Sifton, K.C.M.G., has opened an office in London, England, in the same building as the Canadian Trade Mission, where he places orders on a two and a half per cent basis, and that he then floats Rumanian securities to a syndicate, paying cash for goods purchased, less the commission referred to?

2. Has the same privilege been given to other individuals or firms?

3. If so, will the Government give the names of such firms?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN SHIPS REQUISITIONED.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. How many Canadian registered ships were requisitioned by the Admiralty since August, 1914?

2. What was their gross tonnage?

3. In how many cases did the Admiralty secure the consent of the Canadian Government?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Five.

2. 11,543 tons.

3. One.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. How many commissions have been appointed by the Government since the year 1914, to date, and for what purpose was each appointed?

2. How many members were there on each of said commissions, and what are their names?

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

How many conscientious objectors are still in jail for contravention of the Military Service Act?

RETURNS OF ENLISTED AND CONSCRIPTED MEN; ALSO MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved:

For a return showing: (a) The names of all the medical officers who joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force since the beginning of the war; (b) the length of service of each of the said officers, in England, France, Canada, or elsewhere; (c) the units in which they served, the date and length of service therein, and (d) the decorations which said officers respectively received from the Imperial Government, and the reasons given therefor, in each case.

Also,

For a return showing: (a) How many men voluntarily enlisted for service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and the number of men who were conscripted for service by virtue of the Military Service Act of 1917, respectively, belonging to each of the electoral divisions of the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Prince Edward Island, and the following electoral divisions of the province of Quebec, namely: Chambly-Vercheres, Hull, Jacques Cartier, Laurier-Outremont, Quebec South, St. Ann, St. Antoine, St. Laurent, St. George, Sherbrooke, Westmount, St. Henri, and Wright; (b) the number of men belonging to each of the above-mentioned electoral divisions who enlisted for service in the said Force from the 17th November, 1917, to the 17th December of the same year; (c) the number of soldiers belonging to each of above-mentioned electoral divisions who, at this period, were on the American continent, in the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and on the continent of Europe, respectively.

Major-General MEWBURN: In regard to these motions, in so far as my department is concerned, I am most anxious to give the hon. gentleman all the information possible, but I fear he has put these motions in such a way that we will be unable to obtain the information. Regarding the portion of the motion under the heading of (b), the individual file of every officer will have to be searched and we will also have to get information from overseas which will take some considerable time. With regard to the second part of the motion we have no record as to the number

of men belonging to each electoral division. To obtain that information it would be necessary to go through six hundred thousand files, and even then, I am afraid, it would not be accurate. During the present congested period it would require an enormous staff to compile and furnish the information requested, although I may say I am very anxious to give the hon. gentleman whatever details he may require that it is in my power to furnish.

Mr. ROBB: Then the minister does not object to the passing of the motion.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no objection to the motion, I am simply pointing out that it is almost impossible to furnish the information asked for.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The motion had better stand until the hon. member concerned is present.

Motion allowed to stand.

C.N.R.—TENDERS FOR COAL.

Hon. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East) moved for

For a return showing the tenders received for coal for the Canadian Northern Railway and Canadian National Railways, between 1st January, 1918, and 1st April, 1919, also a statement showing the tenders accepted during the same period, along with a statement of all tenders for coal (a) received, and (b) accepted, by the Grand Trunk Pacific since that road passed into the hands of a receiver.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): In reply to the hon. gentleman I should explain that tenders for coal for the Canadian Northern have been received within the last day or two, but the contracts have not yet been awarded. To bring down the tenders before the contract has been closed might interfere with the decision as to the disposition of the tenders. With respect to tenders for the Grand Trunk Pacific I shall have to ascertain whether I would be justified in laying those documents upon the Table without consulting the Judge of the Exchequer Court, seeing that the affairs of the railway are not now in the Government's hands but in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. MACKIE: With respect to the tenders that have not yet been accepted the minister is doubtless justified in withholding the information for the present, but where tenders have been considered by the Government and a contract awarded, I submit that the documents should be laid on the Table.

Mr. J. D. REID: The hon. gentleman must understand that I do not object to giving information so far as tenders for the Canadian Northern Railway system is concerned. I will do that as soon as the contract has been awarded. But with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific I would not like to give the information without first consulting the Judge of the Exchequer Court who is acting for the receiver as to whether I would be justified in doing so or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the meantime the motion had better stand.

CANADIAN TRADE WITH NORTH EUROPE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Might I draw the attention of the Acting Prime Minister to a despatch which appeared in yesterday's Gazette. I will simply quote the "title" of the article—pardon me I mean the "heading" because I understand that titles were abolished this morning by the Committee having that subject in charge—the heading is:

Canada barred from trade in North Europe
Reported U.S. put embargo on exports from American ports. Shipping Manipulated. Danes prevented from doing half a million dollars weekly trade here.

I would ask if the Acting Prime Minister knows anything about the embargo referred to, and what steps are being taken at Washington to remove it?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): On the ground of congestion in American Atlantic ports, owing largely to strikes, the United States Food Administration has refused transit to Canadian wheat and flour through United States ports for Northern European ports. Officially that is all the information which this Government has. A license for a shipment of Canadian flour via an American port to Denmark was requested a few days ago, and was refused on the ground I have just stated. The matter is under consideration with the authorities at Washington, and as the application of the Canadian milling industry is being supported by the Danish legation at Washington it may be reported on favourably.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Has this reference to American, British, or Canadian bottoms, sailing from American ports?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To American bottoms.

BUOYS ON THE ATLANTIC COAST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) yesterday asked a question in regard to the placing of buoys on the Atlantic coast. I was unable then to give the information for which he asked, but I would now like to read a memorandum prepared for me by the officials of the Marine Department in respect to the matter. The memorandum is as follows:

The buoys are being prepared and placed as fast as the buoy-laying steamer can handle them. The "Stanley" is to-day placing the Spry Bay Bell Buoy, Beaver Bell Buoy, Nixonmate Bell Buoy and on completion of this work will proceed to Louisburg to place the buoys in position in that harbour.

The buoys around Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands are for the most part ready and will be placed just as soon as we can get a steamer around there to handle them.

MILITARY SERVICE DEFAULTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Has the Acting Prime Minister brought to the attention of the Acting Minister of Justice the question that I put yesterday?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The hon. gentleman can always depend upon my carrying out such a request. I did as he asked.

Mr. GAUVREAU: There is no answer forthcoming as yet.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): As the question has been passed to me it is virtually the same as question No. 13 on the Order Paper. If that is correct, all I can say is that the matter of introducing a Bill providing for the disfranchisement of defaulters is under immediate consideration, and a definite statement will be made to the House either on Friday or Monday.

ADMISSION TO GALLERIES OF HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would draw attention to the fact that a great many visitors come to the House and finding their member otherwise engaged—I shall not say absent—are unable to obtain admission to the galleries. Now that the war is over and all danger of ministers being blown up by a bomb has passed, would it not be well to relax the existing rule and allow any free-born citizen of Canada who presents himself at the door to enter the building which he owns as much as we do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter will be taken under advisement. The great difficulty in connection with this Chamber is that the gallery is so small that after space has been reserved for the wives of members and others entitled officially to be present, there may be over congestion, but the suggestion of the hon gentleman is worthy of consideration.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It must be remembered that these are the days of democracy.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 52, to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose yesterday at six o'clock we were considering clause 1 of the Bill, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) had the floor.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND: When the Committee rose at six o'clock yesterday I was dealing with the remarks of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) with reference to the alien enemy within our country. There are several thousand such alien enemies interned in Canada at the present time, and the hon. gentleman thought that on account of that fact no danger was to be apprehended. On the other hand I made the remark that I thought it would be in the public interest if these people could be sent back to the country from which they came as quickly as that could be arranged for. Under present conditions some difficulty may exist in that regard. I would point out, however, that this question is one that affects the country to such an extent that it is very important we should have a proper conception as to what the effect of this Bill is going to be on the future of Canada. If you contaminate a stream at its source that stream will be polluted throughout its entire course. The next few years will undoubtedly see a great many people coming into Canada from other countries, and therefore I am glad to see that the Government has taken steps to meet the conditions which will confront us in future by establishing a separate department of the Government, with a responsible minister in charge, to take care of the stream of immigration that is likely to enter the Dominion.

A Department of Public Health has also been established with a view to preventing

the lowering of the standard of our people through undesirable immigration and otherwise. We cannot pay too much attention to questions of this kind. Many people who have come here in the past had little or no means; in fact I believe that in many instances assistance was granted to them by the provincial governments to enable them to reach this country. Ultimately they became good citizens. During the next few years the Government should see that immigration to Canada comes from Great Britain in so far as is possible. We as a part of the British Empire must have people who are actuated by the motives that actuate the people of the British Empire; our educational institutions must carry on with that object in view.

I was surprised at some of the remarks that were made with regard to the foreign element which have established themselves in large colonies in Canada, particularly in the Western Provinces. The minister told us that no effort had been made by previous Governments to do anything for these people after they came here. The member from Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) contended that with our splendid educational facilities, there should be no difficulty in taking care of the foreign element who come to this country. Unfortunately, our educational institutions are not of a uniform nature; in one province certain regulations prevail, and in another province we have something entirely different. If we are going to remain a part of the British Empire we should have national schools; children should not be permitted to attend schools where a foreign language is taught, and in which the fundamental principles of the British Empire are not properly set forth. So far as the constitution permits, the policy which I suggest should be adopted and carried out in its entirety.

Mr. GAUVREAU: That is altogether nonsensical.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Some reference was made to an Imperial policy. No doubt a policy will be formulated as a result of the negotiations which are taking place between the representatives of the various colonies, and the Motherland. It is not possible to anticipate what will be done, but this Bill will enable the Government to put into effect the conclusions arrived at as a result of those negotiations.

Reference has been made to the splendid reforms that have taken place among the people who have come into some of our provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) said that if the Austrians who have settled in Western Canada had not come here and become established in these communities they might have fought against us during the war, and that it was a splendid thing to have brought them here and thus to have prevented them from joining the ranks of the enemy at the front. If you stop to consider, you will be able to form an estimate of the deplorable influence exercised upon the standard of our citizenship by the attitude of those who are not and have not been in sympathy with us during this war. I remarked at the outset that the standard of a nation's greatness must be measured by the character of their people. Canada, with her tremendous undeveloped resources and her great possibilities for the future, must see that none but the most desirable people are permitted to come within her bounds.

The hon. gentleman also complimented the late Liberal Government upon the work which they did in the matter of immigration. I have my own opinion with regard to what was done in this respect while hon. gentlemen opposite were conducting the affairs of the country. I do not know that I could better illustrate the methods pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite than by reading a letter written by the notorious W. T. R. Preston, an officer of the then Liberal Government, who was at the head of the Emigration Department in the Old Country, with headquarters 17 Victoria street, London S.W., on October 18, 1901—a time when the peopling of Western Canada and even of Ontario by immigration was at its zenith—to an official of the Ontario Government, then a Liberal Government. The letter is as follows:—

Private.

My dear Southworth,—I have your letter of a late date on emigration to Ontario. You incidentally say in the letter that you are opposed to indiscriminate emigration. Well, in that respect you agree with everybody else. I do not know any one who suggests, or who would propose, that there should be indiscriminate emigration to that province. Whatever is done must be done carefully, and any who are sent out must be well-selected emigrants. But don't run away with the idea that only well-to-do people, or those with money, are going to emigrate. If you are going to keep up a population in the old parts of the province you must be satified with sober, energetic and industrious emigrants. I know all you people are terribly afraid of the foreign element. Upon that point I don't agree with you, and have no hesitation in saying that a good class of foreigners scattered about the old parts of Ontario will do very much more towards preserving a proper agricultural population than those from England for instance. Politically

speaking I believe the introduction of a hundred families or so into some of those close ridings with the connections which could be had and maintained here would easily preserve for us many doubtful seats in that province. I know the anxiety or nervousness of the minister upon this question. Confidentially, I may tell you, I fear it bears some slight resemblance to one of courage. You know enough about politics to know that courage always beats. However as we don't agree upon that phase of the question we won't discuss it. Etc.

(Signed.) W. T. R. Preston.

This was the opinion of a man in the employ of the Government that, the hon. gentleman says, did such wonderful things for Canada. Large numbers of people were being brought from Central Europe by officials who were endeavouring to place people in Ontario for political purposes. When you realize the influence they would have over those people after placing them here, you can form some idea of the cause of the resentment and the outburst of indignation that swept through their ranks when they found that so many of their alien enemies had been debarred from polling their votes in the wartime election; they would not be able to exercise that control which they sought and which they had exercised for so many years. I need not say anything further in that regard, but I want to emphasize this, that we cannot permit those people in those communities of Western Canada to carry on their language and to teach in their schools whatever suits them, and at the same time expect that we are going to overcome the difficulties confronting us.

Reference has been made to the recruiting that took place in Ontario, and it was pointed out how well the people of Ontario volunteered. Last night when the Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) had his Estimates before the House, an hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Lemieux) pointed out that this was due to the military training they had. It was due not to the training they had along military lines, but to the fact that the old stock in Ontario was of British origin and, therefore, the people responded quickly to the call of duty when danger threatened this country. Danger may threaten this country again, because the menace with which we have been confronted during the past five years may again threaten. We must look to the future, and Canada must be built up on a sure and sound foundation. We are not going to take any chances in that regard, and I, therefore, compliment the Government on having established a Department of Immigration with a responsible minister at its head, and on having brought down a Bill which is going to ensure that in the future people who are not desirable will not be permitted to come within the borders of Canada, and consequently, the purity of the stream of our immigration will be maintained as it should be. The influence of the stock that came out here years ago and peopled this country will be felt in the future, and we must not jeopardize it in any way by permitting an indiscriminate flow of undesirables, as regards which it was stated last night by an hon. member opposite that no bars, no hindrance should be placed in their way, and that this Bill was introduced with a view to barring out the alien enemy. We are still at war with the enemy; peace has not as yet been declared, and we cannot read what the future may have in store for us. But we would be blind to our interest and our duty, if precautions of this kind were not introduced and placed before Parliament.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything further on the matter, in view of the fact that we are in Committee on the Bill and that this discussion is really out of order, it being only by permission of the Chair and the House, because, owing to an oversight of some hon. members who intended to take part in the discussion, the Bill received its second reading without any discussion on the principle. Before sitting down, however, I would again refer to the urgent necessity, particularly during the next few years when reconstruction will be taking place, that nothing should be permitted in this country that would make possible such a condition of affairs as is now being experienced in many European countries; that nothing must be done to aggravate the situation at home. We must take great care to see that our returned men are given every possible opportunity and advantage to become reestablished in civil life. That being done, we must then see that only people of a desirable character are allowed to come into this country to develop the resources which have been placed at our disposal.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The question before the Committee at the present time is probably of more importance to Western Canada than to any other section of the Dominion on account of the fact that we are looking for people to develop the West. But I think experience has taught us that we should in the future be very careful in the selection of our citizens, and we should benefit from the mistakes that have been made in the

past. It is true we want countless peoples to come to the prairies to cultivate the soil and produce wealth, but at the same time, we want more than that; we want people who will make good Canadian citizens, and the qualification of production of crops, production of wealth, is not sufficient in itself. Undoubtedly, some people have settled in the West who are not assuming the obligations of Canadian citizenship, although probably at the time they came to Canada it was not recognized that their characteristics were contrary to Canadian citizenship, and that they, to a greater or less extent, separate themselves from other communities and live by and for themselves alone. Since the commencement of this debate, mention has been made of the Hutterites and the Mennonites, and I feel my responsibility, as member for a district in which many of those people have been settling during the last year, to make some observations with regard to those two classes of settlers. I intend to argue that they are not desirable citizens, although probably not on the same ground as is defined in the Bill itself. I look upon a desirable citizen as one who comes into this country prepared to associate with the rest of the people and to assume all the obligations of citizenship. If immigrants fail to do that, then I do not look upon them as desirable citizens, and we should refrain from allowing such classes of people to enter the Dominion of Canada. For many years we have had Hutterites living in practically all sections of Canada, and I always understood that they lived in individual homes, although in communities, but the so-called Mennonites that have been coming into my district in the last year, do not live in what we would call individual homes. All the families live together in one large house; they all eat in one building, and all sleep in another. I do not think people of that type should be allowed to come into this country. Further, they want their own schools, and want to teach their own language, which is almost wholly German. Those of you who have followed the dispatches in the press will know that in Saskatchewan and Manitoba the authorities have had a great deal of difficulty in compelling some members of this sect to support the public schools and send their children to them. On the contrary, they want to maintain their own schools, have their own teachers, and perpetuate their own language. I object to that because I think that the only way we can develop good citizens in this country is for the newcomers to acquire a knowledge of the English language in order that they may mingle with the other elements of the population and become good British subjects.

I have another objection to these people —and I am going to class the Hutterites and the Mennonites together, although there may be some distinction between them— and it is that their property is vested entirely in one individual, who practically controls the situation. In South Dakota, I understand that an effort was made during the war by the authorities there to break up these organizations and force the property into the hands of individuals, and probably as a result of that action a great many Hutterites and Mennonites left South Dakota and came to Canada. Now, we have had experience with one class of people with a form of Government very similar to that of the Hutterites; I refer to the Doukhobors, who are also under the control of one head, in whom all the property is vested.

Another objection I have is this: When an effort was made in South Dakota to break up these organizations, evidence was adduced to prove that these people were prepared to admit that under certain circumstances their own laws were above the laws of the State, and that they would refuse to obey the laws of the State if they came into conflict with their own laws. I do not think we should admit people of this type into Canada. Some of them have come in already, but I think we should prevent immediately the entrance of any more of them.

We know what the attitude of these people is with regard to military service. There are many people who are quite sincere in their opposition to military service and to war; but the particular classes of whom I speak are not prepared to assume any obligations whatever in connection with war. They refused to contribute to war funds and war loans, though I understand that in my district they did contribute in some instances to the Red Cross by subscribing to the Victory Loan and allowing the interest to go to the Red Cross. At this time in our history, I think it is extremely important that we should only allow into this country, people who are prepared to assume all the obligations of Canadian citizenship, who are prepared to bear all the responsibilities, acquire a knowledge of our language, attend our own schools, and assimilate with the rest of our people. I maintain that these people are not prepared to do any of these things, and consequently I look upon them

as undesirable citizens. We know that in the United States they did object to contributing to war funds, and objected to military service; and largely on account of the feeling of their neighbours in South Dakota they were forced to leave, and have come to Canada. I do not see by what right they have earned a place in this free country, and as it will take some time for this legislation to come into effect I would urge that an Order in Council be passed immediately, under the War Measures Act, to prevent any more of these people coming in. If we do not do that, they will continue to come in as they are doing at the present moment and have been doing for months past.

I do not represent the feeling of merely one class in my part of the country. I believe that all classes of our people desire that no more Hutterites and Mennonites shall be allowed to settle in Canada. Of course the agitation is strongest with the returned men, and I fully appreciate their point of view. They went across the seas and risked their lives, and they dislike very much to see other men who were not prepared to risk their lives or their money for the freedom and liberty they possessed come and buy land and settle in this country and enjoy all the privileges and protection of Canadian citizenship, and especially as these people are nearly all of German origin and want to perpetuate the German language in Canada.

But apart from the returned soldiers, a number of Canadian clubs throughout Western Canada have declared themselves against the entrance of these people into the Dominion. Now the Canadian clubs, as I know them, are supposed to represent a very high type of citizenship; they want to perpetuate the very best ideals of our citizenship, and if after mature consideration by men of all parties and of all creeds, the Canadian clubs in Winnipeg and elsewhere in the West declare that it is not in the interest of Canada that these people should be allowed to settle in this country, I think their views are worthy of the attention of this Committee.

By reading the press and the statements made by public men and leaders in all important movements, I find that the feeling is unanimous in the Prairie Provinces that these people should not be allowed to come into Canada. The women's organizations of the province of Alberta and I think the same remark applies practically to the whole of Western Canada, look upon these people as a menace and are urging their exclusion. I do not want to be classed as an individual who wants to discourage people coming away from oppression to a land where there is freedom. I am prepared to welcome to this country all classes of people who we are satisfied will assume all the obligations of citizenship when they come to this country, but I want to place myself on record as opposed to the entrance into this country of people who are not prepared to assume all the responsibilities of citizenship and who desire to live by themselves under their own form of government, who want their own schools, and if possible to use their own language exclusively. That is my reason for asking the Government to take immediate action to prevent any more of these people from coming not only into Western Canada, but into any other part of the Dominion. I believe it is in the welfare of Canada that they should be kept out.

Mr. GREEN: I desire to say a few words on this Bill, not because it affects Western Canada, but because the introduction of undesirables is a matter that affects the whole Dominion. This is a period of reconstruction. We have heard a great deal in the last few months concerning reconstruction, and I wish to congratulate the Government that in this Bill they are preparing to ensure that we shall get a better class of immigrants in Canada. Perhaps we in the West may be in a position to speak with more knowledge on this question than people in the East. Possibly Western Canada offers greater advantages to farmers, in that they have less trouble in breaking up new lands and establishing themselves upon the land. In the province from which I come the natural resources are not only very great, but are very easily accessible, and the climate appeals to people coming into a new country. In the past we have experienced difficulties in regard to Oriental immigration. I am not going to deal so much with the question of Oriental immigration, because it has been threshed out in this House and by the people from time to time and is fairly well understood. The hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) yesterday eulogized Sir Clifford Sifton on his immigration policy. In the main I endorse that eulogy of Sir Clifford Sifton, but I want to tell the hon. member that Sir Clifford Sifton informed me himself that he made a mistake when he brought the Doukhobors to Canada. No one who knows those people can deny that they are sober, industrious and hard working. But they live in communities. Their families all live together, eat together, and have their buildings together,

4 p.m.

and they do not allow their children to attend the schools provided by the country, nor do they comply with the necessary regulations for the registration of births, deaths and marriages. They speak their own language, and as a class they are not even educated in their mother tongue. I do not think we would ever be able to assimilate these people so long as they are allowed to remain in these communities, and we should not allow the Doukhobors, Hutterites and Mennonites or any people of that sort to come into Canada and live under their present customs. If we are going to build up a united Canada we must have people whom we can assimilate and who eventually will join the family of Canadian life. The people I have mentioned are not of that kind and I wish it were possible in this legislation not only to debar any more from coming in, but—and I hope the Government may see its way to make this possible—to deport those who are living in communities, as well as interned aliens, and to send them back to the countries from which them came, Russia or wherever else it may be, where they will be more at home among their fellowmen. In this reconstruction period I think we should see to it that the necessary restrictions will be provided so that we may not be flooded with an influx of people whom it will take generations to get rid of or to assimilate. I do not think that any one should advocate the giving of the privileges of Canadian citizenship to interned alien enemies belonging to countries that we have been fighting and with which we are still technically at war. These men who were interned were not peaceable, law-abiding citizens. They were interned for some breach of the laws of the land; and at this moment, it seems preposterous that we should advocate, just because peace is about to be declared, that they be taken in as full citizens of Canada. One of the great troubles in the past has been the laxity of the naturalization law. I do not know whether they have experienced any trouble in the East, but in the West we have had traffic in naturalization papers, and I venture to say that it is not all over yet. Under the new law, however, this matter will be more easily dealt with than in the past. Under the old law a man was only required to live two years in the country, and if he made his application and it was vouched for by some one, even if proper notice had not been given to the public, he was accorded the full rights of citizenship. Under this Bill he must have five years' residence, and there are many restrictions in the Bill to-day that were not in the old law. I wish to again congratulate the Government on the introduction of this Bill, and I hope that when it is completed it will not only keep out of Canada those aliens who are not desirable, but will enable us to deport those who have proved to be undesirable while living amongst us.

Mr. CALDER: If the general discussion is to continue I think we might bring ourselves in order by taking one of the sections of the Bill which will provide for a discussion such as this. Section 13 will, I think, be found wide enough to cover a discussion such as that which has been going on. If action is to be taken at an early date or immediately to prohibit the entry of certain of these people to Western Canada I would like to have an expression of opinion from this House on this particular section. I concur in the view that has been expressed that it will probably be ten days or two weeks and possibly more before the Bill is eventually through the House. But owing to the feeling that exists in the West, it seems to me that it may be desirable to act at once so far as these particular classes are concerned. I move that we proceed to the discussion of section 13.

Mr. JACOBS: Just a moment. With regard to clause 1, subsection (a) as to the position of the minister and the deputy minister. As I understand it, there is no deputy minister of immigration at present. Is it the intention under this Bill to provide for a deputy minister?

Mr. CALDER: The department provides for the appointment of a deputy minister and the Estimates do as well. Provision is already made in the Act to create a department with a deputy minister.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the Deputy Minister of Immigration is also the present Deputy Minister of the Interior. Is it the intention to divide the two positions so that we will have a Deputy Minister of the Interior and a Deputy Minister of Immigration, separate and distinct?

Mr. CALDER: That has been the intention. As the hon. gentleman no doubt was aware, during the past year, the volume of immigration has not been very excessive. We thought it advisable for the time being to ask Mr. Cory, who is the Deputy Minister of the Interior and who formerly had the administration of this Act, to act as deputy minister in the meantime for the purpose of getting ready for the immigration which we expect to come. That matter, however, has not been considered or decided. Unless there is an amalgamation

of these departments again, or an amalgamation of this department with some other department, I think it would just as well to let the matter stand as it is now.

Section agreed to.

Mr. Calder moved that the Committee proceed to the consideration of clause 13 of the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have a very few words to say on this Bill. I wish to take issue with the minister's statement that nothing had been done by the people for the vast number of Ruthenian and foreign immigrants who have been brought into the country in past years from central Europe. A great deal was done for these people. They were pretty thoroughly debauched very shortly after getting into this country by the politicians of both sides in the Northwest. I think it is just as well that we should be frank in regard to this question. In Manitoba the Ruthenians and other immigrants from central Europe were organized into clubs and herded in the cities and towns of Manitoba and they were supplied with whisky and beer. I see my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) raise his eyebrows in wonderment. I imagine he has never heard the words "whisky" or "beer" used in this House before. He seems to be quite horrified that I did not make a distinction as between the politicians of the different sides but that I placed the blame on both. The manner in which these people have been debauched became a public scandal throughout the West. Their votes were bought, they were herded into political droves, members of their own class were given offices and they were used as political bosses. I do not think this country has perpetrated any greater crime upon any portion of the population than it has perpetrated upon the foreign population that has been brought to the country.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was that in connection with provincial elections?

Mr. RICHARDSON: My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) suggests that this has occurred in connection with provincial elections. I fancy that if my hon. friend will confer with the hon. member for Maisonneuve he will probably get a satisfactory answer to his question. It is a great satisfaction to me to know that in this Bill that is now before the House provision is being made which will prevent the importation into this country of undesirable settlers. We have Doukhobors, and Mennonites and now we are getting a portion of the Hutterites. I think all are undesirable. The Mennonites who were brought in when Alexander Mackenzie was in office under certain guarantees have proved very good settlers so far as agriculture is concerned. But they have not become assimilated with the other peoples to any extent up to the present time. I would like to testify to the fact that in connection with the Victory Loan, the Patriotic Fund and other subscriptions for the purpose of carrying on the war the Mennonites acted very well and subscribed a large amount thus showing their sympathy with the ideal of liberty for which the enlightened nations of the world were fighting.

An hon. MEMBER: Did they volunteer?

Mr. RICHARDSON: They did not volunteer at all; they believe in the scriptural injunction: "Thou shalt not kill." They have a firm conviction that they should not participate in war. It is a matter of conscience with them and I never felt that I should blame them very much for adhering to their conscientious convictions in that respect. I represented the constituency of Lisgar in the old days and a great many Mennonites are located in that constituency. I found them a very agreeable and law-abiding people. It is true they do not patronize our schools.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did the first Mennonites come from the United States or from Russia?

Mr. RICHARDSON: From Russia I understand. I want to say, in case I should be misunderstood, that a new policy is being adopted in regard to the Ruthenian population in the province of Manitoba. The present Manitoba Government, for which I hold no brief, is pursuing an excellent policy. When these people were controlled by politicians, all sorts of promises were made to them and in many cases they were allowed to conduct their schools in their own way and use their own language. That has all been done away with under the administration of the Norris Government. Manitoba has, in the person of the Hon. Dr. Thornton, an excellent Minister of Education. It was recently my privilege to visit the constituency which I have the honour to represent in Parliament and in which there is a very large Ruthenian population. I visited some of these schools in company with the Minister of Education and Mr. D. A. Ross, the local member of the Legislature, and I found that marvellous pro-

gress was being made by the children of foreign parents. They are wonderfully bright and progressive; in fact they make almost greater progress than the children of the Anglo-Saxon population. In these schools nothing but the English language is taught; nor will be allowed to be taught. I believe that since partisanship has been abolished, or abandoned to a great extent, a better spirit is coming over the dreams of the foreign settler of that province and higher ideals are taking hold of our foreign population. I agree with the Minister of Immigration that we should follow the foreign population, endeavour to set the highest example and lead them along the right path particularly in regard to becoming British citizens. In my constituency, as I say, there is a very large foreign population. Under the War-time Elections Act, which prevailed when the last election was held, this population was not, of course, allowed to vote. I regret to have to tell the House that I have received from time to time lately very disturbing reports in regard to certain portions of the foreign population of Springfield, Winnipeg and other adjacent districts. It is even said that they expect an uprising and indeed that the day has been set for such uprising. I took the opportunity of letting the members of the Government know in order that measures might be taken to put a stop to anything of that kind.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: To what population do you refer when you say that there is danger of an uprising?

Mr. RICHARDSON: To the population brought in from Central European countries.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In what portion of the West?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I was referring to Manitoba especially in my remarks.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Can you give us any authority for that statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, I have among my papers upstairs a letter from Mr. D. A. Ross, member of the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba in which he infers that there is danger. The night before I left for Ottawa last week, after visiting my home about eight days ago, Mr. Ross called me up by telephone and asked me to warn the Government that there was grave danger in the situation; that he had returned from a tour of the constituency, and that throughout it, as well as in the adjoining districts, foreigners were talking of rising at a certain time. I think he said the date fixed was some day in the ensuing month of May. I do not know why this is, but he states that the spirit of Bolshevism prevails and that these people have got the idea that the profiteers in Canada have made immense sums of money—

Mr. JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: —that that ought to be taken away from them, and that certain other measures of retribution should follow.

Mr. JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I cannot tell the Committee just what views these people hold with regard to this matter, but if my information is correct their views are radical and dangerous.

Mr. TWEEDIE: How long have they been in the country?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I should think for ten, twelve, or fifteen years. They are very industrious and quite prosperous. They have taken up lands in small areas in that country and carry on market gardening, small farming, etc., and the progress they have made along agricultural lines is wonderful. If these people are properly handled even at this juncture there may not be much to fear. In this connection Mr. Ross tells me that Bishop Budka, of whom members of the House must have heard a great deal from time to time—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON: —is behind this agitation, and criticism has been indulged in that the authorities have not dealt with Bishop Budka as he deserves to be dealt with.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is Bishop Budka the same bishop who is behind a Bill at present before the House having reference to certain Ruthenian children?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am unable to give the hon. member any information in that regard.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will give it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have no personal knowledge of the actions of Bishop Budka, but Mr. Ross, the local member for Springfield, assures me that he is a very dangerous man. I noticed in the press of Winnipeg that the returned soldiers propose to deal with Bishop Budka, and you may be sure, Mr. Chairman, that if the returned soldiers undertake to deal with him he will be treated in a summary manner. I ob-

serve, however, in a despatch in the morning papers that action has been taken, I think by the Dominion Government officials, probably as a result of the information I laid before the Government, to summon Bishop Budka before the authorities to show cause why he should not be deported. I presume that this action is a result of measures taken by the Government to see that justice is done, and I want to congratulate the Government upon its promptness. As I said before, I have no personal information to convey to the House, although I learned from quarters that I do not doubt are perfectly reliable that a rather dangerous, if not a menacing condition of affairs, exists in that country.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton): Will the hon. member for Springfield lay on the table of the House the letter which he states contains the statements referred to?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The hon. member for Springfield will do exactly as he likes about that matter. I rose for the purpose of giving the Committee the benefit of any information that has been conveyed to me, and I hope that the situation will be dealt with by the Government in such a manner as it should be. I took the first opportunity on my return from Winnipeg last week to lay a statement before the members of the Government, particularly charged with this branch of the administration. I then learned that action had been taken; that word had been sent to interview Mr. Ross, to collect all possible information, and to make such an investigation as would result in the prevention of any such incendiary outbreak as any portion of the population might have in contemplation.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): In saying a few words on this subject, I regret that I shall not be able to take quite the view that is entertained by the Government. I regret that the more sincerely because I know I shan't get any credit from a certain section of this House for differing from the Government. I listened to considerable portions of the speech of the minister (Mr. Calder), and I could not quite appreciate his point of view from the necessity which usually exists of having a coherent policy from the Cabinet. My hon. friend spoke very enthusiastically of Canada's need of increased population. Well, in ordinary times we should all feel just that way, and should use my hon. friend's language but we are not living in ordinary times, and where the policy of the Government, as a Government, appears to lack coherence is in this: That in its policy, as brought out in some of the measures which were mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and in some of the measures which we have discussed here, there is an apprehension that we shall not be able to handle, without considerable difficulty, for the next few years the inhabitants we already have. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that is a misrepresentation of speeches that we have heard in this House in support of certain measures. The Government has taken extraordinary steps, and has taken credit to itself for those steps, to prevent unemployment in this country in the years of difficulty that are immediately ahead of us, and that we all hope will not be numerous. Now I, for one, cannot see the coherence or consistency of a policy which on the one hand is directed to relieve the population we already have, and on the other to increasing that population by means of an immigration policy——

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: And I should be glad if, approaching this matter with no other thought in my mind except to take the wisest steps for Canada, the minister, or other members of the Government, can meet my difficulty on that particular point. My general position in regard to making a distinction between ordinary times and the present time, applies equally to some of the remarks which fell from my good-natured friend from Montreal——I forget his division.

Mr. McMASTER: Good nature is no distinction as regards members from Montreal.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: It is, I think, the hon. member from the St. Lawrence division, to whom I refer.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I heard a warble from another region which tempts me very much to tell a story, but I will not do it at this time.

Mr. BELAND: Let us have the story.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I agreed with the spirit of the remarks of my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) as to ordinary times, when he said that our enemies of to-day will be our friends of to-morrow. Everybody who knows British history will recall the period when Englishmen never referred to Frenchmen except as "frog-eaters," and when Frenchmen never re-

ferred to England except as "perfidious Albion," and that proceeded for some years after the great wars between England and France.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some centuries.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Well, not quite for centuries; it proceeded for some years; but as my hon. friend indicated would be the case now, those feelings passed away to such an extent that the two countries were allies in the recent war. Still, it took some time, and I think that my hon. friend, in his remarks, was not sufficiently careful to remember that fact.

There were other remarks of my hon. friend that I could not quite see the force of as encouraging a vigorous immigration policy. He reminded us that the race to which he has the distinction—I use the words very sincerely—to belong wandered for forty years in the wilderness, and when they got to the promised land there they made good. Well, the record of what they did when they got to the promised land was that they killed off all the native inhabitants, and if that is my hon. friend's idea of how immigrants made good, I hope there may not be many immigrants into Canada of that particular type. However, I repeat that with the general tenor of his remarks I agree, because they were based upon well-known historical facts. I do not think that these race asperities will last forever, by any means, or else we have fought the vainest war ever fought in history. I understand that the League of Nations, about which most of us are enthusiastic, is to put an end to war and to put an end as fast as possible to that hate in the minds of men out of which all wars must come.

Having said so much, I return to the ground of the present condition of Canada and to the immigration policy of the Government as I learn something about it from the speech of the minister. There are other grounds than the fact that we have just come out of this war and that there are great misunderstandings between the various races of the world why we should go very carefully about promoting immigration at this time, or—shall I say?—about how we handle the immigration question. Before the war began at all there was considerable emigration out of Western Canada. That was being stated in this House; it was never contradicted in this House, because it could not be contradicted. We may have an opportunity of discussing at considerable length before this session closes the economic reasons why that was taking place before the war. Of course, since the war began we have lost a large number of inhabitants from Western Canada; I do not want to go into numbers on that question, but it is notorious that that has happened. I quite apprehend that there might be an explanation of that in the early years of the war connected with the war itself. However, the fact is there, both as to the time before the war and since the war began, and that fact would lead one to look at this immigration point of view from a different angle than the enthusiastic one of the minister when he seemed to want to bring men in in great numbers. He said, indeed, that we had been to blame because we had done nothing for our immigrant population in the past. From one point of view, there is a great deal of truth in what he said, although I believe the very first reason he gave for wanting to get more men in shows that he is going to do something to them now, because he said that we needed more taxation. He is going to improve on our having done nothing for our immigrants in the past by now taxing immigrants when he gets hold of them. Well, that is perhaps too liberal an interpretation of what my hon. friend said. I simply point out, however, that that is not a reason why we should endeavour to flood the country at the present time with a certain class of immigrants, to say the least of it. The people who take up homesteads and the people who take up land on a small scale are not a very taxable quantity in the first years of their settling in Western Canada. That remark applies to the various other lines of national activity in which the minister said that an increased population would be useful to us. If I am right in saying that we were losing inhabitants before the war and losing them from the lands of Western Canada, then it is more necessary, to promote the best interests of Canada, that we should see what was wrong with our government of the West; what was wrong with our methods of taxation for instance; what was wrong with our trade policies; what was wrong with the life of the people in the West, that was making our inhabitants leave the country. That would be a more fruitful line of Government activity than the introduction of a Bill or the making of a speech in this House at this particular time to promote immigration upon a large scale.

We have arrived at a period in our history when, if we govern our country properly, we do not need to go over the world

seeking to give inducements to people to come and live in Canada. I am one of those who can speak with the feelings and experiences of an immigrant myself, upon this question, and I think I know that no country in the world offers to a man such an opportunity of advancing his position in life and enjoying a rational and a free existence as Canada does—if Canada is properly governed. A great deal hinges on that. If we frame our laws so that equal opportunities are afforded to all sections of our population, then no country in the world offers the inducement that Canada does to people from more crowded lands to come and reside within our borders. But I should like to guard myself further—though I have been trying to use very guarded language, Mr. Chairman—by saying that the "if" that I have used is one of considerable size, and has been under all Governments, so far as I have been able to study economics in the direction of enlightenment. I do not think that we need to hurry about getting fresh inhabitants at this time. Canada has arrived at that period in her history when it is emphatically true that the best immigration agent is a successful colonist.

Let the Governments of this country in the immediate future get that thoroughly into their heads, and they will do a great deal to settle the immigration question so far as getting suitable and proper inhabitants into Canada is concerned.

When I rose I said that I viewed this question in a slightly different way from the Government, and there are in the Bill points which we shall, perhaps, discuss better when we come to them, but I would have approached the question from an entirely different point of view from that which seems to have guided the Government. They seem to be largely concerned about the people they are keeping out of Canada. I would have approached the question from the Canadian point of view entirely and said: What would be the general policy that would, under the peculiar after-war conditions in which we find ourselves, be the best for Canada? We did enormous things in this war; we sent an enormous number of our inhabitants overseas, and our very first problem at this time is to re-absorb into our civil life, and to place them in a good position when they have been re-absorbed. the boys who went across the seas and fought for us. Our first duty above all things is so to rule our country and direct our policies that we do the right thing by those citizens, primarily, because it is a duty that we owe to them, but scarcely secondarily, because it is obvious to everybody that, if we do well by those men, we have laid the basis of a population which will be second to none in the world if the men can only get women of a similar type to marry, and I do not think they will have much difficulty. On those two grounds I think the overwhelming primary duty of the Government for the next three years would have been to devote their attention to problems connected with our returned soldiers in connection with the immigration question. This consideration was evidently present to the minds of the government of the United States who have a longer national experience than we have, and that Government have, I understand, taken a step in regard to their immigration policy, rather different from that taken by this Bill. Before that announcement was made as to the Government of the United States, I had been in the West saying to my intimates that I personally would be in favour of closing the borders of Canada absolutely for a period of three or four years to everybody except carefully selected citizens of allied countries. I would support that policy—and I want the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) to apprehend my point—not along the lines of hostility to any people on earth. I want to repeat that I agree with the general principles he laid down, and I can and will exemplify the sincerity of my belief by saying that within thirty miles of my home there are Germans, born in Germany, who have lived as long as I have in Western Canada, whose conduct has been perfectly correct during the war, with whom I have been on friendly terms during the whole of the seventeen years that I have lived in Western Canada, and with whom I hope I shall live on the same friendly terms in the years immediately in front of us. I do not hesitate to say that, however much it may be misunderstood in certain quarters. That is my point of view on this question. I do not advocate our imitating or following the policy of the United States from the point of view of exclusion, but I advocate it from the point of view of governing Canada in such a way as to make her a desirable country to live in for the best men in the world who are not satisfied with the countries in which they are living at the present time. That is all the contribution I have to make to what would, perhaps, have been a debate better conducted on the second reading of this measure.

Mr. ANDREWS: During the recent recess, it was my privilege to attend, at Win-

nipeg, a very large meeting comprising, I think, the Rotarians, the Kiwanis, the Canadian Club, the Women's Canadian Club, the Great War Veterans, the Imperial Veterans, the Army and Navy Veterans, Orange lodges and perhaps some others. It was estimated that at least 35,000 citizens of Winnipeg were represented at that meeting. It was pointed out by the chairman that, with the exception of the Canadian Club and the Great War Veterans, whose views on the subject of the entrance of those Hutterites were well known, the others had been invited without knowing to what they were coming. There was a free and open discussion without any strings attached to it, and there were present at that meeting at least four members of this House. Speeches were delivered by gentlemen who had evidently made a very careful study of the subject under discussion, and I am only too sorry that they cannot deliver them here to-day, because they covered the ground from the early days down to the present. It was pointed out, amongst other things, that the Hutterites were known to have been in existence for something like 400 years; and that to-day the community was very small, numbering only a few thousand; that during this time they had owned their property in common, and that if a man did not agree with them, he was thrown out on the street. Cases were cited of men 56 years of age who were destitute after having belonged to that colony for twenty years.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Like Government ownership?

Mr. ANDREWS: So far as I could gather, the Hutterite community, as an institution, was not looked upon as a very serious proposition there, except in so far as it was related to the entire alien problem in Canada. The Hutterites are not numerous as they have produced only a few thousand in 400 years, so that they have not been a success under modern conditions. So far, however, as the Hutterite community is related to the present alien problem, the unanimous opinion of that meeting was that they must be stopped at once, and that the whole subject of citizenship in this country must also be tackled immediately. A considerable amount of criticism was expressed at the slowness with which the Government had tackled this problem; and it was hoped that no further delays would be permitted, and it was stated that if further delays were permitted, they could not be responsible for the results. There is in the West, a very high feeling with regard to a certain class of aliens. It is so strong that it cannot be played with, and I say that advisedly. The minister in moving the second reading of the Bill yesterday pointed to the mistakes of the past. There is an old aphorism which runs "A man who never makes mistakes never makes anything else," which can be applied with equal force to governments as to men. As an old-time western man who had been out there for years among our undeveloped resources—and the Indians had been there years before me—I know we were all mighty glad to see these foreigners coming in under the old immigration policy, for we needed a little help in developing our country. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson), who knows whereof he speaks, the mistake was not so much in bringing them in, as in the treatment they received after they got here. I sometimes think that the old-time western Canadian was too much of a trapper; he had a tendency to skin his capture as soon as he got it. I well remember those sheep skin coated men coming in, and fine husky men they were. The following winter they would go to the bush armed with small hatchets which they brought from the old land. One would get on each side of a tree and peck it down like woodpeckers, then they would cut it in four-foot lengths and after piling a cord, which it would take two men a whole day to do, all they received was thirty cents. A little later when an election came on, somebody thought that if these men could be taught to make a cross they would be able to vote, so they were sworn in as good citizens, and then a little later on came the bottle of white whisky. I am sometimes surprised that we have not had more trouble with our foreigners. But we have come to the jumping-off place now. Our returning soldiers have had the fact driven into them by six-inch shells that citizenship is a question of vital importance, which must be settled. It did not take John Bull or Canada two years to wake up. If it had, we would have been licked. I do not wish to be understood as saying that those men who enlisted early in the war had more courage than those who enlisted later, because as a matter of fact I am convinced that it took more courage to join up in the later stages, but it was the spirit of those men who sprang to arms in 1914 that saved the show; and I think we all realize that in the future the thing that will count is not our great railways not our enormous

resources or our millionaires, but Canada's honour, and we must breed and bring up in this country men who at the drop of the hat will spring to arms in its defence.

Mr. REDMAN: I fully agree with other hon. members that we should not adopt in our immigration policy the principle of hostility to any nation or race. History records that eventually our enemies may become our friends. While that is true, and should be one of our guiding principles, it must be pointed out that the war is not yet over, and that the feeling in Canada, especially among the returned soldiers, against people of German blood and German tongue is very intense; and I could not imagine any better way of accentuating that feeling of hostility than to allow people of German blood and German language to come into Canada at this particular time. I think that if we wish to cure this feeling of hostility towards the German people, which undoubtedly does exist, we should see that the feeling of Canadian soldiers and Canadians generally is not irritated by an influx of people speaking the German language, if not of German blood. The War Veterans of Canada have taken a positive stand against the immigration of Hutterites and Mennonites into Western Canada. The hon. member for Lethbridge this afternoon gave in my opinion sufficient reasons why it is not desirable to admit these people into Canada. I do not think it is the policy of this country, and I hope it never will be, to exclude people from Canada on account of their religion; we should never act on that principle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the hon. member mean that positively or negatively? A great many people have been brought in because they were of a certain religion.

Mr. REDMAN: I do not mean it either positively or negatively. I simply state that religion should not enter into the discussion of this question. In addition to the reasons which the hon. member for Lethbridge gave, I should like to point out another characteristic which is very unfair to the other citizens of Western Canada, and that is their method of purchasing land. They will buy a certain area of land, four pieces, perhaps, close together, and at once the other people on the circumference of that circle desire to leave. The value of their land goes down, no one but these organizations will take it, and in that way the colony spreads, to the detriment of the citizens settled around, and who, of course, have a right to live in any part of the country they please.

I am very pleased that section 13 of the Bill empowers the Government to remedy by Order in Council just such situations as these as they arise. The feeling in Western Canada during the last few months has been so intense—and this is not unreasonable when it is remembered that in that part of the country we have just as great a proportion of foreign-born people as we can possibly stand, and having regard also to the fact that we wish our people to live up to British ideals—the situation in the West is so serious that I think the Government should not wait for the Royal assent to this Bill before passing an Order in Council excluding Hutterites and Mennonites, but should exclude them now by passing an Order in Council under the War Measures Act. I do not think it is necessary for me to say that it would be quite proper to pass such an Order in Council under the War Measures Act, because the situation is one of the results of the war.

The soldiers of Canada do not wish to force their views upon the rest of the people, but the opinions which they have on this subject have been gained under circumstances which, I think it will be admitted, place them in a position to speak with knowledge. Their right to these opinions and their right to set them forth on all proper occasions must always be conceded. They have no uncertain voice on this question and have been asking that the Government should take some steps in regard to it. Now that the Government have enunciated their policy, and having regard to the fact that the situation is extremely critical and that these Hutterites are coming in even now while we are speaking on this Bill, and that it is difficult to know exactly what may happen if this stream continues, I think the Government would be well advised to take advantage of the provisions of the War Measures Act and pass an Order in Council to exclude the Hutterites, Mennonites and Doukhobors until such time as the Bill may become law.

Mr. WHIDDEN: With regard to clause 13, if the context is as good as the text which we have here there should be no trouble in having a very unanimous support.

Mr. CALDER: Will the hon. member permit me to interrupt him a moment? I intend to suggest to the Committee a new clause 13 before the discussion on this

clause proceeds any further. It is proposed to amend clause 13 by striking out all the words after the word "nationality" in the sixth line and replacing them with the following:

or race or of immigrants of any specified class or occupation, because of any economic, industrial or other condition temporarily existing in Canada or because such immigrants are deemed unsuitable having regard to the climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada, or because such immigrants are deemed undesirable owing to their peculiar customs, habits, modes of life and methods of holding property and because of their probable inability to become readily assimiliated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their entry.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. WHIDDEN: I am satisfied that the clause as now amended will meet the views of fighting men returning to Canada from overseas. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer, we must think of these people in their relation to the developing of Canada, and we must also consider what they think about other people in relation to our developing country. Whether all the men have thought correctly with regard to the Hutterites or not, I am not prepared to say, and I do not think any of us are, because we are not omniscient. But the general attitude of the men returning from overseas and of their families in Western Canada has been a sanely expressed view of this whole matter. I am sure that there is no desire on the part of any of us, as the member for East Calgary (Mr. Redman) has said, to exclude the Hutterites simply because of their religious views, but because embedded in the very heart of those religious views there is a false political philosophy, a false conception of their relation to the state, which makes it impossible for them to become other than a people in Canada, and what we need to-day is not more people, but more Canadians. We need just as many new people as we can assimilate, but only as many as we can assimilate. Numbers are not the greatest consideration at the present time. These people may bring money with them and may buy some of our best lands, but if they are allowed to come with their peculiar and, to us, false views we may be able to tolerate them, but it would be only toleration. They pay their debts well, I understand; they are good farmers and have good bank accounts. But so far as I can learn, the Government of South Dakota and generally the people residing there found that they were very loath to purchase, or even to consider purchasing, Liberty bonds. I am glad that the Minister of Immigration and the Government have been willing to consider seriously the taking of steps to relieve the present situation, and will make it possible to give the Hutterites a fair deal before they cross the line and, above all, to give the Canadian people a fair deal now and permanently by excluding the Hutterites.

I believe this Bill is one of the most important that will have been before this House during this session because it affects more than conditions to-day; it may affect conditions in Canada for many years to come. I am glad to see in the Bill evidence of more practical and scientific regulation of immigration, and a realization of the necessity of a national policy—that is a dangerous term to use, but I repeat it, a national policy—of immigration involving the preparation for nationalizing all people who come into our country. And I hope that, associated with this Bill, legislation will yet be brought down for the purpose of doing away with colonizing and of making impossible the growing up of classes of foreigners who have come into Canada in ignorance of the significance of Canadian institutions, Canadian laws and the Canadian spirit.

In other words, provision must be made, in some way or other, apart from the public schools of the several provinces, for simple machinery whereby the education and naturalization of aliens now in the land or who are yet to come in, may be taken care of, so that we may have more Canadians. I would like to submit before sitting down, four simple statements which, I believe, are involved in this Bill and most of which are either involved or implied in this clause. We should be slow to make statements, at least without considering all phases of the question, such as were made yesterday in regard to letting down the bars and making Canada an asylum, a place of refuge, for all who desire to come here. That may be a good church policy; it is not the way to built a nation. It may be desirable that missionaries of one kind and another shall have the spirit which was suggested by the words of the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) who spoke yesterday,—I do not mean political missionaries. But certainly, the preaching of that gospel in this country at the present time and the creation of machinery which would make it possible for that gospel to be accepted, will not give us a united Canada or an in-

telligent Canadian people. It will give us a group of Canadian states—Balkan states if you please—throughout the West. Canada should—and I believe the hon. minister has this in mind—so regulate and, if necessary, restrict immigration that only so many of each race of people shall be admitted as can be wholesomely Canadianized.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would it not be possible to so arrange matters, provincially and federally that each such immigrant would become a citizen of Canada rather than remain a member of a foreign state?

Mr. WHIDDEN: I am satisfied that it could be done. The presence in Canada of races who have become Canadianized will afford the best basis of a measure for the further immigration of other members of those races. I am satisfied, without giving very much consideration to the matter, that without any hate in our hearts at all towards certain alien enemies, that principle will settle the matter and will not let them come into Canada immediately peace has been signed. My third point is that Canadian standards of living should be protected from the dangerous economic competition of immigration whether from Europe or Asia. Such provision should be made for the care of aliens residing in our country as will most rapidly and genuinely promote their being Canadianized, and thus maintain intact our democratic institutions and real national unity. Let us then, Mr. Chairman, support the minister and the Government if they have the carrying out of these principles in their minds, as I believe they have, and see to it that immigration is regulated proportionately in a ratio based upon the possibility of assimilating foreign peoples, taking as the basis the number of these different peoples that we have in our country at the present time —five per cent of a given people, ten per cent of another, three per cent of another, and 15 per cent of another. Let there be no indiscriminate letting down of the bars. To use the term employed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), let us get a selected immigration of the peoples from the allied nations in the immediate future. Let us also have a Federal distribution bureau. We should arrange in some way or other for a distribution of settlers which would be fair. In addition to all the educational plans and programme in our respective provinces. I submit that some provision should be made for a Federal bureau for the general education of all immigrants and settlers from non-English speaking countries who may yet come into Canada in elementary Canadian history and civics.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I neglected to say in my remarks that I was thoroughly opposed to the Hutterite immigration. Lest my silence may be interpreted as indicating that I am in favour of it, I would like to make this explanation, because in the West, and particularly in Winnipeg, it is a very acute question. I am opposed to Mennonite, Doukhobor and Hutterite immigration in its entirety.

Mr. STEELE: Clause 13, I think introduces a new era in the development of an immigration policy for Canada, an era which is going to be characterized by the fact that Canada has at last determined to select her immigrants. That seems to be the characteristic principle of this clause —the selection of immigrants. In the past we have to a great extent opened our arms to every immigrant who, for his own purposes, chose to select Canada as the country to which he would go. In the future that policy must be reversed and no man allowed to come into Canada as an immigrant except such as Canada wishes to receive.

We have been neglectful in the past; from the point of view of citizenship we have been almost criminally neglectful. Let us now, as Canadian citizens and as a Government, modify our policy in that respect and realize that every immigrant who lands on our shores is, as it were, a ward of this Government, for a certain length of time at least, and that the Government owes an obligation to that man to educate him and to train him into Canadian citizenship. I hope we shall never see in Canada again what we have seen during the past four years: The spectacle of men who have come to this country as immigrants, who perhaps could not be objected to very much in time of peace but who, when trouble arose and danger threatened Canada, showed that their sympathies were with the enemy. If that occurs again it will largely be because this Government has not done its duty to those men in educating them in the privileges and duties of Canadian citizenship. Without going into the matter at length, I believe one of the first duties in making Canadian citizens of the immigrants who come to this country is an insistence, if necessary, that within a very short time—within a very few years at least—that before they are granted the rights of citizenship they shall, to a substantial extent, acquire the English language. I believe that if we studied the cases of those whom we speak of as for-

eigners and who have not assimilated with the rest of the population, we should find that one of the main reasons is that they preserve their native tongue and make no effort to learn English. I would not object to any man preserving the language which he brings with him. But when he comes to Canada—where English and French, if we wish to unite the two, are the languages of the country—and decides to become a Canadian citizen, he should have it impressed upon him that before he becomes naturalized he must show that he possesses a substantial knowledge of the English language. Because when they acquire a knowledge of the English language these people will see that their families are also taught it; and as they get to know the language of the country they are able to associate more freely and with less hesitation with those whose language is English, and in that way, almost unconsciously, acquire the customs and the thought of the English people by whom they are surrounded.

I am glad that the Government has decided to modify this clause so that there shall be no exclusion of a religious sect. We have heard to-day a good deal of criticism of the Mennonites, and if the clause under consideration stood as originally drafted it would exclude, providing the Government passed an Order in Council to that effect, all Mennonites. I want to say that there are Mennonites and Mennonites, and if the estimate that has been made of the people of this community who are going into the Canadian West is correct, they are entirely different from many Mennonites whom I know that are located in the province of Ontario. I feel in duty bound to say a word for at least a section of Mennonites who are citizens of Canada and located in that province. I know many of them very well, and I must say there is no better class of citizens—perhaps I should say residents—in Ontario to-day, from many points of view, than the Mennonites. They are splendid farmers, they are an industrious people, their family life is above reproach, they are a moral-living people of a high type, and they are devoted to their church. Let me say also, what perhaps cannot be said of every class of people, that although the teachings of their church may be regarded as rather peculiar in some respects, you will find the Mennonites practising what is preached in their church. The only objection, I think, that can be taken to them is that they are not in favour of military service—they are opposed to war. They are opposed to war in their church teachings, and they religiously live up to that just as they live up to all the other teachings of their church. They have brought that teaching down from several centuries ago, when they suffered from oppression in Europe, and were glad to be free from that oppression. They obtained refuge in the United States, and from the State of Pennsylvania came over to Ontario, for the same reason—to escape the war service which was being imposed upon them during the great revolutionary war there. Let me say further that the Mennonites are not pro-German in sentiment. There may be some. I believe there are some, who may feel that way; but throughout the recent war their sympathies were largely with Britain, because—while they know little perhaps of British life and of Britain as a country—one of the teachings of their church is that every member of it shall be loyal to the country in which he lives, and they emphasized and illustrated that to a very large degree during the past four years. It has been said that some of the Mennonites will not contribute to the Victory Bonds. Let me give an illustration of how some of the Mennonites, those in my own neighbourhood, contributed to Victory Bonds last fall. A congregation of 160 families, living near the town in which I reside, contributed to the Victory Bonds at that time the sum of $39,000, almost $250 for each family in the congregation. At the time they were being canvassed for Victory Bonds, they were also being canvassed for contributions for the Belgian Relief Fund, and their contributions for that purpose amounted to nearly $5,200. I say this in justice to a class of the community in Ontario who are respected by every person, who are held in high esteem, who are absolutely honest, who live up to their religious doctrines, who are perfectly law-abiding—in fact, they do not believe in going to law at all—who live a high moral life, and who have adopted our public schools. Such great advocates of education are they, that they probably give their children a better public school education than does the average citizen of Ontario. They did nothing under the Military Service Act, I think the Mennonites of Ontario were exempt from military service. They are intensely opposed to military service, there is no doubt about that, but the Order in Council, which I understand has been passed, providing that no Mennonite coming to Canada hereafter shall be exempt from military service, obviates any difficulty in that regard. I am glad that the Government has brought down this Bill, and has

inserted section 13. I hope that as the discussion goes on the necessity for selecting our immigrants in the future will be further emphasized.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): I cannot see eye to eye with those who criticise the immigration policy followed in this country up to 1914, because the immigration policy of the late Liberal government was the cause of the great prosperity which prevailed in Western Canada for quite a number of years. I live in a section of the country in which there are large numbers of the settlers referred to as alien enemies, and I must pay this tribute to them: during the war, in spite of the fact that they felt aggrieved by the War-time Elections Act, which deprived them of their franchise, they behaved in almost every instance as good Canadian citizens should behave. true, their nationality was that of the people whom we were fighting, and blood is thicker than water; but their public conduct was as good as, if not better than, that of a great many other people with whom we were, one might say, on neutral terms. There were branches of nationalities in Western Canada, with whom the allied armies were not fighting who showed stronger pro-German sentiment than ever was exhibited by Austrian, German or Bulgarian in Canada.

One criticism has been that certain nationalities which have been brought into Canada during the past twenty years have carried out their own ideas of education and language. In Alberta we have not that condition. The Provincial Government maintains absolute control over educational matters, and no particular section of the community has endeavoured to teach its own language and preserve its own national traditions. That criticism, therefore, is not fair, at least in its application to a great proportion of the people in Alberta. I have also heard adverse criticism of the Mennonites. The member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) said that Mennonites in his section of the country lived in communities, had a sort of common household, and were communistic in their ideas and apparently socialistic in their method of carrying them out. The Mennonites that I have any knowledge of in Alberta live the same as any other men, in many cases it would be difficult to discern their nationality. In their methods of life, their habits, their industry, and in everything that goes to make up a good citizen—with possibly one exception—the Mennonites in Northern Alberta are a model citizenry. But they do object, on religious grounds, I believe. to military service. From my own knowledge, that objection took the form only of a refusal to serve as combatant soldiers. When it came to subscribing to patriotic funds, buying victory bonds and taking part in Red Cross and other war work, these people, my information is, contributed as generously as any other section of that community. So that it is only fair to say that this particular class of people should not be classified as they are in Southern Alberta.

I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the clause of the Bill pertaining to naturalization. Immigrants have been brought into Western Canada from different sections of Europe. Prior to the adoption of the new Naturalization Act of 1914, these men could be naturalized quite easily and without much formality, but it is a fact that when the war broke out there were men of foreign nationality who, though they had been residents of Canada for ten, twelve or fourteen years, had not been naturalized. That condition should not be permitted. If these men wish to take up their homes with us and obtain the benefits of Canadian citizenship, the Government should insist that after a reasonable length of time, say three years, they formally signify their intention to become citizens of Canada. In the United States it is necessary that an immigrant, after three years residence in the country, should signify his intention to become a citizen of United States. If in five years an immigrant does not signify his intention of taking out naturalization papers, I take it that he is not a desirable citizen and should be deported. Population is what we need above everything, but I do not think it is right that we should allow foreign people to come here, partake of the benefits that this country affords to any man who wishes to earn a competence, and yet not assume and live up to the obligations of Canadian citizenship. The minister will be well advised to look into that phase of the question and, if possible, to make some provision in the Act to compel people coming into the country to signify their intention of really becoming Canadian citizens and of adding to the wealth and prosperity of the nation with which they have become affiliated.

Mr. CALDER: If I understand my hon. friend aright, he states that in the United States there is provision of law whereby an alien who has resided for a certain length

of time in that country is compelled to make a declaration of his intention to take out naturalization papers. That is not the case.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS: I did not intend to convey that impression. I understand that he must signify his intention within three years if he intends to take out naturalization papers within five. We could go further and insist that he signify his intention of becoming a Canadian citizen.

Mr. W. D. EULER (Waterloo, North): The minister in explaining the Bill made a statement with which I heartily agree. I do not give it in his own words, but he intimated that as a result of the war the mind of the people at large is, perhaps, not quite normal and that unless the feeling of Parliament is well controlled we may do injustice to others as well as to ourselves. Without a doubt, the war has brought about a great many prejudices and has bred racial hatred. This, probably, is not to be wondered at. But, in reference to that, I should simply like to throw out this suggestion, that after all those prejudices and hatreds will not last forever, and at this particular time it should be borne in mind that, while those feelings are quite natural and to be expected as the result of the events of the prolonged war which is now coming to an end, those feelings are not a safe guide for those who are legislating for the best interests of Canada.

What impels me to rise just now particularly is the speech of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) and that of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. J. M. Douglas) with regard to the Mennonites. I am glad to endorse much that those hon. gentlemen have said. I have read, with a good deal of regret, some statements by public men published in the press with regard to the Mennonites. I desire to say at the outset that I know nothing whatever of the Hutterites, but they have at times been described as Mennonites. I know very little of the Mennonites in the West; I know there is in Manitoba a sect of Mennonites which immigrated into Canada in 1873 or 1875, and that they were accorded certain privileges. Criticism has been made of those Mennonites and others living in the Canadian West: that they do not yield themselves to the customs of the country; that they will not permit their children to attend the ordinary public schools; that they have their own schools in which they teach German and other languages; that they do not live as ordinary Canadians do and as well-living citizens ought to live. I want also to make the point made by the hon. members for South Perth and Strathcona that there are Mennonites and Mennonites. In the county, the northern part of which I have the honour to represent, there are a large number of Mennonites; in fact, one township is inhabited almost entirely by people of that sect. They did not come from Russia, nor from Germany; they did not come from any enemy nation at all; they immigrated into Waterloo county about one hundred years ago from the state of Pennsylvania. I am not sure that some of them did not come from Germany into Pennsylvania a long time before that, but I know many of them claim that they came from Switzerland. For many years these people and their descendants have lived in the northern part of Waterloo county. Some of them have settled in Perth, some in Huron and some in Bruce, but the central settlement of the Mennonites is in my county. They are considered amongst us as being of our very best citizens,—and I use the term "citizens," although I think the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) rather qualified his statement with regard to that. They are the best of farmers, understanding farming well; they are clean in their living; they do not live in communities; each family lives by itself, and they have never to my knowledge raised the slightest objection to having their children attend the same schools as are attended by all the other children in our county.

Mr. CALDER: Are any numbers of that class of people immigrating into Ontario at the present time, or have they been immigrating during the last few years?

Mr. EULER: I know of none at all. In fact, the immigration of Mennonites into Waterloo county and, I presume, into any other county in Western Ontario, has been an accomplished fact for many years. Whether those people were at the time of their entering into Canada a hundred years ago of the same character and class as those with whom so much fault is found in the West, I do not know. It may be that they were, and if they were, there is at least reason for hope that, if a considerable number of those people have already entered the Western provinces, it will be found before long that they are after all pretty good citizens and an asset to the Dominion of Canada. We should take cognizance of those people. The reports that have been spread abroad as to the Mennonites generally will

be found to be untrue and not founded in fact. It is true they live to some extent to themselves. They do not very readily intermarry with the other people in the county, but they are absolutely respectable, hardworking, responsible people. Their word is as good as their bond, and in my county it is a fact that any man would almost sooner take the word of a Mennonite than that of anybody else. That is a strong statement, but I believe it to be true; and as I said before, you cannot find the same fault with the Mennonites of Western Ontario as is apparently to be found with those of Western Canada. They do not ask for schools of their own in which they may teach a foreign language. There is no distinction whatever as regards education between the children of the Mennonite of Western Ontario and those of any other class.

Mr. GAUVREAU: They are absolutely loyal?

Mr. EULER: They are absolutely loyal. They cannot be anything else, because all their traditions are Canadian. They did not come from a European country; they came from the United States. It would be a great pity and injustice if, at some time, their friends and relatives in Pennsylvania —and they have many relatives in Pennsylvania whom they visit occasionally—who happen to belong to the Mennonite sect, should be excluded from Canada. I do not think they should. For many people a basis of objection to permitting the entrance of Mennonites into Canada is that they do not believe in war. They take the Bible literally; they are entirely conscientious in their attitude; they refuse to go to war because of conscientious objections. I think we all hope that we shall not again have a war, and if that be the case, it may be after all that the objection which is raised to the Mennonites will never again become a practical one.

Mr. CALDER: I should like to point out to the hon. member that this section governs immigrants; that it would not prevent persons residing in the United States from temporarily entering Canada for the purpose of visiting here. I think in section 44 of the Act as it stands there is a general power given to the minister, notwithstanding any provision in the law, to allow any particular person to come in on humanitarian grounds, or on any other grounds. That is a section which we are called upon to exercise quite frequently, because, as hon. members can understand, there will be many cases where a power of that kind should be exercised on purely humanitarian grounds. I wish to make it clear that there is in the present law sufficient power to deal with cases of that kind, should they arise.

[Mr. Euler.]

Mr. EULER: The minister states that there is provision in law whereby those people could come into Canada for the purpose of visiting. I would like to ask him, if Mennonites from Pennsylvania, for example, and they are of the same class as our own, should desire to locate in Western Ontario, whether the proposed measure would exclude them. If it did, it would not be a just law nor one in the interests of our people.

Mr. CALDER: There is power to exclude.

Mr. EULER: But would that mean the necessity of excluding those Mennonites? If such a clause is added I think it is desirable that the minister should be given discretionary powers to decide in individual cases.

Mr. EDWARDS: I understood my hon. friend to say that the Mennonites object to military service on conscientious grounds. Do they object to others fighting for them?

Mr. EULER: They object to war altogether.

Mr. EDWARDS: It must be obvious that if this class of people were in Canada in sufficient numbers they might very seriously affect our policy in defending ourselves.

Mr. EULER: If all of the inhabitants of Canada were Mennonites, Canada would never be at war.

Mr. COWAN: But should we not be under the domination of Germany to-day?

Mr. EULER: No aspersions can be cast on the loyalty of the Mennonites; they are true Canadians. I know of Mennonites helping to-day to rebuild France. They have no objection to performing non-combatant service, but they do believe it is absolutely wrong and sinful to destroy human life.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is not that a limited loyalty?

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman may put his own construction upon it.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is not one hundred per cent loyalty from my point of view. Does the hon. member consider it one hundred per cent loyalty?

Mr. EULER: I am not responsible for my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS: What about yours?

Mr. EULER: Should I be in order, Mr. Chairman, in discussing one or two other clauses now?

The CHAIRMAN: It would be much more in order if my hon. friend would wait till the particular clauses are called. By the unanimous consent of the Committee a great deal of latitude has been allowed to hon. members during the past two days, but I must draw attention to the fact that there has been a tendency in the House of Commons for some time to discuss the principle of a Bill in Committee instead of on the second reading. The discussion which has taken place to-day, while very interesting, should have taken place on the second reading. The minister has moved for the consideration of section 13 and I think hon. members should confine their remarks to the subject matter of that section.

Mr. EULER: It was not my intention to speak at any length on the other clauses. I had only one or two remarks to make.

The CHAIRMAN: The trouble is that the moment one hon. member makes even one remark on some other clause, an answer is made by an hon. member on the other side of the House and a very lengthy discussion may ensue. I must ask the hon. member to adhere strictly to the rules of the Committee.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the wording of the section would be improved by substituting the words "by reason of" for the word "because" in the seventeenth line.

Mr. CRONYN: May I suggest that this clause be allowed to stand for the present? I have not seen a copy of the amendment, and it is therefore quite impossible for me to judge whether it meets the case.

Mr. CALDER: We all know the objection that has been taken to doing things under the War Measures Act while Parliament is in session, and the only reason I suggested that this section be considered at this time was that I might have the approval of the Committee before taking action under the War Measures Act. If the Committee agrees to the principle, I think we might very well take immediate action under the War Measures Act to prevent these people from coming into Canada.

Mr. McKENZIE: May I suggest that if immediate action is necessary it could be taken under the present Act, which provides that you can prohibit for a stated period or permanently the landing in Canada or the landing at any specified port of entry in Canada of immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation or character. Surely we can specify the Hutterites as a class of people unsuited to Canada? I think any lawyer, in fact, any member, will agree that the minister has power to take immediate action under the law as it now stands.

Mr. EDWARDS: I understood the Minister of Immigration to invite an expression of opinion as to the advisability of taking immediate action for the exclusion of these people who are seeking entry into Canada at the present time. In my opinion, and I think I am speaking for every one of my constituents, the Government should take immediate action by Order in Council, or any other expeditious means, to prevent the entrance of Hutterites, who, I believe, are of the same class and kidney as the Mennonites and very similar to the Doukhobors. The hon. member for Kitchener would like the bars let down and these people now living in Pennsylvania to come and settle in Western Ontario. He has made the remarkable statement that these people are absolutely loyal. What does he mean by absolutely loyal? I would take the qualifying word "absolutely" to mean that they were loyal in every sense of the word. These people who would not lift a hand to save this country from being placed under the heel of the Hun, but were willing to let others go across the seas and fight and die for principles that we hold dear, are in the opinion of the hon. member absolutely loyal. That may be his idea of absolute loyalty, but it is not mine.

We do not want in Western Canada or in Ontario or in any province in the Dominion people who are not prepared to assume their full share of the responsibilities of citizenship. If there are in the United States or Europe people of any class, whether they be called Mennonites, Hutterites or any other kind of "ites," we do not want them to come to Canada and enjoy the privileges and advantages of life under the British flag if they are willing to allow others to do the fighting for them while they sit at home in peace and plenty. We certainly do not want that kind of cattle in this country. Indeed not only do we not want that kind of cattle, but I would go further and support the view that we should deport from Canada others of the same class who were allowed to come in by mistake.

Mr. PEDLOW: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would say, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for South Renfrew has risen to a point of order.

Mr. PEDLOW: The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has referred to a certain class of people, who are conscientious objectors, as "cattle." I object to that statement, Mr. Chairman. I am of that class myself, and I object to being included under the description of "cattle."

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand that the hon. gentleman's remark was addressed to any hon. member of the House, and I therefore cannot find the point of order.

Mr. PEDLOW: Probably my point of order is not quite understood. I belong to a religious denomination known as the Society of Friends. The principles of that society are opposed to war and we are therefore conscientious objectors: We object to taking direct part in war. The hon. member has described that class of people as cattle. Now, Mr. Chairman, my objection is to these people, who are in every other respect decent and eminently respectable and loyal citizens being referred to by the term which the hon. member for Frontenac has seen fit to use. As a member of the Society of Friends I object to their being called cattle, and would ask that the hon. gentleman be requested to withdraw that statement.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the statement, and apologize to the cattle.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: The rule laid down by Sir Erskine May in connection with the point of order raised by the hon. member for South Renfrew is to be found at page 99. He says:

> If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the House or the chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the House, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals.

I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac to be addressed against a class of people not represented in the House and therefore I cannot order him to withdraw them.

Mr. PEDLOW: I do not think you quite understood the hon. gentleman's remarks, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to the Mennonites. If his remarks were addressed to the hon. member for South Renfrew I would certainly request him to withdraw them.

Mr. EDWARDS: I had not the hon. member for South Renfrew in mind when I made the remarks to which objection has been taken. I certainly had no thought of the Quakers, although I would include the Quakers with the Mennonites or Doukhobors or any other class in this country who would object on conscientious or any other grounds to assuming their full responsibilities as citizens. When I used the word "cattle" I did not notice any hon. member on the other side of the House with horns or other characteristics of these four-footed animals enough to call the word to my mind. If I had looked more closely, however, I might have deemed it proper to use another word describing a different class of four-footed creatures that are more distinguished for the length of their ears than for horns. Then the hon. gentleman might have called me to order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The language now used by the hon. member for Frontenac is absolutely undignified and unparliamentary. It is out of order, should not be used in the House of Commons and must be withdrawn.

Mr. EDWARDS: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and hasten to do so before you declare it six o'clock. I withdraw.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 13:

Mr. EDWARDS: I just want to add one or two remarks before this clause is disposed of. I got in wrong with certain hon. gentlemen by using the word "cattle" in reference to certain people that I thought were an undesirable class to have in this country, or to be allowed to come in to any great extent. My use of the word—I am not going to withdraw it—had special reference to Doukhobors and such people as that. I had no reference whatever to Quakers or conscientious objectors. May I remind the Committee of a little incident that took

place in this country a few years ago when some of these people—the Doukhobors they were called—went on a tramp, or march, through the country, men, women and children, absolutely naked. Is that the kind of people we want in Canada? I was perfectly right in offering my apology to the cattle when making a comparison between them and people of that kind. Cattle are pretty high priced now; they are valuable. That is not the class of people we want. It was a mistake that they were ever permitted to come in. It is a reflection upon the intelligence of the people who were administering the affairs of this country that they were allowed to come in under special conditions. It emphasizes, in my opinion, the mistake which has been made along immigration lines by every Government in Canada from 1867 down to the present time. One hon. gentleman spoke about the success that had attended the immigration policy during the Laurier regime. In my judgment, instead of estimating the success of our immigration policy by the number of immigrants we have obtained, in looking back over past history, we might take the number of immigrants as an indication of the lack of success which has been achieved, or the lack of thought which has been given to our immigration policy; for, just to the extent which we have been successful in point of numbers, in my judgment, we have been unsuccessful from the proper standpoint of getting people into this country.

Just one word in regard to another class which may be considered as being mentioned in clause 13—those who come under the designation of the conscientious objectors. I need not emphasize now what I said in that regard before six o'clock. I said then, and I still maintain, that we have a country here sufficiently attractive to people of other countries in Europe, or other parts of the world, that we can select the class of people that come to this country, and we should select them. If a man comes here, no matter from where he comes or what he may call himself, to take advantage of our splendid resources and to share in all the privileges that go with citizenship, we must make him understand distinctly that it will be part of his duty as a citizen to take his full share of the responsibilities of citizenship. If our country is in danger, if its rights have to be defended, or if we find it necessary to go to war, every person, no matter what he calls himself or to what sect he belongs, whether he is a conscientious objector or anything else, should come forward and do his full share and take his full part in the fight. Why should we open the doors of our country to all classes from the continent of Europe, to the people that have governed the continent with their doctrines and with the leprosy of their political ideas? What do we want them here for? Are we to consider that a man is a desirable immigrant because he weighs so many pounds and gives evidence of being physically able to work? Is that the only thing we are to go by?

One hon. gentleman objected to a reading or writing test. We are perfectly justified in requiring that a man should be able to read some language before he comes into this country. Fancy a community in a part of Canada—hundreds of them—who can neither read nor write. We are appealing to all classes of the agricultural community to farm along the best lines. We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars getting out agricultural bulletins. For what purpose? They are got out to send to people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits in order to give them the advantage of the results of scientific research that has taken place at our agricultural colleges, farms and schools. What is the good of getting out these bulletins if a considerable proportion of your population cannot read or understand them?

The minister called attention to the fact that we had not done our part in trying to make citizens of these people. He said that we had failed in that respect. I think the hon. gentleman was perfectly right in that. We are not going to help any by allowing those people to come in here regardless of whether they can read or write any language. How are we to instruct these people or to give them the knowledge that we expect to give them along patriotic lines, how are we going to give them any idea of the British institutions under which we live if they cannot read? We are perfectly within our rights in insisting upon an educational standard at least to the extent that they should be able to read some language before they come into this country? We have been over anxious in trying to fill up the country. We have lots of space, lots of agricultural land, lots of opportunities for people, and we have thought that perhaps the larger our population the more we could divide the burdens of taxation and the public debt. That probably is all right. But we are in a peculiar position in Canada at the present time and would like to get the right class of people here to help in carrying through our period of reconstruction. In my judgment, we do not want

in this country, for many years to come, an inferior class who will only increase our difficulties and troubles, so far as the labour market is concerned, without assisting us to any material extent in bearing the burden of our national obligations. For years we have placed restrictions upon certain people entering Canada. We have placed restrictions upon the Japanese, only a certain number of whom are allowed to enter Canada, and we have also placed restrictions upon Chinese immigration, and that has apparently been accepted by both parties in the Dominion as a proper policy. Now, it does seem to me that we have been illogical, to say the least of it, in placing restrictions upon the entrance into Canada of a progressive people like the Japanese, and a decent people such as the Chinese have shown themselves to be—at any rate all that I have seen coming into the country—and throwing our doors wide open to immigrants from countries in central Europe whom we have been fighting for the last four and a half years, and with whom we shall practically still be at war until peace is signed.

I am in entire accord with the idea of placing restrictions upon immigrants coming to this country. There is no necessity for us to cheapen Canada in the eyes of the world. We believe that we have the very best country on the face of the earth, and we can with confidence invite immigrants to come here. But I do not think it should be necessary for us to spend a dollar in inducing them to come. Our country is sufficiently advertised in the countries that we want immigrants from, so that we need not spend any more money for that purpose. Where do we want immigrants from? Principally, from the British Isles, from the United States, and from France, Belgium and Italy, the countries which have been allied with us in this war. If these countries have people to spare let them come, because we have tested them as they have tested us, during the past four and a half years of war. We know what these nationalities are like, and we know that we can depend upon them in a crisis or in an emergency; they will not hide behind any conscientious objections to military service, nor behind any Doukhobor or Mennonite doctrine; they will fight if necessary for the liberties of the country in the future as they fought for liberty along with us in the recent war. That is the class of people we want here. You do not need to advertise Canada to them because they know what it is like. The money we needed for the purposes of immigration, in my belief, should be devoted to a rigorous inspection on the other side of the Atlantic, before the immigrants board ocean steamships destined for Canada, supplemented by a further inspection on this side, to see that we exclude from the Dominion a class of people who have shown themselves to be troublesome in their own country, and from whom we can expect nothing but trouble if they are admitted here. Let me say emphatically that we do not want that class of people here at all; we have too many of them at the present time. In the past we have allowed things to drift, we have been too lax entirely. There has been too much compromise with these people, and too much compromise in the western provinces, in the way of allowing these people to settle in colonies and communities by themselves, to retain their own languages and their own customs, and their own ideas of how people should live. They have brought from Europe their own ideas of how a country should be run, and their ideas are not our ideas, and they are not the ideas, I venture to say, of any member of this House. Therefore I say we are perfectly justified in taking steps to maintain the high standard of civilization that we now have in this country. If there has been any lowering of that standard it is not due to our native-born population, or to immigrants from the British Isles or the United States. Any lowering of the standard of civilization in Canada has been brought about by our lax immigration laws in permitting the entry of people who never should have been allowed to come here, people who have shown themselves to be absolutely unfit for the privileges and liberties they have enjoyed here, and who refused to come forward and fight for those liberties and privileges. That is not the class we want in Canada, and I for one will support the Government in the most drastic legislation it can bring forward to restrict and prohibit that class of people from coming into Canada. I will go further and say I will support the Government in any move to debar from Canada those people who have shown themselves to be unreliable when the test came, and proved themselves to be an undesirable class of citizens.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): The position taken by the member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) is the position that I also desire to take in this matter as a member from the province of Alberta. I intend to speak on one of the points that

has been brought up this afternoon when the Franchise Bill was introduced, but as I have been subjected to attacks in the press of Canada in that regard I deem it advisable to discuss at some length what has taken place and to refute the charges that have been made in several newspapers in reference to myself. This afternoon the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) laid a charge against a population of three hundred and fifty thousand souls residing in the West, basing his charge on statements contained in a letter from D. A. Ross, a member of the Manitoba Legislature. I do not believe the rumours referred to, and I will give the Committee the grounds for my belief in a few moments. With the intention of assisting the member for Springfield I asked him to lay upon the Table the letter upon which he based his accusations, and the abrupt reply I received was that the member for Springfield would do just as he liked. I want to tell that hon. gentleman to-night that whenever he, and his friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), move resolutions, and amendments to resolutions, in this House, and line up the members behind them, and then secretly enter into a compact with a member of the Government that they shall withdraw such resolutions and amendments, and place members in a difficult position and force them to vote against their convictions so as not to give a slap in the face to the Government—I tell that hon. gentleman the next time I shall vote as I please, and I am sure that in saying so I am voicing the sentiments of a large number of my colleagues in the House. The hon. member was unfortunate in most of his irresponsible statements this afternoon, and unfortunate also in the choice of his language. In the Evening Telegram of October 8. 1918, there is an article written about me appearing in special correspondence from G. C. Porter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not send for the hon. member for Springfield?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: He will get it. The heading of the correspondence referred to in the Telegram is as follows:

To restore vote to Aliens.—Hon J. A. Calder makes move.—H. A. Mackie, M.P., Admits Appeal to Premier Borden on behalf of Ukrainians.

In this article they make an attack upon the Minister of Immigration and Colonization and upon me, saying that we were endeavouring to restore the vote to those who were the enemies of the country. They conclude the article by saying that "Mr. Mackie, who has been chosen to carry on the negotiations with western members of this province, is a native of Quebec, a French Canadian Catholic." I shall be pleased, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to file this article so that it may be published in Hansard. I do not blame the Evening Telegram, because the article in question is the special correspondence of Mr. Porter of Winnipeg.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. gentleman wants any article to appear in Hansard, he will certainly have to read it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Mr. MACKIE: I did not like to take up the time of the Committee. It is as follows:

(Special Correspondence to The Telegram from G. C. Porter.)

Edmonton, Alta., Oct. 8.—Intrigue is rampant through the west to have the Dominion Elections Act disfranchising electors of alien enemy races abolished at the approaching session of Parliament. Hon. James Calder last week laid the plan before the Great War Veterns' Executive Committee, of Edmonton, and this week will take the executive at Calgary into his confidence. H. A. Mackie, M.P. for East Edmonton, has been selected to communicate with all the western members to see how they feel on the subject. He said to-day that he would move the resolution when Parliament opens. He admitted frankly that he has wired the Prairie members the following:

Seek Revision of Act.

"Local Ukrainian Association want revision of War Times Election Act relative to disfranchisement with a view of doing non-combatant work at soldier's pay and taking a share in the war. Their bishops and priests favourable. All western members are being canvassed. If Government is favourable will you concur?"

This is supposed to be a telegram which I sent. As a matter of fact, the statement is not correct. The article continues:

Mr. Mackie said he had already received some replies, both favourable and unfavourable. He defended his position very vigorously, saying this would solve alien enemy labour question of the prairies. He limited his observations to the Ukrainians.

Veterans to Oppose.

But Hon. J. A. Calder, in talking with the Soldiers' Committee, referred to all alien enemies disfranchised. The returned soldiers are individually bitterly opposed to the idea, and it will come up for discussion on Thursday night. The members are greatly excited, as this coming at the time of the immigration of so many German Mennonites into the prairies, has provoked the returned soldiers to desperation.

Not Wanted.

Tom Dace, Alberta's representative of the Dominion Great War Veterans' Executive, said

he would not express an opinion until after the meeting to be held following the Calder suggestion of suspending the Disfranchisement Act. It was so serious that 2,000 members here should first be permitted to discuss the subject before he spoke. He did, however, say that he and all other soldiers were bitterly opposed to these Mennonites coming in here with their German schools and exemptions. As he put it: "We don't want any of these people being spewed out of the U.S., and the 2,000 returned members here and the similar number in Calgary are a raging volcano on the subject of the preferred treatment the alien enemies are and have been receiving from the Government."

He added that the soldiers' executive put the Mennonite menace up to Hon. Mr. Calder at the meeting here as they did to Hon. N. W. Rowell.

Mr. CALDER: Where was that meeting supposed to have been held?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In Edmonton. I will refer to it; I know what he means. I just want to give my friend Porter something that is coming to him in a few minutes:

—and neither faced the question squarely, and the soldiers were much disturbed by their equivocating demeanour. Each said he would have to take the subject up at Ottawa before making definite reply.

BISHOP BUDKA AGAIN.

Bishop Budka, of the Ukrainians, was in Edmonton last week in connection with the scheme to get his people's franchise restored, and has been working quietly all over the prairies for some time in this direction. He is now in Ottawa. This is the same Bishop Budka who was charged with sedition at Hafford in July, but acquitted, and it was Budka who issued a pastoral letter to his flock advising them to return to Austria and fight for the fatherland. He escaped serious consequences because the document was issued prior to Britain entering the war.

EDITOR GETS THREE YEARS.

Ukrainians are mostly Austrians, and there are from 70,000 to 100,000 of these alien enemies in the prairies. The editor of the chief Ukrainian paper at Winnipeg was sentenced to three years in penitentiary for seditious utterances.

There was intense excitement among G.W.V., Next of Kin British Citizenship League and Sons of England over the Mennonite menace, that the latest disclosure of the intrigue to give the alien enemy back his franchise, has enormously increased the feeling of alarm among patriotic societies, and feeling is general that the Act is likely to be suspended unless the greatest energy is displayed to convince the Government of its unpopularity.

BELONGS TO QUEBEC.

Mr. Mackie, who has been chosen to carry on negotiations with western members for this purpose, is a native of Quebec, a French-Canadian Catholic, and in his constituency there are two thousand alien enemies. His majority in the last election was 600, exclusive of the soldiers' vote, which gave him nearly 2,000 majority. He said he opposed the disfranchisement of these people last fall until he learned that the Imperial authorities did not want them sent overseas as soldiers.

The statement made by Porter with regard to the Minister of Immigration and myself is absolutely false and manufactured from his own immoral imagination. A meeting was held in the Macdonald Hotel, Edmonton, at which the Minister of Immigration and myself were present, along with a number of civilians and soldiers. We made a protest against the entry of Mennonites into Canada; not a word was said about the Disfranchisement Act, nor did I have any communication with the minister in connection with this matter, good, bad or indifferent, except that I stated to him that I was sending a petition to the Government asking that the War-time Elections Act be rescinded so that the Ruthenians who are British subjects could be conscripted for non-combatant work in Canada. This man Porter comes into my office and says: "I understand that you are to present a petition to the Dominion Government asking for the recision of the War-times Elections Act." He passes off as my friend; his zeal began with hypocrisy and ended with treachery. He says: "I am your friend. You are doing a great deal for the soldiers." I assented to all these remarks, and then when I told him what I was doing he began to ask me whether I was a Mason or a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. I resented these remarks and told him where he was "getting off at." Before he left he asked my permission to publish the interview and I granted it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was that before the election?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: This was in October, 1918. What I told him was this: That the Ruthenian Association had asked me to send a petition to the Dominion Government asking for the rescision of the War-Time Elections Act so that Ruthenians, British subjects, could be conscripted to do non-combatant work in Canada.

I told him I thought that was the proper attitude to take. I did not see how I could reconcile my views with those of the Government who had disfranchised those people, because, even although they were not wanted overseas and their opinions might not be taken seriously in war matters in the Dominion of Canada, they could have been recruited for non-combatant work. Those are the views which I held then and which I hold at the present time. He spoke of Bishop Budka. I never met Bishop Budka until the month of February

of this year, when I was on my way from Edmonton to this House, and in the presence of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake), I told the reverend gentleman that if what was being circulated about him was true, I would be one of the first to ask for his deportation. In that regard the hon. member for North Winnipeg put upon the Order Paper a certain number of questions which were answered by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), and I shall refer to that very shortly.

This report of Porter makes out that I am allied with Bishop Budka, and I do not know what purpose he has in view when he says that I am from Quebec, a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic. Again, Mr. Porter is not stating what I told him, and it is quite evident that he intended to do me an injury, one that I could not repair by correspondence through the press. I wish to point out to the press gallery here the power that they have in destroying men in public life by writing such articles as this, if they emanated from them directly. Not very long ago, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) had to complain about the Globe, and may I tell my friend, Marchington, that he had better pay a little stricter attention to the truthfulness of his premises. There is only one member of the press gallery that is safe, and that is Ford, because he never transmits anything West. This man Porter came to me as a friend; at first he deceived me and at last he betrayed me by a most brazen and audicious falsehood. But that is not all.

We come to Jack Canuck, of January 11, 1919. I do not purpose putting Jack Canuck on Hansard. This paper that lives and thrives on carrion meat, is the scavenger in the political and social life of Canada and does not deserve anything more than a passing reference from me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that a Government organ?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I do not know. It it is, the Government should blush for it. It is published in the holy city of Toronto.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is it an Opposition organ?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: It may be an Opposition organ. Some parts of it, I imagine, came from them. The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) put the following questions to the Government:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not Bishop Budka (Ukrainian), resident at Winnipeg, was charged with sedition at Hafford, Sask., in July, 1918?

2. Has the Government any knowledge of any accusation being made against the said Bishop?

3. If so, has the Government taken any steps to inquire into such accusations?

4. Has the Government taken any steps to prosecute the said Bishop for his said alleged utterances?

5. Has the Government any intention of deporting the said Bishop? If not, why not?

The answers were the following:

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes, but the charge was subsequently withdrawn.

2. He has been accused of disloyalty on several occasions.

3. Investigation has been made but no evidence to substantiate the accusations has been submitted.

4. No grounds disclosed to prosecute.

I see by to-night's paper that the reverend gentleman is brought to answer a charge before some local authority in Winnipeg by virtue of an Order in Council passed by the Local Legislature on 12th February, 1919. It is quite evident that Premier Norris is not a member of the Federal Government, or he would be able to write out a better Order in Council than the one which I hold in my hand, which says: Wheras this and whereas that—

Mr. LEMIEUX: He has not had the practice.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: That is what I say.

That pursuant to and under the provisions of the said charter—

and so forth.

—a board to be known as the Alien Investigation Board of Manitoba with powers to investigate the whole situation.

That is the Order in Council constituting a board consisting of certain gentlemen in Manitoba to investigate the whole situation. What is the whole situation? What is the effect of this Order in Council except to foster a political move?

And what the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) said this afternoon is quite true, namely, that we have done nothing for these people, whom we have brought to this country, except to exploit them. There is, indeed, exploitation. I know, as a matter of fact, that a politician in the employ of the Norris Government has a room in Labour Hall, and he gets these people to come and report to him and he tells them: " Now, here is your exemption card from deportation; you are all right; keep that in your pocket or you will be deported, and the Norris Government is preventing you from being deported, by virtue of an Order in Council

which is bound to investigate the whole situation." Are these people being treated fairly? Have they been treated fairly in Saskatchewan or Alberta, where, for instance, in a constituency I know a local member, a man totally incapable of broad and generous thought, who has three political organizations, English, French and Russian, that go forth with three political war-cries: "Long live the British Empire," "Long live Quebec," and "Russia forever?" And here, lo and behold, the Norris Government comes along with an Order in Council that is passed by virtue of some statute in Manitoba authorizing a committee of three men to investigate the situation, and the Rev. Bishop Budka is being investigated at the present time. If it be true that he has done anything against this country, I believe the Dominion Government, and not the Provincial Government of Manitoba, will have to take steps to deport him.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: On what side was that provincial member at the last election?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: He is a member of the local Legislature of Alberta, and since the creation of that province there has been only one political side and I believe they are about to stick there for a longer time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who are the members of that board?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Judge Myers, a member of the Great War Veterans, and the name of the third I do not recollect. Adverting again to the article which was written against me and which was trying to link me up with the Rev. Bishop Budka, who was supposed to be guilty of seditious utterances and to be a traitor to this country, let me point out what I petitioned the Dominion Government to do, because this is the only place in which I can at least explain my conduct and give any publicity in the Dominion of Canada in refutation of articles which are absolutely untrue. On October 16, 1918, I forwarded this petition to Sir Robert Borden, and I shall read only portions of it, as it is rather long:—

> Recent representations were made to me by the local Ruthenian Association that the "War-time Elections Act" ought to be rescinded so as to permit the Ukrainians in Canada to render non-combatant service. To ascertain the feeling of the western members I wired all but two in the four provinces. The replies are enclosed herein. Some disclose that the member is not familiar with the law. Others show an open mind, and still others are decidedly against that proposition. . . . . .

> We now consider the advisability of rescinding the War-time Elections Act in so far as the foreign population, whose citizenship has been suspended, so that every one may render a non-combatant service at soldier's pay for the balance of this war, since we are forbidden by the Imperial authorities to take them for combatant service. . . . . .
>
> I have the assurance of the Ruthenian Associations here that they, supported by their clergy, are prepared to instruct their people and explain why their franchise was suspended and why they should serve, if allowed.

Is that what Porter said? The statement I gave to him is the statement I have just read, but the statement he gave to the press links me up with Bishop Budka. For the purpose of feeling the pulse of the Western members, I wired them, because they were all as much interested as myself and I felt that they would support me in having the Act rescinded so as to ensure a large number of these people doing war work in Canada. I stated to the Prime Minister some of the objections that were raised:

> Objection is taken that their non-combatant work would interfere with labour and their organizations. Non-combatant workers need not disturb economic conditions. The present equilibrium can be maintained and the surplus value of earnings can be diverted to a fund for returned soldiers.

That is what I was asking for, and what I told Porter, that the Act should be rescinded so that these people could do non-combatant service in Canada at $1.10 a day. And I said: Let the surplus value of their earnings go to a fund for returned soldiers. That was the request I made of the Dominion Government.

In 1916 a letter was addressed by the Ukrainians of Northern Alberta to Mr. R. B. Bennett, president of the National Service Commission, Ottawa:

> A recent political development in Europe, namely, the establishment of the independent kingdom of Poland and the promise of internal autonomy for the kingdom of Galicia, are principally responsible for the present letter addressed to you as Chairman of National Commissions, to secure your consent and support in adopting a certain new policy in our recruiting campaign.

This letter points out that the Ukrainians were willing to do national service, and they asked Mr. Bennett how best that could be brought about. On page 7, the letter says:

> The method of securing recruits should be gone into fully by the writer who is in a position to know what would be the best way to reach these people and to make them understand the reason why they have an interest in the present war. I should at all times be ready and willing to give you the assistance necessary in forming the plan.

May I call your attention also to the advisability of undertaking the recruiting among the Ruthenians of the western provinces by stating that it would very materially assist the undertaking of the Government to raise 500,000 troops in Canada?

I would like to point out to you that in the 218th Battalion, commanded by Lieut.-Col. Cornwall, there are a large number of Ruthenians who have volunteered to enlist and have been accepted and Lieut.-Col. Cornwall informs me that they are of the very best material in his whole battalion. Lieut.-Col. Cornwall also informs me that the Ruthenians in his battalion have shown a remarkable ability to learn the English language and that they understand the commands given in English just as well as any English speaking soldiers.

I should be very happy to read at your earliest convenience, that your Committee has given this matter their earnest consideration, and I trust that you will come to the conclusion that the Ruthenians in the Dominion of Canada are able to serve Canadian interests; that we are willing to become better Canadians if you will assist us; and that we realize fully the justness of the cause of the Allies in the present war.

In 1916, therefore, these people were asking to do national service, but the Government did not see fit to adopt their suggestion. What do we find at the present time? Let me read a petition that was addressed by the Ukrainian Council of Canada to the Dominion Government by these people who were alleged this afternoon to be uprising in Manitoba and creating a Bolshevik movement. I shall not read all the "Whereas" clauses, but I shall be glad to show the petition in its entirety to any hon. gentleman who cares to call upon me. I might explain that the Ukrainian Council represents 350,000 people, not 70,000 or 100,000, as has been stated. The Ruthenians do not all come from Galicia. Some come from Bukowina, Hungary, and the little Russias, so called. They are all the same people; they are Ruthenians, but they call themselves Ukrainians because it is the Ukrainian family in language, literature and ideals. The chances are that the Ukrainian republic will be established by the Peace Conference in Paris, which will furnish the key to the eastern situation. What did the Ukrainian Council ask the Dominion Government to do? The petition reads in part:

Whereas such politicians are advocating indiscriminate deportation.

Whereas, Ukrainians in Canada realize they have not become Canadianized as rapidly as might have been expected.

Whereas the Ukrainians are of the opinion that Canada cannot be a nation until a system of education is evolved whereby all people shall learn to suffer alike and to love alike, to revere the same great historical figures and to interpret the meaning of the flag in the same way.

Now therefore be it resolved that we on behalf of the Ukranian people of Canada, humbly petition the Canadian Government:
(a) To establish a national school as a remedy to the evils enumerated herein.

(b) That the Canadian Government do deport from this country all enemy aliens who have committed an offence against this country or the British Empire during the time of the war.

(c) That the Canadian Government do amend the Naturalization Act so as to make education a test, providing that no one shall be naturalized from now on unless he is capable of reading and writing the English language, with the proviso, however, that the Supreme Court judges or the Superior Court judges of this country shall take into consideration, such cases, for instance, of a man who is of an age and so situated that he could not be expected reasonably to acquire more than a smattering of the English language; trusting that such judges stand historically and traditionally as a great body of men who come between the legislative and the executive of the state and the public, and your petitioners shall ever pray.

EXECUTIVE OF THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE'S COUNCIL OF CANADA.

What then do we find these people doing who, the hon. member for Springfield, seeking cheap notoriety, says, are uprising?

The CHAIRMAN: I think I shall have to ask the hon. member to withdraw the expression that an hon. member made use of his place in this House to seek cheap notoriety.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: If the expression is not parliamentary I gladly withdraw it, but I still believe it is true. These people in their petition to the Dominion Government asked that the Ukrainians in Western Canada be permitted to serve with the English and French forces to put down Bolshevism in Europe.

In conclusion, I say that before hon. members make a statement which has a tendency to stigmatize 350,000 citizens of Canada they should first take pains to find out the facts.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Speaking of this Mr. Porter, my hon. friend said that he attempts to link his name with Bishop Budka, and before that my hon. friend referred to the accusation of sedition brought against the Bishop. Will he explain that point, because there are so many rumours about Bishop Budka?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The difficulty that has arisen in Western Canada regarding Bishop Budka is a religious one. There is a difficulty between the Greek Orthodox and the Greek Catholic. The Greek Catholics recognize the Pope, but are not subject to his authority, instead of recog-

nizing the Czar of Russia who was a religious and a political leader at one and the same time. So far as I have been able to ascertain a meeting was called prior to the declaration of war by Britain and the reverend Bishop attended and exhorted his people to advise their friends across the seas not to think of coming to Canada any longer because there was a question of labour and they were not in a position to take care of them. Is that the explanation that the hon. member wishes?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The charge of sedition was referred to.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Yes, there was a charge of sedition against the Bishop. He was tried and acquitted. Other rumours have been circulated about his attitude, but so far nothing has come out of them, and the Acting Minister of Justice replied to the question which was put to this House by the hon. member for North Winnipeg. Under the Order in Council the whole situation is now being investigated and the Bishop will either be requested to get out of Canada or will once more be excused. I wish to say, in conclusion, that Porter could not have had any intention other than to create a feeling of antagonism against me at the hands of the returned soldiers, or to create a religious prejudice against me. It is true that I come from Quebec, but that is not the way Porter intended the remarks. I do not blush when I say that I do come from Quebec, which has given to the political and social life of Canada a Mercier, a Chapleau, a Lafontaine, and last but not least, a Laurier. And if hon. members will press me I will say why I prefer to come from that province than from any other part of Canada. The returned soldier is full of speculative ideals and he would like to see society differently constituted. But the time politician is the man who will
9 p.m. make the most of the material he finds in the country. A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve taken together form what in my opinion is the essence of true statesmanship in the matter of immigration.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): May I ask a question of the Minister of Immigration, in regard to the question that was brought up by the hon. member for East Edmonton? Will you deny that you are associated with the telegrams with which our country was flooded, after your visit to Edmonton—

The CHAIRMAN: I will have to ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair.

[Mr. H. A. Mackie.]

Mr. COWAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will speak to the minister through you. At that particular time our section of the country, or at least a great many people, condemned the Minister of Immigration because they believed, and it was generally asserted, that he originated the telegrams which were sent out by the hon. member for Edmonton stating that the War-time Elections Act was to be repealed on condition that these men would go into non-combatant service.

Mr. CALDER: This is the first time I have had any inkling that that question has exercised the minds of persons out West. I had nothing either directly or indirectly to do with the origin of these telegrams. I have never discussed the matter in any shape or form with the member for Edmonton. It originated entirely with himself, and I did not know that the matter was of any concern to any people in Western Canada. I may say this too: I am fairly well acquainted with Mr. Porter, who has written and said a great deal about myself, and I ceased long ago to pay any attention to anything he either writes or says.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): About twenty years ago the Ruthenians began to come into the district for which I am now the sitting member. At that time there was about a township and a half immediately south of the southwest corner of the Riding Mountain Reserve which was wild land heavily wooded and hilly, with a ravine separating it on the east side from the English settlement. It lies about fifteen miles from the town of Neepawa. These people came in and took up that section of the country. They have now about 60 per cent of it clear and about 25 to 30 per cent under cultivation, and they have been there from fifteen to twenty years. I have had a great deal to do with these people generally. They do not attempt to cultivate a whole quarter-section of land, but as a rule divide it into smaller areas, 40 or 50 acres, and as you go along the roads in one of their districts it is much like one of the river settlements in the West, a continuous village. The houses generally are built of logs, very neatly plastered—which work the women generally do—and are a story and a half high, roofed with shingles, or even thatched. The farm buildings are of log, and they are generally thatched with straw The people start out clearing a very small bit of land for a garden or a small field, and the men go into the harvest fields every season for labour, and this has been the source of our labour in the West. The older men who are grown up when they

come, except those who have been out in employment hired by the year, very seldom get any command of the English language, and I regret to say that very few of the children have any knowledge of English. It will be understood that, due to political conditions into which I need not enter now, prior to 1915 in the province of Manitoba we had an abominable abuse of the bilingual situation which was first created in 1897.

Owing to that, the Government there permitted young Ruthenians to go to the Normal school, obtain certificates as teachers, and then go into schools to instruct the pupils. There was a stipulation, or a regulation, that these men should be able to speak English. I will tell you how far they were able to speak English. I have had three of these teachers at different times come into my office to do business, and they have had to go out and get an interpreter in order to talk to me. Yet, from a source like that, we were expected to get teachers who would have some command of the English language. That was the situation down to 1915. I, with many others who were interested in politics, I suppose, was to blame for having got these people naturalized as speedily as possible. I have paid $30, or $50, at a time for naturalization papers for them, and I suppose half of them knew practically nothing about the political situation. But we were all doing it and it had become a common practice in the West.

Sometimes we talk of these people being put into settlements and segregated. I do not know just how you are going to deal with that situation. A number of these people come in, they get their friends from the Old Country to come, and they buy land in a neighbourhood. The English-speaking people in that settlement get out, and for a very sufficient reason. In a settlement like that there are not too many people at any time to support a church organization or the social activities of the community. When people have different ideals and different languages there are not enough of them in a district to support those institutions, and the English-speaking people quite naturally get out. Besides that we find that we have a difficulty in regard to English-speaking schools. The English-speaking people find that with teachers such as they have, their own children are not getting proper instruction in English. In consequence, you have this segregation. You are going to have segregation as long as you are getting in these foreigners in large numbers. This will repeat itself despite almost any regulations Parliament may make. As a consequence of what I have told you, we have very few children of these people who are able to read and speak English with any fluency whatever.

What would you do to meet that situation? I have outlined to you the development and history of a typical community. There are hundreds—yes, thousands—of these scattered over our great West. The deduction I draw from that situation—and which I think any sensible man will draw—is that we cannot continue bringing in these people, increasing the area of such settlements and not only the area of the settlements which have begun but increasing the number of them. We have to call a halt until we have assimilated that population which is now out of hand largely owing to the mistakes we have made in the past. It is we who have sinned rather than they.

I wish to say a word or two for them. I know that many of these people have been willing in the past to enlist. They have been willing to do service according to their light, and they have in some cases contributed. But they have also committed errors. The accusation has been made, and, I think, in some cases rightfully, that when there were victories by the enemy they put up their flags and celebrated. They have not been Anglicized and they are not British citizens although they, in many cases, hold our naturalization certificates. We are very largely to blame. But the time has come now when we must check the further encroachment of this situation upon the opportunities and prospects of the Canadian West. If we do not do it the time will come when we shall not be able to control the situation.

You have seen in the province of Ontario 15,000 or 16,000 people every year going from your farms into the cities. The same movement was almost threatening before the war in the West. We found our English-speaking men going off the farms and into the cities. We saw a great many of them leaving the country. The consequence is that these people of whom I have been speaking are spreading very rapidly. There has been some evidence of that in my own district. They have been making money during these times. The constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) lies right west from mine and from the constituency which I now speak of clear across to the other side of the Riding Mountain reserve and almost to the western side of the constituency—that is on the north side of his constituency—there is a

population of a character similar to that of which I have spoken. These people have been making money and buying farms down in the English settlements. It is curious to note the encroachment there. It was a subject of remark in my town within the last year that a splendid quarter-section two miles north of the town and right in the heart of an English-speaking settlement was bought by Galicians. They have been buying first-class farms. In my district we have a rather hard piece of land contiguous to the railway and facilities for shipment, and yet, because of its rough character, the English settlers had avoided it. These foreigners entered upon that and they have made good. But farther west we have a settlement in the constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture which is better land. The settlers there made very rapid progress and many of them have farms which are worth $15,000 to $20,000. They have their Hudson cars. They have been making money. But they have not become Anglicized. We have perhaps a more difficult situation to deal with now that they have money, are able to organize and have leaders amongst themselves than we would have if they were poor and more or less helpless under our conditions.

I thought I should explain the situation to the Committee. There are many men in the East and, I think, some in the West, who have not been out through those districts as I have been. Time and again I have had occasion to go through these particular districts, and I thought it would be instructive to the Committee to understand the conditions of these districts industrially and in the way of settlement and also what has been the result of the effort to induce these people to become British subjects.

Mr. T. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): Just before we pass on I have a few remarks to make in regard to section 13. We have heard considerable discussion to-day in regard to the various classes of people who should be allowed to come into Canada, and it seems to be pretty generally agreed that great restrictions should be imposed upon future settlers, especially upon those from European countries. I have listened with pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie) in regard to the Ukrainians and Ruthenians, and also to the remarks of the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Davis) respecting the Ruthenians in his district, and despite the arguments of these hon. gentlemen I think we must conclude that the people referred to are a class that we do not want to settle in this country. Both gentlemen have shown completely that although these people have remained in the Dominion for a great number of years, and although they have become Canadianized to the extent that they have amassed considerable wealth, have acquired great areas of land, and have purchased their automobiles, still they have not become Canadianized or Anglicized to the extent that they can become part and parcel of the social and economic life of this country. I believe, further, that there are a great many settlers in Canada hailing from European countries who are absolutely out of sympathy with Canada and with the British Empire, and while these people may be naturalized and enjoy the benefits of our laws and the protection of our institutions, I think we must bring them to a full realization that there cannot be granted in the future, as there has been in the past, any concessions by reason of any political affiliations. We have received petitions from many people in the West, since Parliament assembled, asking concessions in regard to, for one thing, the use of their language. We have heard bitter complaints from many because the authorities have seen fit to deprive them of the use of the German language in their schools and in their press; but I do not believe that this Government, or any government in Canada, would be justified in allowing these people to conduct their commercial, social, religious, or educational life in the German language, or any medium which savours of that tongue, and in my opinion it is the duty of all governments, both federal and provincial, to see to it that that instrument of intercourse is curbed to the greatest extent in this country. It is very difficult for me to believe, and doubtless it is equally difficult for any member of the House to-night to believe, when a man uses as a means of intercourse the German language, that he is not so closely allied with the German race and the German people that his sympathies are German. While we curb the people who are already in the country in that respect, we must use the greatest caution and care to see that Canada is not settled for a long time to come by any class of persons who use that tongue as a vehicle for communication. In view of the agitation which has recently arisen in the West in connection with the Hutterites and the Mennonites, it may appear to some eastern people that there is over-anxiety or over-excitement in that country in regard

to the matter. But we find that one of the things in connection with these people is that they have been brought up and taught to use the German language. They have been using it in South Dakota, and other parts of the United States, whence they come to our country. They now desire to use that language in Canada; they have been asking the privilege of carrying on their schools in the province of Alberta in the German language. Their sympathies are not with Great Britain or with Canada, but are first with the German people and then with the Hutterites and Mennonites, who, in the true sense of the word, are Hutterites themselves. We do not want these people in Canada at any time; and I trust that this Government will take immediate steps to prevent the entrance into Canada of any one single person of that class. Why do we not want them in this country? Some person will say they are good farmers, they can herd cattle, and their efforts will tend to the agricultural development of this great country and of Western Canada in particular. I admit that is perfectly true, but their social and economic status, their mental attitude and their ancestral affiliations are such that they can never become part and parcel of the true Canadian people. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan) this afternoon, we find that they are in one sense, and a broad sense, communists. What does that mean? They have been driven from South Dakota by the operation of the laws of that state. Following the doctrine of Jacob Hutter, they formed their various societies, which they call religious denominations, and through their medium operated in the state of South Dakota. An investigation was conducted by the authorities, and it was found that they were carrying on trade and commerce under the guise of religion. The state authorities at once put the law in force and are now bringing actions to dissolve these organizations. But the difficulty with the organization, so far as our economic system is concerned, is that the individual in it has no rights. If there is anything upon which we pride ourselves in this country it is our individual liberty, our individual freedom, and the right to enjoy and to hold property. These Mennonites and Hutterites who are now coming into this country as individuals have no power to enjoy any such rights; the property which they acquire as the result of their industry and of their labour becomes the property of their association or organization. The women toil, the men toil, but as a result of all that labour they are not the owners or the possessors of one dollar's worth of personal or real property—it all becomes the property of the organization. The result has been that in South Dakota, where actions are being brought in the courts for the dissolution of some of these organizations, we find there are men well on to fifty years of age who have toiled all their lives for these organizations, who are now turned out—they have not a dollar. We find again another case in which a man left behind him two wives and fourteen or fifteen children who have been thrown upon the mercy of the public. We find that every man who disagrees with that organization is, if possible, kicked out into the street, and receives no share of the profits that have been accumulated. Hutterites and Mennonites, so far as their organizations are concerned, are introducing into this Dominion the greatest possible form of bondage and slavery. It is a condition which is inimical to the best interests of our agricultural and our economic life, to the best interests of the individual, and to personal liberty.

Then if we turn from the economic side of the question, and consider it from a personal point of view, there is the character of their social life to be borne in mind. These people all live together. They live under conditions which are not suitable to our people, and which would not be tolerated by Canadian citizens. They live under conditions in which Canadians would not associate with them. They converse in the German language, they carry on their own trading amongst themselves, and they desire to have their own schools if the law will permit it.

Is this country to be benefited by that class of people? When they form their small colonies the English, Scotch or Canadian settlers round about them are gradually driven out because their form of life is inconsistent with ours and wholly incompatible with our customs and ideals. What we want is immediate action; we do not want one more Hutterite or Mennonite to cross the boundary from United States into Canada. The Government would be justified in passing an Order in Council under the War Measures Act dealing with this matter pending the operation of this proposed legislation. If this is not done there will be great unrest throughout Western Canada. Having excluded these people, the future policy of the Government should be to exclude from Canada all classes of people who have communistic ideas. Com-

munism as practised by people of certain European countries is incompatible with the economic and industrial life of Canada. One of the best sections in the Bill is that which places in the hands of the Government power to exclude from our country people whose ideas and notions are wholly inconsistent with ours.

Mr. W. C. KENNEDY (North Essex): As the minister knows, a head tax of $8 is imposed by the United States Government upon Canadians visiting United States, the amount being refunded if the visitor returns within six months. The money is collected by the railway and steamboat companies, and sometimes it takes one, two or three months to get it back, even if the visitor remains in the United States only three or four days. Many Canadians who live near the border have relatives in the United States, and often illness or death in the family necessitates their making a trip to the American side. In many cases they can ill afford to deposit this head tax with the United States Government. The law is not aimed particularly at Canadians; it was originally intended to apply to entries at the ocean ports. Nevertheless, it affects our people. I am convinced that ninety per cent of the people of the United States have no knowledge of the law; it should be brought to their attention. The best way to do that would be to place a similar tax upon persons entering Canada from the United States, the amount to be refunded if the country whence they came accorded a similar privilege to Canadians. Is any progress being made in securing the removal of this head tax?

Mr. CALDER: No progress has been made in the direction of having this head tax removed; that is a matter for the American Government, which may see fit to impose a head tax against any peoples entering their country. However, we have taken the matter up with the United States authorities; the head of their Immigration Department is here to-day and the officers of my department have had another opportunity of discussing the matter with him. The head tax is not imposed on all Canadians visiting the United States; it is imposed only in cases where the United States immigration officers think there is good reason to disbelieve the statements made by those who enter their country from Canada. From the negotiations that have been carried on, I think that this law will be administered a little more carefully than it has been in the past.

[Mr. Tweedie.]

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On Section 2—domicile, etc.

Mr. JACOBS: A slight change might improve paragraph (vi) of Subsection 2. It reads:

> Members of dramatic, artistic, athletic, or spectacular organizations entering Canada temporarily for the purpose of giving public performances or exhibitions of an entertaining or instructive nature and actors, artists, lecturers, priests and ministers of religion, authors, lawyers, physicians, professors of colleges and commercial travellers entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their respective callings.

I would suggest that it should read:

> Members of dramatic, artistic, athletic or spectacular organizations entering Canada temporarily for the purpose of giving public performances or exhibitions of an entertaining or instructive nature and all persons entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their respective callings.

We have dealt with ministers, circus managers, lawyers and so on, but possibly we have left out some, and if we make the clause read in the way I suggest, we shall cover every occupation and calling.

Mr. CRONYN: We have left out one class that was in the old clause, namely, musicians. Why that was omitted, I do not understand.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Would the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) suggest that persons whose business is spreading seditious utterances should be allowed to enter Canada?

Mr. JACOBS: If that is a calling, it would be for the minister to use his discretion under section 38 of the Act. We are dealing here with a certain specified class of people, authors, lawyers, physicians, professors of colleges and commercial travellers, and so forth. That does not exhaust the entire list of occupations and callings, and to cover those which we may not have in mind at the moment, we might say " all persons entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their respective"—and if my hon. friend would wish it—and respectable callings." That might improve the matter.

Mr. CALDER: The officials of the department have had a good deal of trouble in connection with the administration of this Act, and if we throw it wide open as the hon. member has suggested, it might lead us into serious trouble. I should, therefore, like to have a full discussion with the officials of the department before I would agree to his suggested amendment. As regards the inquiry from the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), the term "musician" has been dropped from this sec-

tion mainly because we have a very large and excedingly troublesome class of strollers called musicians who we think should not be admitted under this section. The only way in which we can properly deal with them is to exclude them from the provisions of this section.

Mr. JACOBS: If it is a profession?

Mr. CALDER: If the musicians belong to a dramatic, artistic or regular theatrical society that is coming in for the purpose of giving dramatic or musical performances, they are readily admitted, but the single musician who comes in can hardly in many cases be classed as an artist, and it would be just as well for us to watch him carefully.

Mr. JACOBS: What about Paderewski? He is a musician first.

Mr. CALDER: The department would class him as an artist, not as a musician.

Mr. NICKLE: Before the minister agrees to this amendment, I sincerely trust he will give very careful consideration to the possibility of an injustice being done in the border towns by the adoption of the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs). I know that in the riding from which I come there has been considerable discontent owing to the fact that American orchestras have come in, alleging that they were dramatic companies, and have interfered a great deal with Canadian orchestras. There is a conflict, more or less acute, between the provisions of this Act and those of the Alien Labour Act, and I would be exceedingly sorry to see the provisions of this Act so widened that orchestras, which certainly would come within the language of the amendment suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) would be admitted as not being considered an immigrant class. I trust the minister, before changing this clause, if he has any idea of so doing, will look carefully at the Alien Labour Act and see that the two Acts are made to harmonize.

Mr. CALDER: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) presses his amendment, I will certainly ask that this portion of the section be allowed to stand until such time as I have an opportunity of looking into the side of the question mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle).

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that it be allowed to stand for the moment. Before the clause finally passes, I should like to say a word or two with regard to section 2, paragraph (ii), which at present reads:

Canadian domicile is lost, for the purposes of this Act, by a person voluntarily residing out of Canada not for a mere special or temporary purpose but with the present intention of making his permanent home out of Canada.

That is to say, a man may have come to Canada and become a British subject. He leaves Canada with the intention of residing elsewhere for the purpose of improving his position, and then he finds, if he has not improved his position and wishes to return, that he cannot return to Canada, although a British subject, because of this section which says that the domicile governs and he has changed his domicile. I do not think that is quite fair.

Mr. CALDER: I scarcely think that is the interpretation to put upon this clause. The purport of the proposed amendment is briefly this: If a person retains his Canadian domicile and he leaves Canada temporarily, when he attempts to enter Canada again, having retained his domicile, the provisions of the law against prohibited classes do not apply to him. Let us assume that a man has retained his Canadian domicile, and he goes to the United States and remains there for a short time. He contracts some loathsome disease, or tuberculosis, or he becomes insane. We cannot shut him out from Canada as long as he has retained his domicile. But if he leaves the country with the intention of leaving the country, and he loses his domicile, then we have the right to shut him out.

Mr. JACOBS: Even although he be a British subject?

Mr. CALDER: Yes. We shut out people from Great Britain now if they belong to the prohibited classes. For instance, we shut out any one from Great Britain if he is of unsound mind, or if he is liable to become a public charge, or if he belongs in any way to any of the prohibited classes. If a man has come to this country from any part of the world and leaves this country with the intention of leaving the country, and during his residence outside of Canada he comes under any of those prohibited classes, why should we admit him?

Mr. JACOBS: Assuming that in every other respect he is qualified to come in?

Mr. CALDER: There would be no question about his entering. He would have a perfect right to enter.

Mr. JACOBS: A distinction should be made between a British citizen and a citizen of another country. We ought to give some protection to the British citizen who

has shed his old citizenship and has acquired his British citizenship. He goes away to improve himself in business, and then he comes back and finds the doors are closed to him.

Mr. CALDER: Only if he belongs to a prohibited class.

Mr. JACOBS: That is not so stated in the section.

Mr. CALDER: That is the purport of it.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Suppose a man comes to Canada, becomes naturalized and has his domicile here, then goes to the United States with the intention of remaining there. Now, we could not shut him out within the prescribed time of his domicile if the United States immigration authorities wanted to deport him on account of insanity.

Mr. CALDER: If they deport him, we must accept him.

Mr. TWEEDIE: It does not make any difference whether he is in a prohibited class under our law. If he has his domicile here they can ship him back.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I see no provision in subsection 2 for the admission of farm hands or harvesters. In recent years the farmers of the Western Provinces have been very glad to get harvest help from the Western States. The harvesters work in the fields of Kansas, move on to the Dakotas, and then come to Canada. Apparently they would not be admitted under this Act.

Mr. CALDER: If there is any defect in the law in that respect it certainly has not been used against these people during the last ten years, for they have been coming in every year. The department itself has been responsible for bringing them in to help in the harvest fields. There is now a provision in the law whereby the minister may admit any person for any cause if he deems it advisable. I do not anticipate any difficulty over the harvesters.

Mr. CRONYN: Perhaps they will be admitted as members of athletic organizations.

Mr. JACOBS: How will paragraph (a) read as amended?

Mr. CALDER: It will read as follows:—

Idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons and persons who have been insane at any time previously.

The law as it stands at present reads "within five years previous." The amendment will enable us to debar any one who has been at any time insane.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Subsection 2 stands.

On subsection 3—diseased persons:

Mr. CALDER: With this amendment the law will read as follows:

Persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with any loathsome disease or with a disease which is contagious or infectious or which may be dangerous to the public health. . . .

Mr. JACOBS: What would happen in the case of a person, not a naturalized British subject, who contracted tuberculosis in Canada, and, having been to Denver for treatment, attempted to come back to Canada?

Mr. CALDER: I think he could easily establish that he went to Denver purely for a temporary purpose. He could apply to the consular agent, if necessary, for a certificate to the effect that he went to Denver for the purpose of a cure. He would not lose his domicile.

Mr. JACOBS: The law is being very well administered by the department. I think the Department of Immigration is handled with more intelligence perhaps, than any other department of the Government; at least, that has been my experience. The Minister of Agriculture looks surprised. I think it would be well for us to make the Bill as clear as possible, because even ministers of the Crown sometimes change, and a king may arise who knows not Joseph, and who would apply the law more rigorously than at present. Many of these sections are satisfactory if handled intelligently, but I think cases of very grave hardship might arise if they were interpreted by a department not sympathetic to the immigrant.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 5—beggars and vagrants:

Mr. CALDER: The law at present reads as follows:

Professional beggars or vagrants or persons likely to become a public charge.

The phrase "or persons likely to become a public charge" is transferred to another part of the Act, and is put in a substantive section reading as follows:

Persons who in the opinion of the board of inquiry or the officer in charge at any port of entry are likely to become a public sharge.

On subsection 6, paragraph (k)—psychopathic inferiority:

Mr. JACOBS: What is meant by "constitutional psychopatic inferiority"?

Mr. CALDER: It is a medical term with which I am not very well acquainted, but a definition has been handed to me which I might read:

> In this classification are included various unstable individuals on the border line between sanity and insanity, such as moral imbeciles, pathological liars, many of the vagrants and cranks, and persons of abnormal sexual instincts. There is no well-defined dividing line between the various classes, and they should be included in one group and certified as cases of a constitutional psychopathic inferiority.

I understand that the doctors are thoroughly familiar with the full meaning and effect of this term, and I presume we shall have to issue very careful regulations to our officers administering this law to be sure to catch people with this disease, whatever it may be.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Can we deport those in Canada suffering from this disease?

Mr. CALDER. Yes, if they get in.

(a) Enemy aliens.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the Committee would like to have from the minister a clear interpretation of the meaning of this section.

Mr. CALDER: I must admit that when I first looked at the section I took a wrong meaning from it myself, but if it is read carefully the meaning will be clear. One would suppose that the mere mention of enemy aliens in the first line would indicate that hereafter all persons who are enemy aliens are to be rejected. That is not the purpose of this clause. The clause says: "Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies." Once the peace treaty is signed, those people who are now interned and who will not be deported until after the war is over will not then be alien enemies, because the war will be at an end. So that the section as I interpret it is this: Enemy aliens who have been interned or persons who have been alien enemies who have been interned. That is, it does not mean that enemy aliens shall be prohibited, but enemy aliens who have been interned.

Mr. JACOBS: Would it not be better to strike out the words "or persons" and say "enemy aliens who have been interned in any part of His Majesty's Dominions"?

Mr. CALDER: But some of them may be interned after the war is over and they will not then be enemy aliens.

Mr. JACOBS: I must confess that the section appears to me to be rather obscure and I think it would stand re-drafting. For that purpose I would suggest that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. CRONYN: What will happen to those who are enemy aliens who have been interned and have been let out on parole?

Mr. CALDER: I did not know that any were let out on parole.

Mr. CRONYN: I am told that there are many hundreds.

Mr. CALDER: As was explained by the Acting Minister of Justice, in the early part of the war some thousands were interned, not because they were dangerous or had committed any overt act of any kind, and not because of disloyalty, but simply on account of conditions existing at that time. At that period employment was very scarce and many of
10 p.m. these people were interned merely to take care of them. To provide that these people shall be deported simply because they happened to have been interned in the early part of the war would be a great mistake.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I do not think it would do any harm to make the clause comprehensive enough to cover all those who should be dealt with.

Mr. CALDER: I think we might let the clause stand. I am not quite satisfied with the drafting of it, and possibly its intention might be made just a little clearer.

Mr. EULER: Does this clause refer only to those who have been interned, or also to possible immigrants after the war?

Mr. CALDER: This refers only to those who were interned.

Mr. EULER: Is it the intention of the Government after the war to debar absolutely those who are now alien enemies?

Mr. CALDER: They are now debarred and have been ever since the armistice. An Order in Council has been put through debarring all persons who are nationals of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria, and it is certainly the intention to keep that Order in Council in force for some time.

Mr. EULER: I am not raising any objection to that. I am merely asking for information. I have not Hansard before me, but I have a copy of the Globe of to-day in which the minister is quoted as saying

that there was no provision in the law to debar alien enemies.

Mr. CALDER: Section 13, which we were considering all afternoon, gives the Governor in Council power to prohibit the entry of people of any nationality or race.

Mr. EULER: I missed that, and would have liked to make a suggestion when section 13 was under discussion. Would it be in order for me to make a suggestion now?

The CHAIRMAN: It would be out of order to discuss section 13 now. Paragraph (p) of section 3 is being discussed.

Mr. EULER: Will there be another opportunity?

Mr. CALDER: If the hon. gentleman merely has a suggestion to make, I think we might hear it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EULER: If the law is absolutely prohibitive without any discretion on the part of the minister or the Government, it should be changed. There should be some provision for the minister to make exceptions.

Mr. CALDER: There is a provision in the Bill whereby the minister may, under permit, allow any person to enter Canada. I explained that this afternoon. In addition to that, in the Order in Council which we put through, there is express provision for the minister to admit any of them. There are very exceptional cases arising that must be dealt with on humanitarian and other grounds.

Mr. PEDLOW: In view of the uncertainty as to the application of this clause and the fact that there is already an Order in Council dealing with the matter which the Government intend to keep in force, would it not be wise to delete this section altogether?

Mr. CALDER: Clause (p) deals with persons of enemy nationality who have been interned in any portion of His Majesty's dominions.

Mr, JACOBS: Or in any Allied country.

Mr. CALDER: Or in any Allied country. Persons who were interned in the United States or in any of His Majesty's dominions are shut out as being of the prohibited classes who have no right to enter Canada; whereas our general order applies only to persons who are living in enemy countries.

Mr. JACOBS: What does the minister intend to do with the interned alien enemies in Canada? Are they to be deported?

Mr. CALDER: An announcement has already been made to the House on two or three occasions by the Acting Minister of Justice to the effect that all those aliens now interned who are thought dangerous or undesirable will be deported. An arrangement has already been made by the British authorities whereby a hundred will be deported—if they have not already been deported—just so soon as shipping can be arranged and the countries to which they belong are open for their entry.

Mr. JACOBS: So that we will deport 2,117, the number of interned aliens during the war.

Mr. CALDER: No; there were 8,000 or 9,000.

Mr. JACOBS: The return brought down by the Minister of the Interior the other day stated that there were 2,117.

Mr. CALDER: That is the number now in the internment camps, but during the war there were about 8,000.

Mr. JACOBS: Then the Minister of the Interior misunderstood my question because I wanted to know the actual number interned during the war. I was told that it was 2,117.

Mr. CALDER: The others were out at that time.

Mr. NESBITT: As I understand the minister it is only the intention to deport those that are regarded as dangerous? He does not purpose deporting all aliens who have been interned?

Mr. CALDER: I think the fact that those spoken of by the Acting Minister of Justice are still interned, after some three or four years of war, is an indication that there is a very good reason for keeping them there. If I am not mistaken, the great bulk of those, unless some very good reason can be shown, will be returned to their own countries.

Mr. JACOBS: Many of them were sent to farms and made to act as farm help and others were put on railway construction. They were under the supervision of the Government but they were not actually interned in the sense in which we understand internment.

Mr. CALDER: I do not know that.

Mr. NESBITT: Many of them were employed on public works. I do not know about the 2,100 you have now. Certainly many of them were interned and then afterwards

employed. What are you going to do about them?

Mr. CALDER: Do you mean those who were interned during the war?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: There has been a large internment camp in North Ontario. At one time there were 2,000 interned aliens in one camp. But they have been weeded out. Those that were considered not dangerous and not regarded as a class that it was necessary to intern, were allowed out. Those who are still in camp are men of a dangerous type who could not be safely permitted to run at large.

Mr. NESBITT: That is what I have been trying to find out.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: We have in Northern Ontario many hundreds of men who were interned in the early days of the war, but who after a careful investigation by the officers of the Militia Department, were found to be perfectly harmless. They were allowed out. But they are still reporting month by month. There are several hundred still interned who are recognized as dangerous enemies.

Mr. CANNON: Some people were considered at the outbreak of hostilities as being alien enemies who have since become our Allies. What will the Government do in connection with these people? For instance, Germans who were living in German Poland were enemies and now not only are they not our enemies, but they have become our Allies, and I see by the papers they are going to sign the covenant of the League of Nations with Canada, Great Britain and other allied countries. Is there any provision made in this Bill for this class of people?

Mr. CALDER: The Order in Council to which I have referred excludes all people from enemy countries; that means Austria, Germany, Bulgaria and Turkey. It is quite true that, particularly in Austria, there are some of the people—Poles, Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs—who were more or less opposed to the Austrian Government, and new nations are going to be set up under, I presume, a democratic form of government. But until these conditions are settled and we know where we are we feel that this prohibition should be maintained against people residing in that part of Europe. If I followed the discussion this afternoon, it is evident that there is a feeling in this House and in the country that, with conditions as they exist in Canada at the present time, during the reconstruction period, we have pretty nearly all on our hands that we can take care of without inviting people from these portions of Europe whether they are friendly or not.

Mr. CANNON: Under this Bill, will the Government be in a position to consider these people as living in these countries according to the boundaries as they existed at the time of the war, or according to the boundaries as they will be limited and defined at the Treaty of Peace? That is a very important question.

Mr. CALDER: Under section 13 the Government is left free to consider this question from any standpoint it chooses. That section gives the Government very large powers. The Government is empowered at any time to prohibit the entry of any class or section of people or people of any occupation and coming from any country. So that we will be able to deal with the people of such areas from time to time according to the conditions as they prevail.

Mr. CANNON: If Poland is set up as a new kingdom, if that kingdom is friendly to Great Britain and the Dominions over the seas, and if it signs the Treaty of Peace and the different covenants that are going to be entered into at Paris as an Ally friendly to this country, will the Government, according to international law, be allowed to treat the inhabitants of that country as enemy aliens now or later, or as a people who cannot enter Canada, or will they be justified in so doing?

Mr. CALDER: We would not treat them as alien enemies at all. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House and had heard the discussion that has taken place he would have learned that the members of the House and the people have come to the conclusion that in so far as the admission of any people to Canada is concerned, we should have the right to determine that for ourselves. There is nothing in international law that I know of that would prevent us from exercising that right. But while we exercise that right of determining for ourselves what people shall enter Canada, we must be prepared to bear the consequences of the exercise of that right.

That is, if we say to the people of any nation, "Your citizens shall not enter Canada," we must remember that that nation has the power to take action against us, in some other direction it may be, and we

must be prepared to suffer those consequences no matter what they are, so long as the action upon which it is based is within international law. Again I say, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in holding that there is anything in international law to prevent us from making a prohibition against any class of people, the world around, whom we do not wish to enter Canada.

Mr. CRONYN: Reference has been made on one or two occasions to what happened at the Imperial Conference in 1918, and it might be well to place upon record the actual resolution that was unanimously passed at that time. The Imperial authorities, of course, were represented at that conference, and representatives from the Dominions. as well as from India, were there as well. This is the first clause of the resolution which was introduced in 1917, and passed in 1918:

> It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities.

That does not, of course, deal with foreign nations, but it is, I submit, a very admirable precedent on which we can act in dealing with nations outside of the British Commonwealth.

Mr. JACOBS: That is as between the British Colonies?

Paragraph (p) allowed to stand.

On paragraph (q)—persons guilty of espionage with respect to His Majesty or any of His Majesty's Allies:

Mr. JACOBS: What is the object of that at this time? As I understand, when the war is over, espionage automatically stops, it is no longer in force. This is liable to give rise to a great deal of misconception, and perhaps considerable activity sometimes on the part of the Government.

Mr. CALDER: The paragraph, as I understand it, simply means that any person who has been. found guilty of espionage during the war, or at any time should be placed in the prohibited class and not allowed to enter Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Espionage in what respect?

Mr. CALDER: I am presuming, of course the expression has a well defined legal meaning.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. JACOBS: It has a well defined meaning in time of war, and has probably a different meaning in time of peace.

Paragraph agreed to.

On Paragraph (r)——Persons guilty of conspiracy against His Majesty or any of His Majesty's Allies, or guilty of assisting His Majesty's enemies.

Mr. JACOBS: What is understood by "persons found guilty of conspiracy"? Does it mean that he be found guilty by a court of justice, or deemed guilty by the department?

Mr. CALDER: No, he must be found guilty by a court.

Mr. JACOBS: I think it would be well to make the meaning clear by amending the paragraph so as to read:

> Persons found guilty in any competent court of justice—

and so on,

> —against His Majesty.

Mr. NESBITT: The paragraph does not say that the man is "presumed guilty," but that he be "guilty."

Mr. JACOBS: Found guilty by whom? A person may be guilty and yet not be found guilty.

Mr. KEEFER: Under our law a man is always presumed to be innocent until he is found to be guilty.

Mr. JACOBS: This is a different case. This is a statutory enactment, and I think it is well to be as clear as possible in framing the language.

Mr. FIELDING: How would the word "convicted" do?

Mr. JACOBS: "Convicted of conspiracy" would be better.

Mr. CALDER: Instead of "guilty"?

Mr. POWER: Is there such a crime as "conspiracy against His Majesty"? I presume that conspiracy against His Majesty would be sedition and treason. It would be well to have a definition, because I do not remember such a crime in the Criminal Code as "conspiracy against His Majesty."

Mr. CALDER: The drafting was done by our law counsel, and I presume he has used the proper legal phraseology in describing these crimes. However, if hon. gentlemen think there is any question about it, I will have the matter referred to him again.

Mr. JACOBS: Suppose we let the paragraph stand?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: What is declared here is that a person must be guilty of the crime of conspiracy. If conspiracy constitutes treason, then he is guilty of treason.

Mr. POWER: I do not think there is such a crime as conspiracy against His Majesty defined in the Criminal Code. As far as I know that is treason and should be defined as such.

Mr. CALDER: To save time and discussion, if there is any question about the matter, because I want to get the wording right, I am quite prepared to let this paragraph stand in order that we may have an opportunity to look into the question of the appropriateness of the phraseology used.

Paragraph allowed to stand.

On paragraph (s) Deported conspirators.

Mr. JACOBS: That ought to stand also.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not know how we are going to conclude the consideration of this Bill if everything is to stand on an objection raised by the hon. member. As I understand the meaning of "conspiracy" no one person can be guilty of it. It is a crime entirely different from sedition. One man may be guilty of sedition, but one man cannot be guilty of conspiracy, two men may conspire, and although their object may not be attained, one or both of them may be found guilty of conspiracy. I am sure the hon. member will understand that is the law.

Mr. JACOBS: That is the very reason why I asked that this paragraph should stand, so that we might have a chance to straighten out the difficulty.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not see any difficulty at all. It is so plain to the average lawyer that there should be no argument upon it.

Mr. JACOBS: For example, the paragraph in question reads:

> Persons who at any time within a period of ten years from the first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, were or may be deported from any part of His Majesty's dominions or from any allied country on account of conspiracy against His Majesty or of any of His Majesty's allies, or for assisting His Majesty's enemies or because such persons were regarded as hostile or dangerous to the allied cause during the war.

By whom were they regarded as hostile or dangerous?

Mr. CALDER: By the parties who deported them.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not so stated. We ought to be particular in a matter of this kind.

Mr. CALDER: The clause we are considering only refers to persons who have been deported. Those persons would be deported by the state within which they were interned, and the authorities of that state must have regarded them as hostile or dangerous, otherwise it would not have deported them. Take the case of persons interned in Canada to-day. Some person must decide whether they shall be deported or not. Eventually they will be deported, and this prohibition will prevent those people from again entering Canada. Now, we will assume that there are certain persons interned in the United States, who will be deported because the authorities there regard them as hostile or dangerous to the Allied cause. The paragraph in that case obviously refers to the authorities who do the deporting. We can take it for granted that if the governments in allied countries have thought it advisable to deport these people we should not admit them to Canada.

Mr. POWER: To return to my objection of a few moments ago, I am quite convinced there is no such crime as conspiracy, and I therefore raised the question in order to make the matter clear. I understand, in reply to the question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs), the minister said that the person to be refused admission must be convicted of the crime of conspiracy. But if there is no such crime, and you cannot indict a man for conspiracy, I do not see how in the world you are going to prevent him from entering Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to commit an unlawful act.

Mr. EDWARDS: If there is no such thing as conspiracy, no one will be affected by this clause; so why bother your head with objections?

Mr. POWER: I have a great deal of respect for the good name of the House, for the Minister of Immigration, and for the officers of the Department of Justice, and I would hate to see things that are of absolutely no use put into our statutes. This crime should be defined; we should ascertain exactly what offence will render a man liable to exclusion from the country under this provision.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why should we, in this Act, define crime or conspiracy in this country when the clause has reference to conspiracy in some other country?

Mr. POWER: Conspiracy in His Majesty's Dominions.

Mr. EDWARDS: If certain countries do not know better than to have such a thing as conspiracy and a law against it, persons convicted under that law should not enter Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: I am perfectly willing to let it go through, because we may be called upon in our legal capacity to interpret the law for the benefit of the Government or of others, and in that way make a handsome fee.

Mr. MORPHY: If two men conspire to commit sedition, that is conspiracy.

Mr. JACOBS: Conspire to do any unlawful act.

Mr. MORPHY: To commit the crime of conspiracy against His Majesty; to be guilty of sedition or treason. The provision is quite plain.

Mr. POWER: Conspiracy is not a crime, but conspiracy to commit treason is.

Sir HERBERT AMES: This is simply a category of prohibited classes; the officials of the Immigration Department will interpret these definitions. There will be no recourse against them if they decide, on the information that they have, that a person who has been engaged in a conspiracy in some other country is not a fit person to be admitted to Canada. I do not see how the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) can get any law case out of that. If a person is refused admission to Canada he cannot sue the Government to secure permission to be allowed to come into the country.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, he can; I have done it myself. We take out a habeas corpus and bring the party before the court, sometimes with splendid success.

Mr. CANNON: The clause would cover the case if it was made to read: "Conspiracy to commit any crime against His Majesty." Hon. gentlemen will search Section 74 of the Criminal Code, which enumerates all crimes against His Majesty, in vain for any such crime as conspiracy.

Mr. KEEFER: It is a kind of conspiracy —conspiracy against His Majesty.

Mr. CANNON: The Government wishes to keep out of the country any man who has committed an offence against His Majesty; that is all right. But the clause should be correctly drawn. There is no such crime in our law as conspiracy, but there is a crime called "conspiracy to commit an unlawful act."

Mr. KEEFER: Would you want to exclude a man who had conspired other than against the Crown?

Mr. CANNON: No, I would say: "Conspiracy to commit any crime or offence against His Majesty."

Mr. CALDER: I see no objection, in order to make these provisions perfectly clear, to adopting the suggestion that has been made. I move that the words "to commit any offence or crime" be inserted after the word "conspiracy" in paragraphs (r) and (s).

Mr. TWEEDIE: If we are going to limit this provision to conspiracy to commit a crime, we should include in the definition the words set out in the Criminal Code, in which are enumerated certain things which constitute a crime against His Majesty. But under the section as it stands it is possible to exclude from this country people whom we could not exclude if we confined the section to the literal meaning of the Criminal Code. An offence committed against a Sovereign in a foreign country might not constitute a crime under our Criminal Code; yet persons guilty of such offences in other countries might conspire to commit the same offences against our Sovereign. A man who commits what is a crime in his own country and under his own law is a very undesirable man to have in Canada, because he may conspire to commit that which is a crime under our Criminal Code. I submit that the wording of the section is better as it is, because they may conspire beyond the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada against our Sovereign, in a manner which does not constitute a crime, and consequently we could not exclude them, because we have this interpreted by the words of the Criminal Code. The section is better as it stands. It gives wider jurisdiction to the immigration officers; it gives them power to exclude people from other countries who conspire against His Majesty, but who do not commit an offence under the Criminal Code.

Mr. CANNON: This clause applies only to people who have been deported within ten years from Great Britain or a British colony or an allied country. Great Britain and the British colonies have all the same

law as we have, that is the English criminal law, so that there cannot be any mistake as to that. If we are going to draft our statutes now to meet the Italian or the French or the Montenegrin or the Bosnian or the Grecian law, how far will we go? For instance, I understand that in Italy treason goes far further than it does in Great Britain or in Canada, and acts that are in no way criminal in this country or in Great Britain are considered in Italy to be highly criminal. Are we going to load our statutes with clauses to meet foreign laws? That would be an altogether new and very dangerous departure. When we are called upon to enact legislation in this Parliament, we enact it according to conditions existing in this country and to traditions given to us by the English tribunals. I am satisfied with the English law and with the fair play that exists in England, and I do not want to have in Canada laws that would be drafted to meet conditions existing in Italy or Greece or Montenegro, where people are put in jail for hardly anything. The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) says the Act might be a crime in those countries. Is he sure of what is conspiracy against His Majesty in Montenegro? Does he know anything about the law in Greece, or in Italy? I do not, and I do not claim to know. I know the British law and I am satisfied with it, and I want our law to be the same as the English law. We shall be better satisfied if we stick to it than if we have adaptations from Italian or Greek legislation.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend takes this position then, that some person in Italy who was regarded by the authorities in charge of the administration and welfare of that country as unfit to remain there, is fit to remain in Canada?

Mr. POWER: Yes, otherwise, Garibaldi would never have been allowed to enter England, and Garibaldi was the saviour and founder of United Italy. And some of the leading Italian patriots would never have been allowed to enter England, for instance, Giuseppe Mazzini. The leading revolutionists of the past were deported from their countries and they sought refuge on the free soil of England and America where they were well received. Therefore, if we were to pass a law such as this, and if at some future time the laws of a foreign country are such that freedom is no longer enjoyed, are we to be debarred from receiving men of the stamp that I have mentioned? I do not think we should be.

Mr. MORPHY: On looking at section 74 of the Code quoted by the hon member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), I notice how closely the clause in question reads to the wording of the Criminal Code which the hon. member says does not contain this sort of crime. Subsection (e) of section 74 provides against:

> Conspiring with any person to kill His Majesty or to do him any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, maiming or wounding, or conspiring with any person to imprison or restrain him.

A little further down, subsection (g) probably brings it closer to the intent of this Bill:

> Conspiring to levy war against His Majesty with any such intent or any such purpose as aforesaid.

So that, in this respect, the Code clearly and distinctly recognizes conspiracy against His Majesty in the very words of this Act as a crime.

Mr. CANNON: Conspiracy, to do something against His Majesty.

Mr. CALDER: I am sure we have all but the one desire, and that is to have the Bill perfectly clear. From the discussion we have had, I can take the matter up with the law officers of the Crown and have them inquire into the point which has been raised, and if necessary I will bring back re-drafted clauses to the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would suggest that the insertion of one word would meet the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think it would be an improvement upon the amendment proposed by the minister if the clause were to read:

> Persons guilty of 'criminal' conspiracy against His Majesty.

Then it is a crime, and the crime is defined.

Mr. JACOBS: Every conspiracy is a criminal conspiracy.

Mr. RICHARDSON: One might conspire to see that His Majesty gets a good brand of cigars or whisky. I fancy the hon. gentleman would agree that was not a crime; but if he says "criminal" conspiracy, then I suppose crime is defined by the Code.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. member knows the proverb, "Sutor, ne supra crepidam."

Mr. KEEFER: The clause is quite plain. It says "conspiring against His Majesty."

Amendment stands.

Clause as amended stands.

On section 3, subsection (6), paragraph (t)—illiterates:

Mr. JACOBS: This is a clause about which I had occasion to make a few observations yesterday. I feel sure that the minister could not have given much attention to it, because, if he had, I am positive his sense of justice and fair play would have caused him to pause and consider before he submitted to the House the section as it is. I do not purpose going into the matter any further now, but merely wish to add that a clause of this kind cannot appeal to the good sense of justice and equity of this Committee. It is not right that a person who, through no fault of his own, but only through misfortune is unable to read, should be debarred entry into this country. If this had been done in the past we should have kept out of this country many people who have come here and made good and became assets to the community.

Sir HERBERT AMES: And many that we would be glad to be rid of now.

Mr. JACOBS: I think if we were to make a list of those we want to get rid of, we should find in the list more people who can read and write than who cannot. I pointed out yesterday that this test would exclude people not only from Europe proper, or what we are pleased to call the better parts of Europe, but immigrants from the British Isles in large numbers. In the remote portions of the British Isles there are many people to-day who have not had the advantage and blessing of being taught to read, and yet these people would make splendid material for this new country.

Mr. EDWARDS: Where are those remote portions of the British Isles?

Mr. JACOBS: I would say the Hebrides, the Orkney Islands, the Isle of Skye, and places of that kind where people earn their living from five or six years of age in fishing and mining, and consequently have not the time to learn to read; they have neither the opportunity nor the schools if they want to improve their condition. Now these are the very people who might want to come here to improve their condition, and are we to bar them out simply because they have not been taught to read? I have no doubt that this clause was inserted with the best of intentions, but I very much fear that it will not have the result the Government expect. We want to keep out undesirable classes, and page after page is devoted to describing these undesirable classes. Surely a man who is unable to read, if he has no other disqualifications, ought not to be debarred from entering this country. I appeal to the minister to strike this clause out entirely. I should like to have an expression of opinion from the House on this matter, as I am confident the majority of hon. gentlemen are opposed to the inclusion of a provision which would be a blot upon a statute which is in many other respects very good.

Mr. A. E. FINLEY (Souris): I think this is a very important section, because it is a very well recognized fact that illiteracy and crime have always been very closely allied. I received a letter a day or two ago from a statesman who has given a great deal of thought and attention to this very subject, which I should like to read:

As the subject of immigration will come before the House shortly, I wish to bring to your serious attention some considerations of great and vital importance to our national welfare.

The policy which has obtained during the past, of establishing communities in special colonies, and of granting special privileges to various sects and communities, has proved most unsatisfactory from the point of view of our Canadian national life; it is highly desirable that no special privilege should be given to any individual or community in the future, and steps should be taken to limit, and if possible, terminate, the arrangements that have previously been entered into.

The request by any community or individual for special concessions, such as exemption from military service, is a clear indication that these people do not wish to accept the general laws and institutions of this country, that they do not intend to become Canadian in spirit, but wish to retain their own institutions and customs. Their presence gives rise to many difficult problems in our community life, affecting municipal, social and especially school affairs.

The history of these settlements is that their proximity is resented by the neighbouring settlers, who finding it impossible to mend matters, sell out their holdings to the newcomers, sometimes at considerable sacrifice and move elsewhere. Thus the truly Canadian citizen is driven from his home; thus the colony spreads in extent and influence to the detriment and ultimate extinction of the true Canadian community.

Last year a colony of Hutterites was established in Manitoba, thirty-five miles west of Winnipeg. They left Dakota to escape from the obligation of military service. Already the selling out process has begun in this neighbourhood.

I am reliably informed of negotiations nearing completion for settlement of two similar colonies at other points in this province. Steps should be taken to prevent at once the entrance of any such, pending the passing of any necessary legislation. A definite and decisive policy should be adopted to exclude as undesirable immigrants, all persons or communities who will not accept unreservedly, all duties, burdens and responsibilities of citizenship or residence in Canada.

This could be accomplished by requiring of each prospective immigrant before his entry into Canada, a sworn statement that he is prepared to accept all responsibilities of citizenship in Canada, including military service if necessary. Any persons refusing or unable to sign this declaration, should be permanently excluded.

The Militia Act should be amended by removing from Section 11, the paragraph which gives exemption from military service to—

"Persons who from the doctrines of their religion are averse to bearing arms or rendering personal military service under such conditions as are prescribed."

With a view to terminating some of the conditions now obtaining in Canada, certain orders in council should be dealt with. These are, specifically—

(a) August 13, 1873, affecting Mennonites.

(b) December 6, 1898, affecting Doukhobors.

(c) August 12, 1899, affecting Hutterites.

Any persons now in Canada, who have come in while these orders in council were in force, should be notified that the provisions thereof will not extend to any of their descendants born after July 1, 1919.

These matters are of vital moment, and I would earnestly request your co-operation in having them thoroughly and satisfactorily dealt with.

This letter was written by the Hon. Dr. Thornton, Minister of Education in Manitoba, who has studied this question very thoroughly indeed. In that province we have some thirty odd different nationalities, with whom Dr. Thornton has come in very close contact. I thought the letter was worth putting on record.

Mr. CRONYN: I sincerely hope the minister will not consider altering or in any way amending this section. It is of the greatest importance that it should form part of our law, more particularly as it has been the law of the United States since 1917. If we do not follow their example, the ineviable result will be a larger percentage of illiterates seeking entrance into Canada. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier asked what warrant the minister had for including such a proviso. I do not know that there was any warrant, if such were needed, but I am quite certain that if the minister and the department have taken cognizance, as I am sure they have, of what has happened in the neighbouring republic they could not help being impressed with the need of a section of this kind. I am not instancing what has been done in the United States as something that we must of necessity follow, but because it is evidence of a striking nature. Their experience in immigration has been on a very much larger scale than our own and has extended over a longer series of years.

What is termed the literacy test has been the subject of nineteen votes in the Congress and Senate of the United States, every one of which favoured it. Three times a law to this end passed by both Houses was vetoed by three different Presidents, and in each case either the House or the Senate failed by a narrow margin to overcome that veto. But in 1917 the literacy test was included in the law of the United States and has been in effect since that time.

All of the nine members but one of the Commission on Immigration, which, as I said yesterday, sat for four years and most exhaustively studied the whole subject, recommended the imposition of the reading and writing test "as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration." Of course, we know the inability to read very often arises from lack of opportunity, and neither this test nor any other that may be devised can prevent some undesirable immigrants from entering, whereas, on the other hand, it may possibly prevent a desirable immigrant from coming to Canada. The classic case of Lincoln has been quoted on the other side of the line until it is threadbare. It really does not touch the subject. We are dealing with a mass of figures and a vast volume of immigration, and, in my opinion, this test is one of the most valuable we could have.

Mr. J. F. REID: I just wish to say a word in regard to this section and in reply to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). He made the statement that in the remote parts of the British Isles the people could neither read nor write. I am sorry that he made that statement. I have lived in some of the remote parts of the British Isles and I presume I know just as much about the subject as the hon. member does. I did not know in the Orkney Isles, at the time I lived there quite a few years ago, any one person of my own age who could neither read nor write. They have the finest public schools I know of in the British Empire. They have compulsory education and truancy officers who see that the children go to school. I cannot speak with any great authority in regard to the Hebrides or the Isle of Skye, but I do not know that I have met a Highlander who could not only speak the English language, but could also speak the two tacks. I hope that this clause will be accepted in its entirety. Canada to-day does not need to go begging for a second or third class immigrants. We want the very best immigrants who can at least read and write in their own language.

Mr. CANNON: The most important part of this clause I think is the provision that those who cannot read the English or the French language, or some other dialect shall not be admitted into our country. If the clause simply restricted the class to those who could not read English or French I would support it, because it would mean that no one would be admitted who could not read one of the official languages and who would therefore be unable to become a true Canadian. The clause goes too far by including "some other language or dialect." Suppose a man comes from the remotest part of Russia and knows a dialect which is spoken by say five hundred people. He would have a right to be admitted and the Government could not exclude him. He could ask for a printed paper in his dialect and if he could read it would certainly have the right to be admitted. Would that tend to the advantage of Canada? Would you, Mr. Chairman, compare a Russian who was able to read a dialect spoken by five hundred people, with a clever and intelligent Irishman who, unfortunately, could not read English? Would it be contended for a moment that an Irishman who could not read or write English would not be as good a citizen as the Russian, and in all probability a very much better one?

11 p.m.

Mr. JACOBS: Where would you get your immigration from?

Mr. CANNON: If the qualification is only ability to read any language or dialect it is just as well to have no clause at all, because it is of no value.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I think it would meet the case if we took care not to exclude any from the British Isles or British countries. I practise law and I know it is not an unfamiliar thing to have Old Countrymen who cannot sign their names come into my office, men of the finest type. You very seldom see this inability among the Scandinavian races. I think we should provide for the admission of British subjects.

Mr. CALDER: We have had a fairly good day of it and I doubt very much if we would be able to agree upon this clause to-night. I suggest that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before that motion is put; can the minister give us a fair idea of how many dialects there are and how many officers he expects to have standing with slips in their hands to test the ability of these people to read—about 3,000 or 4,000?

[Mr. J. F. Reid.]

Mr. CALDER: I doubt very much whether you will find those dialects in the form of printed languages.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think the clause is unworkable.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. McKENZIE: Cannot we speak to the motion?

The CHAIRMAN: It is an undebatable motion, but it may be withdrawn by the minister.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not bothered the House very much to-day. I think the clause is unworkable and I wish to tell the minister that I am going to oppose it. He has to provide for agents to meet thousands of different kinds of people that come in. He will require officers to meet all kinds of people and he will have to submit to them a test in different dialects and languages and ask them to read it. I think it is entirely unworkable and it is no test of a man's ability to read or write forty words in some dialect when nobody can tell whether he is doing it correctly or not.

Mr. CALDER: I understand that in the United States, where they have been operating under a law very similar to this for two years, they have never found it necessary to use cards with more than thirty-five different languages. I doubt very much if in the actual operation of the law any difficulty will be found.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the clause stand?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Progress reported.

TELEGRAM REGARDING STATEMENT BY MR. RICHARDSON.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Before the House rises in view of the statement made in the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) I wired to Winnipeg to the president of the Ruthenian Council, a lieutenant in the Canadian army, regarding—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Do I understand the hon. member has risen to a question of privilege?

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I do not know that it is a question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Otherwise the hon. gentleman's remarks would not be in order.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I do not see that it can be a matter of privilege. It refers to a charge made in the House this afternoon against a large number of people in Western Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unless it is a charge that concerns the hon. member personally I must rule it out of order.

Mr. McKENZIE: By common consent the hon. member might make his statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the unanimous consent of the House that the hon. member be allowed to make a statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. DAVIDSON: No.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: The hon. member for Springfield says, "No."

Mr. RICHARDSON: No, I do not.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: I beg his pardon. Well then the hon. member at my right says "no."

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Thursday, May 1, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

BELGIUM.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATE OF BELGIUM TO MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to lay upon the Table a cablegram addressed to myself by the President of the Senate of Belgium.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): Can the cablegram be read for the information of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Clerk will read it.

The cablegram was read by the Deputy Clerk:

"Bruxelles, le 30 avril 1919.

Monsieur le Président de la
Chambre des communes,

Monsieur le Président du Sénat,
Ottawa.

Monsieur le Président:

J'ai l'honneur de vous adresser, en vous priant d'en donner connaissance à l'assemblée que vous présidez, le texte de la résolution adoptée à l'unanimité par le Sénat, dans sa séance du mardi, 29 avril 1919:

'Le Sénat de Belgique ,ému par le vote de la Conférence de Paris que méconnait les titres de Bruxelles à devenir le siège de la Ligue des Nations, gravement préoccupé de la situation lamentable à laquelle la plus cruelle guerre a réduit son pays, convaincu que les ruines sans nombre qui couvrent le territoire ne peuvent être relevées par les seules ressources nationalles, s'adresse, sous l'empire de la plus vive anxiété, à votre assemblée et la conjure d'intervenir avec la dernière énergie en vue d'obtenir que les engagements solennels de prompte et complète restauration, fréquemment réitérés, soient exécutés dans l'esprit de large équité et de généreuse compassion qui les a dictés. Confiant dans les sentiments de solidarité qui unissent toutes les nations civilisées et dans les témoignages de sincère et profonde sympathies que votre assemblée a bien voulu donner à la belgique, le Sénat se tient assuré de trouver en elle un puissant soutien et une efficace intervention à l'appui des satisfactions légitimes et indispensables réclamées de la Conférence de Paris pour la restauration du pays."

Veuillez agréer,
Monsieur le Président,
L'assurance de ma haute considération,
Baron de Pavereau.
Président du Sénat."

Mr. SPEAKER: I may inform the House that I have had a translation of the cablegram prepared and a copy placed in the hands of the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): What is the date of the cablegram?

Mr. SPEAKER: April 30, it was received last night.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I could not understand one word of what was read, and I would like to know what the cablegram refers to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Possibly it will meet the view of the hon. gentleman if I read the communication in English.

Brussels, Belgium, April 30th, 1919.

The Speaker of the House of Commons,
The Speaker of the Senate
Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker:—

I beg to send you and request you to communicate to the Assembly over which you preside the text of the motion unanimously adopted by the Senate during its session of Tuesday, April 29th, 1919.

The Senate of Belgium affected by the vote of the Paris Conference which disregards the claims of the City of Brussels to become the seat of the League of Nations, seriously preoccupied by the distressing condition to which the country has been reduced by this most cruel war and convinced that the numberless ruins which cover its territory cannot be restored by its own national resources, most anxiously appeals to your Assembly and implores it to intervene with the greatest possible energy in order to obtain that the solemn promises of

prompt and complete restoration so frequently reiterated be now carried out in the spirit of broad equity and generous compassion which inspired them.

Relying upon the sentiments of solidarity which unite all civilized nations and upon the assurance of sincere and profound sympathy which your Assembly so kindly gave to Belgium, the Senate counts upon obtaining from your Assembly its powerful aid and effectual intervention in support of the legitimate and necessary atonements claimed from the Paris Conference for the restoration of this country.

Please accept, Mr. Speaker, the assurance of my greatest respect.

(Signed.) Baron de Pavereau,
President of the Senate.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Has the Government taken any action in regard to this matter?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The cablegram does not seem to call for any immediate action on the part of the Government. It is a communication addressed to the House of Commons which will have the consideration of the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I suggest that before any action be taken in regard to it, the House be placed in possession of an official record of the damages done to large centres in Belgium.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATER POWERS.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ORDERS IN COUNCIL AS TO ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER COMPANY'S DAM.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): I beg to lay on the Table the following documents:

Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 2nd September, 1918, with reference to the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company, a corporation of the city of New York, to approve of the project to construct certain works in the South Sault Channel of the St. Lawrence River.

Copy of an Order in Council of the 2nd September, 1918, appointing Hon. Arthur Meighen, Minister of the Interior, and Hon. A. L. Sifton, Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, to represent the Government of Canada at a conference with representatives of the United States Government concerning the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company.

Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 12th of October, 1918, in reference to the result of the negotiations between Hon. Arthur Meighen and Hon. A. L. Sifton, representatives of the Government of Canada, with the representatives of the United States Government in reference to the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company, and also in reference to the Order of the International Joint Commission, authorizing the said company to construct certain works in the South Sault Channel of the St. Lawrence River.

Copy of an Order of the said International Joint Commission authorizing the said works dated September 4, 1918.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would suggest that these documents be printed, together with maps and plans of the works proposed to be constructed, at the very earliest date, so as to be available for the use of members.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would make a similar request, because the matter in question is very important.

Mr. ROWELL: I will be very glad to move that the documents be printed for distribution, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the motion might stand until to-morrow in order that the resolution authorizing the printing of the documents may be properly framed.

SEDITION AND SEDITIOUS PROPAGANDA.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER LEGISLATION.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor-General): With the consent of the House, I beg leave to move:

That Messrs. Guthrie, Tweedie, McIntosh, Allan, Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Boys, Douglas (Cape Breton South), Jacobs, Murphy, Ross, Archambault and Copp, be appointed a special committee to consider and report upon the law relating to sedition and seditious propaganda, and on any changes in the law which may be considered necessary to meet the existing conditions, and that the said Committee have power to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be entertained by unanimous consent. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The reason for submitting this motion at the present time is the fact that the provisions of our law in regard to sedition and seditious utterances and propaganda are not very definite. It is not very easy to find or to apply them. In Great Britain a committee of lawyers of the British House of Commons was appointed to consider English law upon the subject, and in the United States a similar committee performed like duties there. The result in the United States is that a new law has been passed by Congress. The law officers of the Department of Justice consider it doubtful whether the present sections of our Criminal Code adequately provide for all questions which might arise at this particular time, and it

has been deemed advisable by the Government to suggest that a committee of legal members of this House should consider these sections to see whether they do adequately meet present day requirements, and, if not, that the committee suggest to the House such amendments as they deem proper. I think that after one or two meetings the committee will be able to report, and then the matter can be dealt with.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Hon. Arthur Meighen (Acting Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 81 to amend the Interpretation Act.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: Explain, please.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill changes the definition of "superior courts" to make the same comply with the actual constitution of those courts in Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT (ELECTROCUTION).

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 82 to amend the Criminal Code (Electrocution).

Mr. BUREAU: Explain, please.

Mr. MOWAT: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to provide that the mechanism of capital punishment shall be made more in accordance with present day public opinion. The law now is that the condemned man shall be taken back to the local jail and, after a sufficient delay to enable him to make peace with his Maker, that he shall be hanged by the neck until he is dead. The hanging is often inefficiently performed. The sheriff is the executive officer, but not being practised in such duties, he employs the public executioner, whose services are sometimes not available with the result that when a substitute is employed bungling has occurred. In the United States since 1889 execution by electric process has been well tested and has proved very efficient, the death sentence being carried out painlessly and instantaneously. A hundred years ago executions were public and they were made the occasions for wassailing and rioting by the people, but eventually with the advance of enlightenment these gruesome exhibitions have ceased and the sentence is now carried out in private. Those who are familiar with the Ingoldsby Legends will remember that my Lord Tomnoddy's appetite for sensation was so jaded that to revive his spirits his friends could suggest nothing better than an execution. This Bill provides that the execution shall not be in the local jail, as is now the practice, but it shall be in the nearest penitentiary of the province, the reason for that being that condemned men have made their escape from local prisons. Only this month in a certain city of the province of Ontario the death watch allowed communication between the condemned man and his paramour, and the convict escaped and is still at liberty. This Bill provides that a special room be set apart at each penitentiary for the purposes of the execution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this a government measure?

Mr. MOWAT: No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

MISS LAMONTAGNE.

*Mr. DESLAURIERS:

Has Miss Lamontagne, of 91A Jeanne Mance, Montreal, received a bonus in connection with her services as an employee of the Montreal Board of Registration in 1918? If so, what amount did she receive?

2. Did any other male or female employees of said board receive a bonus?

3. Was the entire staff belonging to said board entitled to a bonus? If so, did every person thereof receive said bonus?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I am informed by the registrar of the Bureau that there is no such name on the list of employees.

MILITARY SERVICE DEFAULTERS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

Referring to the following statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence during the debate on the Resolution moved in the House by Sir Sam Hughes, on the 9th April instant:

"In regard to the question of uniform penalties,—as I stated in the House the other day,—immediately after the armistice, on November 11, it was quite apparent that we did not require any more of these defaulters as soldiers, and the question was, what was to be done with them? Under the statute they were liable as deserters and defaulters and personally I never considered that they should be allowed to go scot-free. I do not believe that it is possible in this country,—unless we are going to engage in that work for the rest of our natural lives,—

to attempt to arrest all the men of these various classes; but I would like to see some machinery quickly put into operation whereby all the classes mentioned by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) should be disfranchised and deprived of certain civil rights for a period of years. This, I think, would be approved of by all good people in this country. Those who were defaulters would be thereby penalized."

Is it the intention of the Department of Justice immediately to recall the Dominion Police Officers who are now pursuing defaulters under the Military Service Act, and to pass a Bill founded upon the above minister's proposition disfranchising the said defaulters for a certain period of years?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: A Bill dealing with the subject will be introduced very shortly.

STE. MARIE WHARF.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is the Government aware that a landslip has occurred at Ste. Marie wharf, which prevents the steamer Boucherville from commencing its sailing operations?

2. In connection with the construction of the wharves at this point, already commenced, is it the intention of the Government to extend said wharf construction as far as Hochelaga Bay, during the summer season of 1919?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. This locality is within the limits of the harbour of Montreal and under the jurisdiction of the Harbour Commission. The Harbour Commissioners advise that the damage to the wharf has been repaired and that the steamer Boucherville started running on the 23rd instant.

2. The Harbour Commissioners advise that it is proposed to extend the wharf during this season.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN.

Sir HERBERT AMES:

1. How many persons (not corporations) paid income tax under clause 4 of the Income War Tax Act, 1917, upon incomes (a) exceeding $100,000; (b) between $50,000 and $100,000; (c) between $30,000 and $50,000; (d) between $20,000 and $30,000; (e) between $10,000 and $20,000; (f) between $6,000 and $10,000 and (g) under $6,000?

2. What was the total sum collected from each of the above categories?

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—FARMERS' SONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia a matter of national importance. From the items in the public press and the number of letters that come to my office and what I hear from other members, it is apparent that there is a great scarcity of farm help throughout Canada, and farmers are becoming restless for the return of their sons, some of whom are now in France, and some in England. I should like to know if the Militia Department cannot arrange a preference for the return of farmers' sons.

Major-General MEWBURN: This matter has, ever since demobilization commenced, been given most serious consideration. The British army attempted to work out a scheme of demobilization by pivotal or occupational groups, but immediately after the armistice that was found to be impracticable, and the British authorities had to abandon it immediately. It created great trouble and dissension in the army, and a great lack of discipline and a very bitter feeling throughout the whole corps. After a great deal of correspondence with the overseas minister and with the corps commander, it was found that giving priority of return to any individual or class created a very embarrassing situation and a great deal of trouble within the corps. It was, therefore, decided that it was found impossible to bring back any man in priority except on strictly compassionate grounds. I have the utmost sympathy with members of Parliament who are and have been receiving applications from their constituents for the return of soldiers. Those applications, which have been forwarded to me, have been coming in in very large numbers ever since November, and I have endeavoured to the best of my ability to deal sympathetically with each case. On the 29th of January last I sent a circular notice to every member of Parliament and every senator, explaining the situation and pointing out what men could be brought back only on compassionate grounds, and that medical certificates had to be procured from the districts from whence the men came.

As to demobilization in Canada, we met the situation and demobilized all men whose services were not urgently required, giving particular attention to that class.

As regards the corps, the men are being brought back as units, and I think the hon. member will readily understand, if in one unit one or two individual men are pulled out and brought back in priority to their comrades, the feelings of the rest of the men who are held back. Hundreds upon hundreds, in fact, thousands of applications have been received, not only from farmers, but from all classes for the return of relations and friends for whom posi-

tions are awaiting here. I spoke to many officers who came back and they all said that the giving of priority of return created a frightful situation, and that the only way to deal with the matter was to carry out the policy that has been laid down and that is sound and workable. Demobilization is proceeding more rapidly than was expected; the strike at Liverpool is now over, and the whole of the troops will be coming back at a very early date.

As regards individual men in England who are not with any of the units, they have been given priority in accordance with length of service, the married men being returned first.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo): Could not the Minister of Militia consider the discharge of all farmers who are very badly needed in Western Ontario and elsewhere, who are still held at militia headquarters in the various districts? I think there are still some at London, Ont., and possibly elsewhere. Could not an exception be made in those cases?

Major-General MEWBURN: We have already given that most careful consideration, and, as I have stated, as regards demobilization in Canada, we have released every man possible. It has been absolutely essential, in every military district in Canada, to keep the smallest staff possible to carry out demobilization, which is of much greater magnitude than many people realize. We have also found it necessary, for more reasons than one, to keep a very small garrison unit in each district. We have given priority, as I have stated, and in connection with that I sent out a circular giving these instructions:—

Certain Units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force must be maintained in a state of efficiency; such as, Canadian Garrison Detachments, Canadian Medical Corps, Canadian Army Service Corps, and certain administrative units; but the personnel is being reduced as fast as possible, taking the following as a basis for priority of discharge.

Those who can be spared and who are desirous of discharge:

(a) With overseas service.

That is, the men who have had actual overseas service are entitled to priority.

(b) With dependents. This class will be determined by eligibility to receive separation allowance.

That is, married men have been next allowed to return.

(c) In low medical category and unable to render fully efficient service.

(d) In occupations required for economic reasons as indicated by Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment.

These men will be released as speedily as possible. It was felt that some of these men who had not been overseas could afford to devote some time to cleaning up the enormous work of demobilization, but I have, in every instance that has been brought to my attention, tried to meet sympathetically every specific request of any hon. member and I shall try to do so as far as possible.

NAVAL SERVICE—PRIORITY OF DISCHARGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Might I ask a similar question of the Minister of the Naval Service? I am informed that a number of young men who enlisted in the Canadian navy are being held at Halifax, although their services are much needed on our fisheries and farms. It is a puzzle to a good many people why these men are being held at Halifax, because some of them write that they have nothing whatever to do there. Is there any reason for that?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of the Naval Service): Before I took ill, I gave instructions to the Naval Department to demobilize as speedily as possible. Since my return I have not had opportunity to look into the matter, but I shall do so, and I will be very glad to give a more definite answer to-morrow.

MILITARY TRIALS IN ENGLAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Lieut.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): This morning I received information that a number of soldiers concerned in the Kinmel camp riots are being tried in England. Are these men being tried under the Criminal Law of England or under the military law? If they are being tried by military law, are they being tried solely and only by Canadian military authorities, as the Army Act provides, or are they being tried by Imperial and Canadian authorities together?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): My information is that there has been and still is a court-martial sitting in England, composed entirely of Canadians, according to the Army Act.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The case I refer to is that of one Smith from New Brunswick.

who, when the facts are known, will be found to be absolutely guiltless of any serious offence. I understand he is confined in the Tower with others on a very serious charge, the probability being that he will be lined up and shot. I trust the Government will give this matter their serious consideration.

Major-General MEWBURN: I am not aware of any of our men being confined in the Tower and liable to be shot, and I doubt if that is a fact. I remember the case of another man named Smith from New Brunswick who was acquitted the other day, and the trial of another man is awaiting witnesses who crossed over to this side and who have to return. Already two men have been tried and acquitted. As regards men being confined to the Tower, I think the hon. member must be misinformed. These courts-martial are sitting, and a very able man has been retained to defend all those men. I understand instructions are given that they are to be afforded every facility for their defence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Under Canadian law?

Major-General MEWBURN: Yes.

CIVIL SERVICE RE-CLASSIFICATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Might I ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if the report of the re-classification of the Civil Service is in the hands of the Government, and if so, when it will be laid on the Table?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I am sorry the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who has immediate charge of the matter, is not in his place. I shall direct the question of my hon. friend to his attention. It has not come to my knowledge that the report has been received.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill No. 52, to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3, subsection 6, paragraph (t) —illiterates:

Mr. JACOBS: I beg to move that this paragraph be struck out of the Bill.

Amendment negatived; yeas 37, nays 75.

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that discretionary powers be given to the minister to permit, in cases where he deems it advisable, the landing of such persons as are mentioned in this paragraph, so that it would not be necessary to have these cases brought before Council or dealt with in some other way under the Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to record my dissent from this very unnecessary and unworkable innovation in the Act. It is absolutely impossible to carry out this test. There are thousands and thousands of different dialects in the countries from which we receive and expect to receive immigrants and it is proposed that slips containing between thirty and forty words in the dialect of the person attempting to enter shall be placed in the hands of our officials, who can neither read nor understand that dialect. If the immigrant can mumble over these thirty or forty words he is to be allowed to enter, althouth the official cannot tell whether he has read them correctly or not. The test, on the other hand, will debar the honest British subject, the stalwart healthy Scotsman, Irishman, or Englishman, who would make a desirable citizen in every sense of the term simply because he is honest enough to say that he did not have the opportunity in his early days of being taught to read and write. I submit that that is not a test at all; it is not British; we have never had such a test before. An army of officials would be required to carry out this test, and when carried out, I submit that it would be absolutely no safeguard. I am quite willing that all reasonable precautions be taken to secure a desirable class of immigrants, but I submit that if a man is healthy, physically and mentally, and complies with all the other requirements of the Act, he should not be debarred simply because he did not have an opportunity in his youth of learning to read and write. I am very sorry the minister has thought it necessary to put this unworkable barrier in the Act.

Mr. CALDER: The Committee will agree that there is something in the contention of the leader of the Opposition whose viewpoint I can see quite clearly. However, I do not think we will have the difficulty in administering the law which he anticipates. A very similar law has been in force in the United States for two years and it was only yesterday that I had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the chief official responsible for the administration of this law there, Mr. A. Caninetti, Commissioner General of Immigration, Department of Labour, Washington, whom I think many members in the Committee know,

tells me that they have had very little difficulty in administering this law. While it is true that there are in all countries in the world some thousands of dialects, many of them are not in the form of written or printed languages. As a matter of fact, as I stated to the Committee yesterday—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the minister say, thousands of dialects?

Mr. CALDER: I am repeating what the leader of the Opposition says. He told us that there were some thousands of dialects and for that reason we would have all sorts of difficulties in administering the law. In the United States there have been some hundreds of thousands of people seeking entry every year, and the authorities have found it necessary to make use of only some thirty-five different languages. I do not expect it will be necessary to create an army of officials in order to administer this law. Very few officials will be needed, and there should be very little difficulty in training them to administer the law in a reasonable way. I agree that there is a possibility that under a law of this kind we may exclude some very desirable people; but on the other hand I am quite convinced that the great majority of the people in Canada have made up their minds definitely that this country is not going to be flooded with illiterates. That is unquestionable. It might be advisable to add a rider to this clause giving the minister, under proper regulations approved by the Governor in Council, some discretionary power in the matter. I can understand that persons who have not had an education may seek entry from Great Britain, but it seems to me that if that power is given every precaution should be taken to see that it is properly exercised. I think that before any persons desiring to come to Canada from Great Britain left it would be well that our officers there should thoroughly examine them and ascertain whether or not they would be desirable citizens of Canada, and report the facts to the department before the granting of permission for them to come. If the Committee thinks fit, we might add a rider placing some discretion in the hands of the department, and I would be quite prepared to have a clause drawn accordingly. When we consider that this law has been in force in the United States for two years, if we did not have similar laws here the tendency the world over on the part of people of this class would be to come to Canada, and we might have conditions that would be very undesirable indeed unless there were some check.

Mr. NESBITT: I would support the suggestion that the minister have a discretionary power as regards letting in people who cannot read or write. There are people who come from the British Isles and are unable either to read or to write, but who, nevertheless, might make excellent citizens. I think that if there is one thing more than another that we require in Canada it is ordinary labour, and a great many of these illiterates from the British Isles would make splendid ordinary labourers. As an occasional employer of labour to a limited extent, I have frequently met persons who could neither read nor write but who were good and successful citizens and acquired farms of their own. I think the trouble is that a good many of the people who come can read and write too well and do not want to do anything else. Many of the clauses in the Bill prevent people of bad character from coming, but I think that the suggestion is a very good one that the minister should be given some discretion in the admission of people who might be desirable although they cannot read or write.

Mr. CRONYN: As there has been considerable discussion on the question of illiteracy in the British Isles, it might be well to put on record a table covering a period of ten years which the United States Immigration Commission published after a long investigation. The average illiteracy during the period from 1899 to 1909 among all European immigrants was over 26.6 per cent, and it is interesting to note the striking difference between the illiteracy displayed by what are called the old immigrants and that displayed by the new immigrants. You will remember that on a former occasion it was pointed out that the old immigrants came chiefly from Northwestern Europe and the new immigrants from Southeastern Europe. This table of the percentage of illiteracy is based upon the inability of the immigrants to either read or write, so that it is a severer test than that proposed in this Bill. The table is published by the United States Immigration Commission and is quoted in Professor Fairchild's work on immigration at page 198. Percentage of illiteracy of immigrants of specified races, 14 years of age or over, for the years 1899-1909:

Scandinavian	0.4 per cent.
English	1.1 " "
Irish	2.7 " "
German	5.1 " "
Italian north	11.8 " "
Magyar	11.4 " "
Hebrew	25.7 " "
Greek	27.0 " "

Rumanian	34.7 per cent.
Polish	35.4 " "
Croatian and Slovenian	36.4 " "
Italian south	54.2 " "
Portuguese	68.2 " "

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where do the Scotch come in there?

Mr. CRONYN: I was just going to comment on the fact that Scotland does not appear in this list at all, for the reason, I suppose, that there were no illiterates. They are like our friends the Acadians, who, we were glad to hear yesterday, had no illiterates amongst them. I want to draw the attention of the Committee to the great difference between the Italians of northern Italy with 11.8 per cent illiteracy and the Italians of southern Italy with 54.2 per cent.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: The table just quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Cronyn) is of very great significance to any one who has had anything to do with the foreign peoples that have come into this country. You will note that of the Scandinavians 0.4 per cent were illiterate, while the Rumanian percentage was 34. I have lived for thirty-five years amongst a people in which all classes of foreigners are very thickly mixed. In the town in which I have lived for that period we have had a large number of foreigners. We have them yet in Northern Ontario and the foreigner that is giving us trouble, and that is giving this country trouble to-day by adopting a Bolshevik attitude, is the educated foreigner. There are three families living in the little town where I reside who came into this country and the fathers and mothers of whom were absolutely illiterate. They have lived there now for 34 or 35 years, their children have grown up, they have attended the public schools and have become good citizens. The mothers and fathers themselves have learned to read and write English and can converse freely in that tongue.

But when you get the educated Scandinavian who has been referred to, you get the class of man who is creating all the agitation amongst his fellows and trying to break down the ideals for which Canadians stand. I related an experience to one of the members of the House that we had this past winter with 500 Scandinavians. Nine or ten years ago, if you had asked a man who had paid any attention to public affairs in Northern Ontario what, in his judgment, was the best class of men that you could get into that country in order that it might be properly developed, on account of its rigorous climate and long winters, he would tell you the Scandinavian. That was our experience when we had a small number of these people but they have come in large numbers and since they became saturated with the ideas of the educated agitator they have become difficult to deal with.

At the present time in the town of Sudbury there are eleven men awaiting trial at the next sessions, not one of whom is an illiterate. They are men in the same class as that referred to by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt)—the man who does not want to do anything but read and write and circularize his fellow men of the same nationality in order to create unrest in the country and to break down the Government and the ideals of Canadian citizenship.

4 p.m

I have had something to do with many foreigners and with a very considerable number of Rumanians. This is the class of people who seem to be more willing than any others to enter into our citizenship, and I say that with all due deference to other classes, and notwithstanding the possibility that I may be misunderstood, of the Rumanians, and a number of people who were formerly citizens of Austria. A large class of men who were interned as enemy aliens in the early days of the war and were afterwards let out on parole have always been recognized as peaceful, law-abiding citizens in Northern Ontario. They belonged to countries that were part of the Austrian Empire and many people of these races are now citizens of the Allies. These are facts that cannot be gainsaid and any one who will go through the country and investigate conditions as they are cannot fail to come to the conclusion that an educational test on the basis of a man having been educated in the country of his origin, and for the country of his origin is not right. If the ideals that have been taught to him are not right, submitting him to this test gives us no assurance that we are going to get the right kind of citizen for Canada.

Mr. CALDER: If the Committee approve I would suggest the addition of some words at the end of the clause. The clause now reads:

> The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to Canadian citizens and persons who have Canadian domicile, or to persons in transit through Canada.

I would suggest that these words be added:

—or to such persons or classes of persons as may from time to time be approved by the minister.

The Committee will understand that this places a very large discretion in the hands of the minister. It may not always be administered wisely, but that will be a matter for the minister and the Government of the day, whoever it may be, to look after. It is just a question as to whether or not the Committee thinks it advisable to place that discretion in the hands of the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As those who are undesirable are debarred under some other section of the Act, it would not impose a great responsibility on the minister, because if the immigrant was not debarred on that ground the probability is that he would be debarred on some other.

Mr. CALDER: He would be debarred for other reasons and not on account of illiteracy. The clause would then read in this way:

The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to Canadian citizens and persons who have Canadian domicile, or to persons in transit through Canada, or to such persons or classes of persons as may from time to time be approved by the minister.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have a situation in my part of the country as between ourselves and Newfoundland, which ought to receive consideration. Hundreds and thousands of people go back and forth pretty much all the time between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, landing at North Sydney. They are the best men that we have in connection with our coal and steel works, and we could not get along very well without them. I am afraid that this test may keep a great many of them out. In many parts of Newfoundland they have no very great educational advantages, and while they are a splendid people, good workers and desirable citizens, I am afraid that this requirement that they shall be able to read and write may keep many of them out of the province. We are very anxious to have them come in and go out as they want to. The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) suggested last night that this rule would not apply to Great Britain and Ireland. I wish to add Newfoundland. I do not think we would be running any risk by saying that this rule should not apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and Newfoundland. Let it apply to those who are really foreigners and let our own people come in if they are otherwise desirable. The probabilities are that most of them can read, but let us not put any obstruction in the way of the others.

Mr. TWEEDIE: It seems to me that if we follow the suggestion which has been made by the Minister of Immigration we will throw wide open the question of the literary test in regard to the immigrants that enter Canada. The arguments of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) were not confined to cases of extreme hardship. As far as the immigrant himself is concerned, the hon. member for North Oxford points out that we require people of that class to come into this country for the purposes of labour. He says that we bring them in as illiterates, and being here, they are more contented while they are in that state. Therefore his argument practically means that we must permit the admission of ignorant people for the purpose of having quietness amongst the labouring class. My opinion is that if we throw the burden upon the minister of determining who shall be admitted he will be at once flooded by requests and petitions from all classes of employers in this country who will say that we need a certain class of farm labour. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Douglas) suggests that we need another class of labour to operate the coal mines. It will also be suggested that we need others to work as section-hands on our railways; in fact, that we need for labour purposes generally throughout Canada the admission of ignorant people. I deem it right at the present time to face the issue squarely and say whether or not we are going to apply the literary test to immigrants coming to Canada, or whether we will allow the law to remain as it is. To make the minister the judge would, in my opinion, impose an unfair burden upon him, and he would be more than human if he could resist the many requests having for their object the evasion of this section of the law. I think we should apply the literary test and require the immigrants brought to this country to have a certain amount of education, so that even if they cannot speak the English language they may, through the medium of their own tongue and their own papers, become familiar with the conditions that exist here. We should not, as in the past, permit the entrance of a great many illiterates of foreign birth who cannot read in their own language, let alone read, write,

or speak the English language, and who have no way whatever of familiarizing themselves with the prevailing Canadian conditions, except through such representations as may be made to them. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) charged last night that the illiterate immigrants that have been brought into this country in the past have been made the victims of political trickery, and have been imposed upon by the politicians of both parties. Well, if we wish to avoid that condition of affairs which no doubt has existed in this country in the past I can see no better way of making a start than by requiring the immigrants who enter Canada to be able to read and to write in some language. As far as regards the percentage of illiterates who would come from Great Britain it is certainly very small. I think we should either stand by the principle of the clause as it is now, and not place in the hands of the minister power to permit the entrance of any class of illiterates, or else we should wipe out the literary test entirely, and let the law remain as it is at the present time. Personally I am in favour of the application of the literary test, and I would be very sorry to see any such broad power placed in the hands of the minister.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. gentleman has misquoted what I said. I did not maintain that it was necessary to bring in an illiterate man for labour purposes. What I said was that I would not bar his admission because he was illiterate, provided he was otherwise qualified. The hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) further said that no illiterate Scotchman had come to Canada in the last ten years. I have personal knowledge of a Scotchman who has come to this country in the last five years, who is illiterate and has a very broad accent.

Mr. J. F. REID (Mackenzie): He was an Irishman.

Mr. NESBITT: He was not an Irishman, but it would not hurt him any if he were. I personally am inclined to leave it to the judgment of the Minister of Immigration in certain cases to permit the entry, in his own judgment, of certain classes of immigrants. I am not afraid the present Minister of Immigration would ever abuse that discretionary power, or that he would not carry it out with ability, and I hope that in the future no Minister of Immigration will be appointed in whom we could not repose equal confidence.

[Mr. Tweedie.]

Mr. CALDER: I would like to point out the exact effect of this section. It will be noted that it says:

> The following persons shall be prohibited from entering or landing in Canada:—Persons over fifteen years of age,—

and so on. Then it says:

> The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to Canadian citizens and persons who have Canadian domicile or to persons in transit through Canada.

That is to say, it exempts those who have acquired a Canadian domicile, or those who are simply passing through Canada as tourists or travellers. What the section means, if it passes, is that every person over fifteen years of age who cannot read shall not be allowed to land or enter Canada. As I understand the situation down by the sea, every year there is a fairly large number of people who come over from Newfoundland to work in the coal mines.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, and in the steel works.

Mr. CALDER: That is, these people are engaged in seasonal occupation, and there seems to me no reason why in that particular instance discretion should not be used for the admission of these people to engage in such seasonal occupations. Again, it has been pointed out that on account of the conditions existing in Western Canada from time to time we must send to the United States and engage some thousands of labouring men to work in our harvest fields. Well, if the section remains exactly in its present form we must see to it that such persons are admitted to render that harvest help. It appears to me that, taking everything into consideration, some discretion should be permitted under this section whereby we might be able to meet the labour conditions that arise from time to time in this country.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE (Edmonton East): What would happen in the case of these people desiring to remain in the country permanently?

Mr. CALDER: I think we should provide that the section shall not apply to those people who enter Canada for the temporary purposes referred to, but if they wish to remain then the test will be applied.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: How would the minister deal with a case such as I am about to mention, of which I have experienced two or three in the last few years? The father has come to Canada and is providing, or is in the way of getting, a home.

He obtains a good occupation and later on sends for his wife and chidren whom he left behind in the Old Country—I am speaking now particularly of persons who came from Great Britain. In one of the cases there was a wife, and I think six or seven children, one of the children not being as bright as doctors thought she ought to be. The parents were faced with this condition: They either had to abandon all their arrangements and the whole family remain in England, or else come to Canada and leave the one dull child behind, although it was demonstrated she was not able to take care of herself. It appears to me that where the parents are prepared to guarantee that a child of that kind will be looked after and will be no charge to the country, it is scarcely charitable, to say the least of it, to break up a family circle and upset the plans of six or seven people wishing to come to this country because one of the number may be considered not as bright as she should be. I want to ask the minister if he has any discretion in dealing with a case of that kind?

Mr. CALDER: There is discretion under the law as it now stands to deal with cases of that kind, and the department is from time to time handling such cases. Usually we require something in the nature of security from the relatives that a child such as the hon. member speaks of shall not be a public charge, and the child is then allowed to enter Canada under a section of the existing law. All of those cases are gone into very carefully, and every precaution is taken to see that the person admitted does not become a public charge.

Mr. EDWARDS: I think perhaps it might be pertinent to ask what is the object of the reading test for immigrants? The only object of such a test that I have been able to gather was indicated by some words of the minister, to the effect that we have not done our duty in times past in our efforts to Canadianize those foreigners who have come to this country. So I assume that one of the objects is to enable us to impart information to them which they should have in order to know something about our institutions, customs and ideals. It must be clear to every person that if the immigrant is unable to read there is no opportunity of imparting such information. If that person comes from a country other than Great Britain, say from Italy or Rumania, and he can read his native language, we are in a position to place in his hands reading matter printed in his own tongue which will convey to him some idea of our national ideals, customs and institutions, and in that way we can carry on a campaign to Canadianize him. If that is true there is not the same reason to impose a reading test on an immigrant from Great Britain as to impose it on persons coming from foreign countries, because we can convey to a Britisher by word of mouth our ideals and customs—in fact, coming from the British Isles he understands them pretty well already.

It occurred to me that the real object we had in view in applying this reading test was to enable us to carry out our work of making these foreigners Canadian citizens, and I repeat, if they are illiterate there is no possible way of imparting to them the necessary knowledge of our ideals, customs and instructions. Therefore I think the reading test is consistent with the idea of the minister that we should be more particular and more energetic in performing our duty of turning these foreigners into Canadian citizens. But I do not think there will be any very great hardship in applying the reading test to persons coming from the British Isles. I think there is a smaller percentage of illiteracy among those people than amongst our native-born population as I understand the figures. In Scotland particularly the authorities have been giving very close attention to the subject of education, and I do not think immigrants from England and Scotland would have any trouble in passing a reading test, especially those coming from Scotland.

If an immigrant is under fifteen years of age the reading test does not apply, but if any boy or girl who has lived in the British Isles until the age of fifteen is unable to read the English language, I do not think it is desirable to allow such a youth to enter this country. Any boy or girl who has not had enough ambition, with the opportunities available in Great Britain, to acquire that reading knowledge had better stay at home for a few months longer until able to read.

I think the idea of a reading test is very good and is perfectly logical and consistent with the attitude taken by the minister all along. I might add that this fact has been very strongly impressed upon the people of the United States during the last three or four years. I was very much interested in reading a summary of a report presented by Secretary Lane to the President of the United States in regard to this very matter. I will not take up the time of the committee by referring to it in detail, but he impressed on the President in the very strong-

est language possible the great importance to that country—which we do not regard as illiterate by any means—of taking very vigorous measures to enforce attendance at schools, that the population might be better educated. He calls attention to the large number of illiterates in the United States and the very serious effect it has upon the country. So when the United States is taking energetic measures along the line of selection of their immigrants, it does seem to me that it would be unwise for us to be lax in this matter wherein, I think, we have in times past been altogether too negligent. I think we should have some test along the lines of enabling ourselves to carry on a propaganda of instructing immigrants, if not in our own language, then in their native language, by means of pamphlets and other reading matter.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards), because what we want is immigrants, and a man may be a very desirable immigrant although unable to read or write. We all know that we have had men from the British Isles who have made good citizens, and a great many of them have not had the advantages of an education. I know an old man who was not able to read or write, but he was a skilful farmer and a progressive man and gave his children a good education. It is a good while ago since he came to Nova Scotia, but his grandson is now principal of a great university in the United States. It would be foolish, I think, to exclude that class of men who are so unfortunate as not to have had educational opportunities. There are not as many of them at present as there were years ago, but there are still a certain number, and why should we exclude them? They are in no way dangerous citizens, and I take it that the purpose of the minister is to exclude undesirable people, and a man cannot be said necessarily to be undesirable merely because he is unable to read. The question raised by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) is important in Nova Scotia, and I do not see how the minister can very well deal with every separate case, because that would keep him pretty busy. In the spring of the year, when fifty or a hundred men, who are not able to read, arrive in Sydney from Newfoundland every day, they will not be allowed to land, and they will have to return home until permission for them to land is obtained from Ottawa.

Mr. CALDER: I do not think the hon. member rightly understands the wording of the proposed amendment, which is that the minister may allow persons or classes of persons to enter Canada. If it were adopted, provision would have to be made that those seasonal workers from Newfoundland be put in a class that would be allowed to enter.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If the minister will have to make a regulation to apply to such cases as that, it might as well be inserted in the Bill. The minister should consider the advisability of not applying this regulation to the British Isles, or for that matter to the self-governing Dominions, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland. I am not moving this as an amendment, but I submit for the minister's consideration that these words be inserted:

> Or to persons being British subjects emigrating from Great Britain or Ireland or from any of the self-governing Dominions of the Empire.

Mr. CALDER: I am afraid if we attempted to deal with this in the Bill in a specific way, we shall only land ourselves in trouble. If it is to be dealt with at all, discretion must be given to deal with such cases as they arise from time to time.

Mr. FIELDING: I should like to support the minister's proposal by way of amendment to add these qualifying words which will tend to soften the previous clause and to guard against a possible injustice, at all events, against a possible harshness of administration. It is not generally desirable that we should confer too much power upon any individual minister, but it is, from time to time, necessary to allow a minister a discretion. I quite agree with the minister that it will be better to leave the matter in a general way as he has proposed in his amendment than to adopt words specifying those who might be admitted. I know enough about the case of men from Newfoundland, referred to by the leader of the Opposition, to see the force of his representations. Yet, if we were asked to specify Newfoundland, that would seem to be an unfortunate discrimination against other portions of the British Dominions, and if we adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), mentioning several Dominions, that would still leave out other portions of the British Empire. I hope that the thing can be worked out as the minister proposes in his amendment, and I certainly think to go beyond that and specify particular countries might get us into trouble.

Mr. HAY: If the amendment "that discretionary powers be left in the hands of the minister" is to be included in the Bill, I will certainly support the Bill, because I would not be in favour of excluding British subjects, even if they were unable to meet the requirements in respect to reading and writing. That would be doing an injustice to British citizens if they met the requirements of the Bill in every other respect. It would be working a hardship on the people of England, Scotland, Ireland, and the rest of the British Empire.

Mr JACOBS: I was rather surprised and somewhat startled at the figures which the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn) gave us with respect to illiteracy. Quoting from Professor Fairchild's book, he gave us a list of the percentages of illiterates from various countries in Europe, and amongst those, he told us that Hebrew illiteracy was about 25 per cent. This is the first I have heard of there being such a country as a Hebrew country in Europe. These men come from certain specified countries in Europe, and a classification of some according to nationality and others according to race and religion would require explanation.

Mr. CRONYN: This is the heading of the table as I read it: "Percentage of illiteracy of immigrants of the specified races."

Mr. JACOBS: I think I know probably as much about Hebrews as Professor Fairchild, and no doubt more than my good friend from London (Mr. Cronyn). I can safely say that, in my experience, covering quite a number of years—and I have been the president of the largest Hebrew philanthropic institution in Canada—there never came under my review the case of a single Jew who did not know how to read his own language. In fact, such a thing is absolutely impossible. I have only to turn to the biblical command to prove that Jews must know how to read their own language, otherwise they cannot become members of the Jewish community If my good friend wants to accompany me to my room where I always have a Bible, I think I can show him the text. That being the case, I cannot understand why those figures should have been given by Professor Fairchild, unless it be for this reason that these Jewish people coming from various countries were unable to read the language of the country from which they came. But I question whether, if the test were put to them with regard to their own language, they would be found unable to read that language. Such a thing is absolutely impossible, and my object in rising was to put this clearly before the House. Furthermore I understand that an impression has gone abroad that I have strenuously opposed this section because it is going to debar Jews from this country. The reasons already given by me would indicate that I have no such idea at all. My object is rather one of endeavouring to assist others who, not so fortunate as the Hebrew people, have no injunctions of that kind in their religious cults. I would be satisfied with the clause as accepted by the minister namely, that we give discretion to the minister. I would have been more satisfied if the clause had been entirely struck out, but half a loaf is better than no bread. I trust, that with the intelligence which characterizes the department, no real hardship will be suffered by those who wish to enter this country, who are desirable citizens, but who may be disqualified by their inability to read.

Mr. CRONYN: I hope the hon. member will accept my assurance that in quoting this table I had no feeling against any race therein mentioned. His explanation may have hit the truth; there is nothing in the context to show. The table did include both reading and writing, and it might well be that the test was in the tongue of the country from which the immigrant came.

Mr. McKENZIE: I should like to know when these definite and well-defined arrangements will be made. I have in mind particularly people from Newfoundland coming over to Cape Breton. If a boat-load of these Newfoundlanders went to land at North Sydney, are we to infer that they would have to lie off North Sydney until Ottawa had been communicated with and it was ascertained whether they could come in? Or is it proposed to put the regulations in the hands of the immigration officers at North Sydney and other places, so that they can decide whether the men shall be allowed to land? There was almost a riot in our town last year on account of some regulations that had been passed, inadvertently, I believe, by the Department of Immigration. Three or four hundred Newfoundlanders were held up at North Sydney in consequence of this regulation, but after a few days we managed to reach an understanding with the department and they were allowed to land. These Newfoundlanders are the most loyal type of British subject; they have shown themselves to be excellent soldiers in this war and they are

very sensitive of any obstructions placed in the way of their entry into any other part of the British Empire. I trust that whatever arrangements are made, they will not create any ill-feeling or misunderstanding between the colony of Newfoundland and ourselves.

Mr. CALDER: This section does not come into force until the first day of July, so that we shall have ample time to consider the situation down by the sea. My intention is to refer the matter to the officials of the department immediately, so that the necessary regulations may be framed and our officers in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island made thoroughly acquainted with them before the first of July. The same is true of immigrants from Great Britain. We shall endeavour to frame regulations and give our officials over there ample notice. It can all be done in ample time before the first of July.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CRONYN: I desire to move the addition of a further subsection to section 3. If the Committee are weary of the number of times I have risen on this Bill, I may urge in mitigation that heretofore this session I have not occupied much of the time of the House. Last week we had a prolonged and strenuous debate, but on that occasion I think I had some balance of time to spare over the one and seven-ninths of a minute which it was calculated was the allowance of each member. We heard then a good deal about figurative babies and imaginary wrecks. It seems to me this Bill is fraught with potentialities which will affect many real babies in the years to come, and may possibly bring about many human wrecks. It is in fact the resumption of one of the great biological and sociological experiments that we are considering in this Bill. My amendment, which I shall read later, proposes to prohibit for a term of years immigration from south-eastern Europe. It may be urged that under section 13, which has already been passed by the Committee, power is given by Order in Council to accomplish the same end. Perhaps I share with certain other hon. members of this House some apprehensions with regard to Orders in Council. At all events, if the Bill is passed in its present form, no member of the House should afterwards raise objection to Orders in Council affecting immigration passed under section 13.

There are divers views regarding the general subject of immigration, and I do not desire to detain the Committee by discussing these at length. There is the broad view of the man who may be termed a sentimental monogenist—the man who says "Are we not all brothers in this world?" and who points out that the great war was fought for liberty and mankind, and urges, therefore, that no country should shut its doors against any race. Of course, if he be logical, he must allow the entry of the natives of Asia and Africa as well as those of Europe, and while there are advocates who are prepared to go to that logical length, I fancy that few of them will be found in this country. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier spoke of the white man's burden and Kipling's gospel thereon. Now, my memory of that gospel is different from his, and I shall take the liberty of calling the attention of the Committee to what Kipling actually did say. I shall not read the whole poem, because it is too lengthy. One or two stanzas will show that what Kipling was speaking of was the missionary effort of Great Britain to the less enlightened nations, and not of opening the doors of Britain or her colonies to these races:

Take up the White Man's burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.

Take up the White Man's burden—
The savage wars of peace—
Fill full the mouth of Famine
And bid the sickness cease;
And when your goal is nearest
The end for others sought,
Watch Sloth and heathen Folly
Bring all your hope to nought.

Take up the White Man's burden—
Ye dare not stoop to less—
Nor call too loud on Freedom
To cloak your weariness;
By all ye cry or whisper,
By all ye leave or do,
The silent, sullen peoples
Shall weigh your Gods and you.

Opposed to that general argument in favour of unrestricted immigration, there are those who believe in selective immigration. I shall not now delay the Committee to give the reasons which may be urged in favour of such selection. They are in a sense all covered by a word which has been frequently used throughout this debate—"assimilation." What does assimilation mean? The Century dictionary gives it as: "The act or process of making or becoming like or identical; the act or process of bringing into harmony." So that

assimilation involves identity. There is one final test as to whether assimilation will be efficient in connection with race, and that test is the free intermarriage between the races. If marriage can take place between any man and woman in a country without reference to ethnic origin, then true assimilation has been found. But you may well say: You are talking of European immigration; no question arises in your proposed amendment regarding the white or black races. I therefore desire to say one word on the situation in Europe. Those hon. members who have at all been attracted by the recent discoveries in anthropology will know that the distinct trend of present scientific opinion is to the effect that Europe contains three main races which have nothing to do with national boundaries, languages, or religions, but come out of the womb of time, and the characteristics of which have been fixed, according to some scientific writers, by millions of years of growth. These three races of Europe are known by the names, Nordics, Alpines, and Mediterraneans. One could spend some time in describing the variations that distinguish these races, but I am afraid the Committee might be impatient if I went that length.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. CRONYN: These races shade into each other at different points, and the dividing line is indistinct at other points. Speaking in a loose way the Nordics occupy the extreme northwest of Europe, the Alpines are found in the west and central portions, and the Mediterraneans in the south.

The proposed amendment is to exclude for a time immigrants from southeastern Europe, and while I do not wish to repeat any of the remarks I made in the opening of the debate, I would like to summarize once again the objections against allowing these people free entry into Canada at the present time. In the first place, should we do so, they are likely to arrive in large numbers, judging by the past. Now it is well known that if you introduce into the body of man or beast an inordinate quantity of food, particularly of a new and strange variety, digestive disturbances arise and toxins are produced. And so with the body politic. If you introduce a large mass of strange people who cannot be assimilated, poisonous currents are set up which produce results similar to those mentioned yesterday by hon. members from the West. The second reason is that these immigrants flock for the greater part to the cities and rarely become occupants of rural districts. I gave the percentage on a former occasion and need not repeat it, but it is somewhat alarming to learn that in the case of certain of the races from that portion of Europe over 90 per cent stay in the city and cannot be persuaded to go on the land. The third objection is that so many of them are but temporary visitors to this continent. It will be readily understood that if a man is here to make money he will economize to the greatest extent in his method of living, and will decline to be interested in the social or political problems of this country. A good deal more might be said in that regard, and striking instances could be given of what happens in Canada to-day with that class of worker, but I must hurry on. The fourth objection is the great percentage of illiteracy among these immigrants. We have already dealt with that point and so I pass to the fifth objection, which is the lowered standard of living that must follow the introduction into the country of so many people of this type. I shall now read the proposed amendment as sub-paragraph (u) of section 3:

> 3. (u) the following persons, unless otherwise permitted by existing treaties, shall also be prohibited, for a period of five years from the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, from entering or landing in Canada:—
>
> (i) Aliens from the Continent of Europe whose domicile is situate south or east of a line drawn from the Atlantic Ocean east along the forty-second parallel of latitude to the fifteenth meridian of longitude thence north along said fifteenth meridian to the fifty-fifth parallel thence east along said fifty-fifth parallel to the twentieth meridian thence north along said twentieth meridian to the sixtieth parallel thence east along said sixtieth parallel to the thirtieth meridian and thence north along said thirtieth meridian to the Arctic Ocean.
>
> (ii) Aliens from the North American Continent of European birth who are not citizens of the United States of America and whose domicile in Europe was situate south or east of the above described line.

It may be objected that the above is a wholly artificial boundary. I wish some hon. gentleman would try to find some other way of getting at what I want to accomplish. With the map of Europe in flux it is a difficult matter to describe under any other method the boundaries which I suggest. Starting at the 42nd parallel of latitude, which is the southernmost latitude in which Canada lies, the 42nd or very close to it, being the latitude of Point Pelee, we are just above the northern boundary of Portugal. We cross the northern portion of

Spain, past Corsica, just north of Rome to a point where the line bisects the 15th meridian of longitude. The line then runs north leaving to the west of it almost the whole of Germany, a great part of Austria and what is called on this map, Czecho Slovakia. I have no hesitation in leaving these alien enemy countries within the favoured area because of the declaration of the minister that provision has already been made for the exclusion of alien enemies as immigrants. The 15th meridian bisects the 55th parallel in the Baltic sea whence the line goes east to Konigsberg, north along the 20th meridian to the gulf of Finland, then east along the 60th parallel to a point north of Petrograd and then clear north to the Arctic ocean. To the north and west of the boundaries so defined and thus within the favoured area will be found the British Isles, Norway and Sweden, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland, the northern portion of Spain, the northern half of Italy, and, as I say, some of the enemy countries. These boundaries are crudely placed but I could find no other method of arriving at my object.

5 p.m.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Your object is to exclude the Latin races?

Mr. CRONYN: My object is to exclude immigrants from Southeastern Europe for a period of years.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: Does that exclude people from any portion of France?

Mr. CRONYN: The whole of France and part of Spain are taken in. Portugal is left out. As a matter of fact, in eighteen years, we have had exactly 110 immigrants from Portugal; so that omission is not a serious matter. Southern Italy is left out. It is somewhat remarkable that all the American articles on immigration point to the difference between the inhabitants from Northern and Southern Italy. So great is that difference that the American immigration tables always show the inhabitants of Northern Italy separate and apart from those of Southern Italy. The Southerners come almost entirely from the provinces or departments of Abruzzi, Campania, Calabria and the island of Sicily.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In what part of Italy is Naples?

Mr. CRONYN: It is of course well to the south. This map does not give the departments; I am speaking from memory as to those. It may be of interest to the Committee in passing to learn that I was unable to obtain a wall map of Europe from any department of the Government to which I applied; nor could I buy one in any book store. With the discussion which we may have later about the Peace terms, I took the opportunity of suggesting to the geographer of the Department of the Interior that he should have a supply of these maps on hand.

Mr. BALDWIN: You are going to distinguish between places bounded by certain degrees of longitude and parallels of latitude. These lines divide many countries that you propose to exclude immigration from. What is to hinder people from moving from one side of the meridian or parallel to the other? It seems to me that there will be a very great mix-up.

Mr. CRONYN: The words used are "whose domicile is situate." The word "domicile" is interpreted by the Act as follows:

> "Domicile" means the place in which a person has his home, or in which he resides, or to which he returns as his place of permanent abode, and does not mean the place where he resides for a mere special or temporary purpose.

I take it that the immigration authorities would demand, if this were put into force, a certificate from some proper officer of the country of origin that the immigrant had his domicile at such and such a point.

Mr. BALDWIN: Many people of this character are nomadic in their habits and they move from one place to another. They do not have the same idea as we have about holding real estate, they have no permanent abode and it seems to me that they cannot be lined up very closely.

Mr. CRONYN: That after all would be a matter of detail. I am bringing the amendment before the Committee more to present the general idea than in any hope that it will be accepted as the final working clause.

Mr. McISAAC: Would the hon. member explain in plain and less technical language from what portions of Europe he would exclude immigrants?

Mr. CRONYN: I am sorry I have been using language that any member of the House cannot understand; I had no intention of doing so. The lines drawn would exclude all Portugal, the southern three-quarters of Spain, the southern half of

Italy and the Island of Sardinia, all of Greece, Turkey, the Balkan States, Bulgaria, and the whole of Russia in Europe.

Mr. CANNON: Would the hon. gentleman exclude people from Malta and the other British possessions?

Mr. CRONYN: So far as any inhabitant of Malta is not a British subject. I am using the word "alien" in a technical sense. As defined by the Act, an alien is a person who is not a British subject. British subjects either in Europe or the United States of America, would be free from this prohibition.

Mr. JACOBS: What would happen in the case of territories over which Great Britain has established a protectorate?

Mr. CRONYN: Perhaps the hon. member will inform me what places in Europe are under a British protectorat?

Mr. JACOBS: Take the case of Egypt. Great Britain has a protectorate over that country.

Mr. CRONYN: This clause is confined to the continents of Europe and North America.

Mr. JACOBS: Then emigrants will be admitted from non-European countries if Great Britain has a protectorate over them?

Mr. CRONYN: I did not attempt to deal with emigrants other than those from southeastern Europe and North America. This is a temporary expedient at best, and for a period of five years I think we can take it for granted that there will be little if any emigration from other continents.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. CALDER: If the hon. gentleman insists upon the amendment I think it should stand so that we may have ample time to consider it. His proposition, in many respects, is a novel one, and how it can be worked out in a practical way I cannot at the present time see. Therefore, I should like to have ample opportunity to carefully consider the amendment from every angle. There are difficulties in the way of carrying out what is proposed. I cannot, for example, see how we can for a period of five years exclude Russians who live in Europe, and not exclude people of that nationality if they are domiciled across the Ural mountains. It seems to me there would be very little logic in that position. Neither do I see how we could exclude people from the continent of Europe, whom we regard as undesirable, and not exclude people from the continent of South America, or from the continent of Africa. The method proposed of applying geographical boundaries so as to exclude certain classes of people for a period of years will, I think, have to be looked at very carefully before the House commits itself to the principle. I would suggest that we proceed with the other clauses of the Bill and allow the proposed amendment to stand. It will be printed in Hansard, together with the discussion which has taken place on the proposal, and we will all have a full opportunity of considering the suggestions at our leisure.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I understand the hon. gentleman, by his amendment, proposes to exclude the Greeks and the Portuguese?

Mr. CRONYN: The Greeks and the Portuguese.

Mr. THOMPSON: That is to say, a portion of Portugal?

Mr. CRONYN: All of Portugal.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: That immediately raises a question in my mind for the simple reason that these people are our allies in this war, which will not be concluded until peace has been signed. The Greeks and the Portuguese are still our allies in every sense of the word, and I question the advisability of this House excluding, or going on record as being willing to exclude, the soldiers from other countries that have fought alongside our own men and helped to win this war.

Mr. CRONYN: I have no objection to following the course suggested by the minister and allowing the amendment to stand. The suggestion made is, perhaps, novel, although not quite so novel as might appear to the Committee. The method followed in this case has already been adopted by the United States in connection with the entry of Asiatics into that country—that is to say, the method of using lines of latitude and longitude to define the boundaries of areas whence emigration shall be prohibited. I would much prefer—as I said in opening the debate—that the entire Act should be recast. I would like to adopt the positive instead of the negative method. Let us say, for instance: "We will accept immigrants from the countries of all our Allies," or from certain of them, and then consider the admission of emigrants from other countries. Unfortunately, the

whole trend of legislation for many years has been the other way, and we are forced to hold the wrong end of the stick unless we are prepared to upset all that has gone before.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that further consideration of this section and the amendment submitted in connection therewith be now postponed. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

On section 4—Titles of officers.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is not in his seat, or he certainly would object to proceeding with this clause, which the Committee will observe opens up the whole question of titles, concerning which the House has pronounced so recently. I suggest that the clause be allowed to stand until the Committee appointed to deal with the question of titles has had an opportunity to report.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think the objection is entitled to very much consideration. The jocularity of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) completely carried me away, but I was going to ask, is it intended to appoint more officials at the different immigration stations? For instance, in my own town, there is a doctor and an immigration agent both engaged in the handling and examination of immigrants who land there. Is it intended that such a staff as that shall be increased under this Bill? Possibly the only immigration stations we have in the Maritime Provinces are at Halifax, St. John, North Sydney and Sydney. I would like to know if it is the intention of the minister to re-arrange those stations so as to increase the staff to any perceptible extent.

Mr. CALDER: I have had a thorough examination made of the Outside Service from ocean to ocean, and as a result our staff has been cut down to a very considerable extent. We have no present intention of increasing the staff; it will be increased only as actual requirements make such increase necessary. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) is aware that we also had an inquiry made into the administration of our quarantine stations. I have a report from those who made the inquiry, but I purpose to hand it over to the new Health Department, to be created shortly, and leave to the minister in charge of that department the making of any changes that may be necessary.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister would require under this Bill, I understand, interpreters for thirty-five different languages.

Mr. CALDER: No. Sometimes we have been able to get interpreters with a knowledge of as many as ten languages, and I think we will be easily able to get them again. These interpreters are required at the eastern ports of entry, St. John. Halifax, and Quebec, where most of the people land from Europe. I think probably five interpreters would be quite sufficient to handle the great bulk of that work.

Mr. CANNON: The different provinces also have immigration commissioners, I understand. Is it the intention of the minister to make arrangements with the provinces for co-operative effort? Sometimes in the past there have been clashes between provincial and federal officials.

Mr. CALDER: The work of the provinces is entirely different from our work. They have nothing whatever to do with the matters covered by the Immigration Act and by this Bill. If they have commissioners of immigration those commissioners are interested in colonization work, and there is no reason in the world why the two sets of officers should not co-operate in every possible way.

Mr. CANNON: For instance, supposing the province of Ontario has a commissioner to promote settlement of certain portions of Ontario, and this department has a commissioner to promote settlement of portions of the western provinces, how would those two commissioners work?

Mr. CALDER: Some provinces have agents who are carrying on propaganda and publicity work, which they have a perfect right to do; there is nothing in our Federal laws to prevent them. But we have the right to decide at the port of entry whether those people who are so attracted to Canada shall be permitted to enter.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Board of Inquiry:

Mr. JACOBS: The section provides "for the summary determination of all cases of immigrants." I understand that an appeal would still lie to the minister?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: What happens when there is not a sufficient number to constitute a board of inquiry?

Mr. CALDER: That is provided for in the next section, I think.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Officer to exercise powers of board:

Mr. McKENZIE: My own port is a very important port of entry, but we have only two people there who have anything to do with immigration.

Mr. CALDER: That is covered by section 22, subsection (l):

Where there is no Board of Inquiry at port of entry, or at a neighbouring port to which a person detained under this Act could conveniently be conveyed, or to which a case for decision could conveniently be referred, then the officer in charge shall exercise the powers, etc.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that an old section?

Mr. CALDER: Yes, it is the first subsection of section 22 as it stands now in the Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Inspection of immigrants:

Mr. McKENZIE: I heartily approve of that particular provision and hope that the inspection will be made as efficient as possible, and so prevent a great deal of trouble on this side.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. CALDER: I do not wish the House to be under a misconception as to the purpose of this section. Numerous suggestions have reached the department, and it has been mentioned in Committee, that we should provide for the inspection of all intending immigrants before they get on board ship. That is not the purpose of this section. This section provides that we may make regulations for the inspection—we may do this if we think it is advisable. I am sure the Committee will readily understand what our difficulty would be. Imagine that we are back in normal times, say five years hence, with conditions settled, the country growing and prospering, and we are reaching out for immigrants in many countries; if we were to undertake medical inspection of those people in their home lands. I can assure the Committee that it would be a very big problem and a very expensive one as well. We may, however, find it advisable, at certain ports of entry, where those people would come from very largely, to have medical inspectors to see that the work of medical inspection is properly carried on by the ship authorities, and in the case of Great Britain by the officers of the Board of Trade upon whom certain responsibilities are thrown under the English laws. While we are purposing to take power to have certain of this work done on the other side of the line and on board ship, I would not like the Committee to think that we intend to see that every immigrant who, hereafter, purposes coming to Canada shall be thoroughly examined from the standpoint of health before he ever gets on board ship, because, from the investigations I have made, I feel quite certain that, if we ever undertook that work, it would cost this country a very large sum of money. On the other hand, under the law as it now stands, and as modified by this Bill, we throw upon the transportation company which brings those people to Canada, the full responsibility of ascertaining whether intending immigrants are up to the required standard of health and mentality. Personally, notwithstanding all that may be said on the other side of the question. I am convinced that that is where we should keep the responsibility. We should compel those transportation companies, through their medical officers, to continue to do that work, just as it has been done in the past. I am perfectly aware there are two sides to this question, but from all the information I have been able to gather and the study I have made on this subject, I believe it will be much safer, wiser and more economical, and the administration will be better conducted if we leave the law in the main just where it stands at present.

Mr. McKENZIE: While I would not suggest that there should be many places specified from which intending immigrants could start for this country, I do not think it would be any great hardship on them to say that there would be certain specified ports in Europe from which they would have to start, and that at those ports we would have our machinery for proper examination. Immigrants would have to come to those places by rail or otherwise, be examined and receive the proper certificate to permit them to commence their journey to Canada. Doctors and examiners are human like the rest of us, and I can well imagine, if I were a doctor in an office at Halifax and a man came to me who had paid his passage and had arrived in this country, my mentality towards that

man would be very different from what I would feel if he were in his own town in some part of Europe to which he belonged. I would say to myself: This young man has come across here; after all, it will be all right, and it would be a desperate situation to dump him back aboard this vessel and send him home to his own country. That is the human side, and those are considerations which you cannot dispel from the minds of officials, because we are all human; we are all subject to those humane feelings, and it is a good thing that we are. That is why I am particularly anxious that such considerations should be removed from the mind of the officer, so that he would be dealing with a man at his home where those sentiments would not come in at all, and so that the man would be coldly and cooly told: You have no business to attempt to come to Canada, because you are not within the class of people we want there; you must stay at home. At the same time, I would not in the slightest degree lessen the responsibility which we put upon transportation companies which bring immigrants here. My purpose in emphasizing the desirability of this investigation and examination and of certificates being obtained by immigrants before they leave their homes is as a further precaution and one that is taken at the very beginning where no responsibilities are assumed at all.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—medical examination of passengers.

Mr. JACOBS: Are these medical officers to be on this side of the Atlantic, or are they to conduct examinations at the European ports from which the intending immigrant may sail?

Mr. CALDER: This refers to medical officers on this side.

Mr. STEELE: This clause touches one of the most important matters with which the Immigration Department will have to deal, namely, the examination of immigrants by medical officers. As an evidence of that, I have simply to point out what has been going on in the past, and to illustrate to the Committee what has been occurring in connection with our immigrants in past years, let me point to one fact, which will be sufficient. In Ontario, in 1914, out of 1,451 patients admitted to the hospitals for the insane, 545, or 37½ per cent had been born outside of Canada.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

That is an enormous burden to be laid on our country.

Mr. JACOBS: Could the hon. gentleman give us the proportion of the number of people in Ontario who were born outside of Canada.

Mr. STEELE: I could not give the hon. member that information. Through the immigration offices in Canada there had been admitted up to that time 545 persons who, in one year, were committed to hospitals for the insane in Ontario. How many were admitted in the other provinces, I have not the statistics to show. But I think we shall find that a very large number of such people are in our hospitals for the insane throughout the country, a burden that is laid upon this country, that will continue for years to come and that will grow in cost to Canada, because we know that these feeble-minded people, if they are not confined in some institution, multiply very rapidly, and statistics show that about eighty per cent of their offspring are also feeble-minded. Therefore, when we are putting to intending immigrants tests, such as those that have been already discussed, the literary test, the exclusion of some on account of the country in which they reside, the exclusion of certain classes and so on, let us remember that, in any of the classes that are admitted under the Act, there may be immigrants who themselves appear to be all right, but who will produce children that would be undesirable citizens. The mental condition of the parents is so little removed from the normal that it is very difficult to detect. If the parents are admitted, their offspring may be in the feeble-minded class and be a burden on our country for years to come. For that reason, I think it is most important that much greater attention should be paid to the medical examination of our immigrants, and I have no doubt the minister sees the importance of that. I think we all know that medical examinations in the past have been exceedingly lax for many reasons, but particularly for the reason that the men appointed for this work were not fully qualified. Only men who have the expert training in detecting feeble-mindedness are capable of detecting it. The ordinary physician may be an excellent man for other work; he may be able to detect tuberculosis, trachoma, and the contagious and infectious diseases that will debar an immigrant; but he might be quite incapable of detecting feeble-mindedness. For that reason I think we ought to have ex-

perts for this work. Although they might cost the country a good deal in salaries they would save the country an immensely greater sum by excluding the feeble-minded class. To illustrate this, let me mention this fact. Among the immigrants desiring to land at New York in recent years prior to the war, 4 out of every 1,000 were found to be in the feeble-minded class, and were rejected. If the same proportion prevailed with respect to the 400,000 immigrants that were coming to Canada in the years before the war, it means that 1,600 feeble-minded persons were seeking admission into Canada every year, and we did not reject anything like that number. Many of them are in this country to-day, and are multiplying our feeble-minded population. That is apparent in every municipality from one end of Canada to the other. I would urge the minister to make every effort to have our immigrants thoroughly inspected for feeble-mindedness. It matters not where it is done, but it does matter that men properly qualified for this work are appointed to do it.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I want to support the remarks made by my hon. friend. In my judgment this is, perhaps, one of the most important clauses of the Bill, because it deals with the health of the people who will in future come into this country. The figures which have just been given and the percentages quoted are, of course, absolute and accurate. I have no doubt if a poll were taken of the inmates of the insane asylums and hospitals in Canada a similar condition would be disclosed; that is, a very large percentage of the inmates would be found to have had their origin in countries other than our own. It is an exceedingly difficult thing to detect mental incompetency on a ship or dock as these people arrive. It requires very considerable experience and ability in the medical man to do this work properly, and I would urge the minister, when he is picking his medical men, to secure men who have been trained in this particular branch of the profession. If he does, I can assure him the country will be well repaid by the services these men render, no matter what the cost may be. Too often in the past medical men have been selected—both political parties have been guilty—more for their political affiliations than for their fitness for the work. As I have said, this particular class of work requires a man of very considerable experience and ability. But he should have other experience; he should be an expert in venereal diseases. These diseases have been imported into our country in the past, and no doubt will be in the future. Knowledge of these diseases is being acquired daily by the medical profession, and competent medical men at our ports could prevent a very considerable number of these immigrants from coming in. This is a very important phase of the work. I would again impress upon the minister the necessity of selecting high-class medical men for this work. Another very important disease we should be on our guard against is pulmonary tuberculosis, ordinarily known as consumption. A string of sanatoria stretches across Canada from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver for the treatment of this disease. I have had some experience in this particular work; I have been in practically every sanatorium in Canada, certainly in the majority of them.

Mr. JACOBS: As a visitor.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Yes, fortunately, and one of the things that has impressed me in talking to the patients in these institutions is the fact that many of them were born outside of Canada. A number of immigrants suffering from tuberculosis would be turned back at our ports if we had competent medical men to examine them. That is another reason why we should have high-class medical men at the ports through which these people come.

My hon. friend has also mentioned trachoma, a disease of the eyes, which is perhaps not so difficult to detect as incipient disease of the lung, venereal disease, or mental incompetency, but which nevertheless requires considerable ability to detect. I am sure that if the minister selects high-class medical men for this work, the future of this country, so far as our stream of immigration is concerned, will be more rosy.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—no clearance if Act not obeyed, but deposit may be allowed:

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a word here which I think is not well chosen. There is no such thing as the consignee of a vessel. There is a consignee of cargo, but you do not hear of a vessel being consigned. I think it would be better if the word "charterer" were used instead of the word "consignee," so that it would read: "No vessel shall be granted clearance if the master, agent, owner or charterer violates or refuses or neglects to comply with any provision of this Act." I know a good deal about shipping and I have never heard of the consignee of a vessel.

Mr. CALDER: If the term consignee is not applicable, I must confess I am not familiar with shipping terms. I think we might make it "owner or charterer."

Mr. ELKIN: I do not think the hon. gentleman's point is well taken. There is a consignee on this side of the water or on the other side as the case may be. The owner or charterer always has an agent in the port to which the ship is bound, and therefore the word would, I think, be properly used in the section.

Mr. McKENZIE: Of course, I have some respect for the opinions of my hon. friend who comes from the little port of St. John, and I admit that once in a while a vessel does go there. But I take some pride in having a fair knowledge of marine law, and my hon. friend will search in vain in any authority on shipping for the expression "consignee of a vessel." However, if the minister is satisfied that it is not going to create any difficulty I am not particular. But the word "charterer" would be the right word to use.

Mr. CALDER: We might put both in.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very well.

Mr. CALDER: I move that the word "charterer" be added after the word "owner" in the fourth line of Section 11.

Motion agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On Subsection 4, Section 12—Penalty for bringing, landing, harbouring or concealing prohibited immigrants.

Mr. CALDER: In order to keep the sections uniform I move that the word "charterer" be added after the word "owner" in the fourth line of subsection 4.

Motion agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

On Subsection 6, Section 12—Deposit of money as guarantee that non-immigrant will leave at time agreed upon.

Mr. JACOBS: In what respect does this change the law as it now stands?

Mr. CALDER: Under the law as it stood before, there was provision for the taking of a bond. In addition to that it is proposed to make provision for a deposit of money as a guarantee for departure within the time agreed upon.

Mr. JACOBS: You are doing away with the bond altogether?

Mr. CALDER: No. The bond is not done away with. This makes provision for a deposit of money in place of the bond if it is thought desirable.

At six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CROWE: Does the minister intend to insert a clause, or clauses, dealing with Chinese and Japanese immigration. I understand there is an agreement with the Japanese Government in reference to a certain number of Japanese labourers coming into Canada every year, and that there is a separate Act dealing with Chinese immigration. I think that both Japanese and Chinese immigration should be dealt with in this Act. The matter should be consolidated under one Act. If that were done it would be far easier to handle.

Mr. CALDER: I am scarcely in a position to answer the question at the present. I suggested the other day the advisability of abolishing the head tax. If that is done very considerable amendments will have to be made to the Chinese Immigration Act, but until I have had time to further consider that question I am not in a position to make a statement to the Committee. As to immigration from Japan, I scarcely think any special legislation is necessary. There is no intention on the part of the Government to make any change in the agreement that has been in force for some years.

On section 14—duty of officers and municipal officials to send complaints to the minister regarding undesirable immigrants:

Mr. CALDER: Under the law as it exists, and the amendments, we provide for certain prohibited classes. This section merely provides that if any of these classes arrive in Canada, and information thereof is in the possession of municipal officers, that information shall be forwarded to the department.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that this clause makes it incumbent on the secretary of a municipality to inform the department of the existence in that municipality of these particular people?

Mr. CALDER: That has always been the case.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the change that is made?

Mr. CALDER: Because we have made some changes in the law so far as certain prohibited classes are concerned, we have to embody these changes in this clause.

Mr. JACOBS: Where is the penalty for failure to do this?

Mr. CALDER: I presume provision will be made in the Criminal Code that when under any law an officer is required to do a certain thing and does not do it, he shall be subject to the general penalty there provided. When, by any provincial statute, a duty is assigned to an officer and he fails to carry out that duty, he is subject to a penalty under the general law.

Mr. McMASTER: I would point out to the minister the great difficulty, in a large city, of the city clerk or secretary of the municipality, knowing anything about this.

Mr. CALDER: This is only if it comes to his knowledge.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—arrest or prosecution of rejected or deported person remaining in or returning to Canada except in case of inability to comply with money qualifications:

Mr. McMASTER: What regulations, in brief, have been made under the War Measures Act concerning these matters?

Mr. CALDER: Since the armistice was signed an Order in Council was put through under the War Measures Act providing for the deportation of those interned at that time.

Mr. McKENZIE: In our part of the country quite a number were interned without very much justification, simply because they belonged to a certain alien enemy country. I do not know that we had any evidence in particular against them more than that. Before any people of this class are deported there should be an opportunity given to them to testify as to their conduct, or some trial or investigation should be held. It is only fair to ourselves and them that we shall have evidence as to why they should be deported.

Mr. CALDER: I have the Order under my hand. The operative part of it reads as follows:

> The minister considers it advisable that all alien enemy interned prisoners who may be regarded as dangerous, hostile or undesirable, should be repatriated with the least possible delay and he therefore recommends that it should be provided under the authority of the War Measures Act of 1914 that the Minister of Justice shall be authorized to direct the immediate expulsion, removal, or deportation from Canada, for the purpose of their repatriation, of all such interned aliens of enemy nationality as he may consider dangerous, hostile or undesirable persons residing in Canada. And that direction by the Minister of Justice under his hand shall be sufficient authority for the purpose aforesaid.

It will be noticed that this applies only to those who were in internment camps at the signing of the armistice, not to those who had been previously interned. Under this Order in Council, I understand, some one hundred of those who were interned have already been deported, and arrangements are being made for the deportation of others just as rapidly as they can go. I think it may be assumed that those who were kept interned, and were in internment camps at the time of the armistice, may be regarded as dangerous and undesirable. In the early part of the war, as I explained yesterday, there were a good many persons interned for other reasons than that they were hostile or dangerous. Those have long ago been liberated on parole, and this section only applies to those who will be actually deported under Order in Council, not those who were interned during the early part of the war.

Mr. McMASTER: Do I understand that it only applies to those who are dangerous and hostile?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: That was really the point I endeavoured to make. The minister is a lawyer himself and knows that when we talk of appealing to a tribunal—the Minister of Justice is the tribunal in this case—that any such state of things exists, that implies there has been an investigation, and that the decision is based on a finding upon facts properly submitted. Well, that is just what I was saying—the Minister of Justice should be in possession of well authenticated facts in order to reach a conclusion; it must not be by hearsay. If the Minister of Justice, after a proper investigation, and after well authenticated facts have been submitted to him, reaches a conclusion, I have nothing more to say.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—Cost of deportation after five years.

Mr. McMASTER: Do I understand the import of this clause to be that after an immigrant has been in this country for five years and then gets into trouble with the authorities, the transport company who brought him will be ordered to take him back at its expense? I do not know what the law now is, but that is a most drastic and onerous provision to impose on any transportation company. They bring in an

innocent-looking Swede, let us say, who behaves himself for five years, when he falls into bad company perhaps, and gets into trouble. Then the transportation company is to be obliged to send him back to where he came from. We should try to be fair to all interests, and I would like to hear from the minister whether he has any defence of such a drastic provision as that. I see a smile on the minister's face, and I feel that in the back of his head he must agree with what I am saying.

Mr. CALDER: I fear the hon. gentleman has made a wrong guess. As a matter of fact this has been the law for a good many years, but what we are proposing to do will relieve the transportation companies of some of the responsibility imposed upon them in the past. In the past if any transportation company brought to Canada any of these prohibited classes, they were liable to be charged with all the expenditures in connection with transportation at any time up to the end of the three years, but that period under this Bill is being extended to five years. There is this difference, however, that if the clause for deportation does not arise until subsequent to the five year period then it is left to the minister to decide whether the cost of deporting the person should be paid by the department or by the transportation company. Heretofore the transportation company has always paid, but we think there are cases where the Government should pay. In the United States they have had for years a law the same as this, casting this responsibility upon the transportation companies.

Mr. McMASTER: I may be under a misapprehension as to the meaning of the clause, but as I read it, it would apply to a case like this: A man enters Canada and behaves himself as a good citizen should for a period of four or five years, and then backslides and gets into trouble. In that case the transportation company is asked to take him back to the country of origin at its own expense. If that is the law it appears to me to be a grievously unjust law, whether or not it has been on our statute book, or on the statute book of the United States, for years and years.

Mr. CALDER: It is not altogether a case of happening to go wrong. If a man comes to this country and after he comes here commits a crime—commits theft, murder, or any other crime of that character—that is not a ground for deportation.

Mr. McMASTER: Then I misunderstood the clause?

Mr. CALDER: If a man enters Canada and within a year afterwards becomes insane, that is a ground for deportation, and we cast upon the transportation company the responsibility of returning that man to his own country. I have not heard a single word from any of the transportation companies in regard to any of these provisions. The printed Bill was sent to these companies some weeks ago, and I have not had the slightest complaint from them in regard to this provision. We can therefore take it for granted that they are quite satisfied with it.

Section agreed to.

On section 20—Penalty on transportation company for bringing prohibited immigrants.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is this a new section?

Mr. CALDER: Yes. That is, we cast upon the transportation companies the responsibility of not bringing into Canada these prohibited classes. If they do, then they are made subject to the penalties laid down in these several sections. Let me state the matter in this way: Under the law we provide that certain classes shall not be permitted to enter Canada, and we throw upon the transportation companies the responsibility of seeing to it that they do not carry these classes of people to this country. If they do they render themselves liable under this section.

Mr. McMASTER: Let us have the terms of the Act first. There are some terms here which it is hard for laymen to understand.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It seems to me that if we make the conditions too onerous the transportation companies will withdraw from the immigration business altogether. There is a limit beyond which we cannot go if we are to get our immigrants brought overseas. This seems to imply medical examination on the other side.

Mr. CALDER: They all have that now.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They pay for the examination?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is the only point I care about. I think the transportation companies rather like the immigration business when they can get plenty of it, but at the same time we have to be careful not to put too many burdens on them, or

they will say: We will not carry your immigrants; or, if we do, we will charge them a higher rate.

Mr. CALDER: As a matter of fact the transportation companies in the immigration business now provide for medical inspection at the port of embarkation, and in addition to that they have their surgeons on every ship. The British Board of Trade also has its staff to see that emigrants of a certain class do not embark; similar provisions obtain in America, and also I suppose in other countries. The transportation companies are quite used to working under these laws, and there is no reason why we should not have similar provisions.

Section agreed to.

On Section 22—Duty of transportation company or master to deliver lists of seamen or employees on ship, and lists of crew and others on departure and of names of those discharged, and of deserters—Fine for neglect or refusal—Discharging crew without examination—Penalty.

Mr. McMASTER: Is this anything new?

Mr. CALDER: A great deal of it is new, not all. The purpose of this whole section is to keep a careful check upon seamen. There are some provisions in the existing law, but they are not full enough. We take the view that so far as seamen are concerned the department should have full information with regard to those who come on the ship, those who remain in Canada, and those who go back.

Mr. DUFF: Canadian seamen or foreign seamen?

Mr. CALDER: Any seamen.

Mr. DUFF: Suppose a vessel leaves the Nova Scotia coast for a South American port, when that vessel comes back the crew cannot be discharged without the captain going to the immigration office and complying with the provisions of this section?

Mr. CALDER: All the crew must be examined. We can take no chances as to whether or not exactly the same crew has been brought back. When that ship calls at one of our ports we must know which of those seamen land and which of them depart again, and we provide for the examination of those who land. That is the sole purpose of this section.

Mr. McKENZIE: The ordinary shipping master, if he complies with the provisions of the Merchants' Shipping Act, thinks that he has fulfilled his duty, and it is quite natural that he should think so, I find in many instances master mariners unwittingly break some of the provisions of the Immigration Act. Suppose a sea captain is two or three years away from Canada, there was no such law as this when he left, and when he returns and complies to the best of his ability with the provisions of the Merchants' Shipping Act, that is his confession of faith. I think there should be some co-operation between the Immigration Department and the Department of Marine with a view to making this Immigration Act a supplement to the Merchants' Shipping Act, or in some other way that may appear reasonable to the minister, in order that these men may be made acquainted with these provisions.

Mr. CALDER: I quite agree with the suggestion. I think we might have printed for the guidance of ship masters those sections of the Immigration Act that particularly affect them, with some explanatory notes added. At any rate, I can assure my hon. friend that his suggestion will be taken into consideration, and we will endeavour to so arrange that the owners and masters of ships will be made thoroughly acquainted with these provisions, to prevent any undue hardship arising from ignorance of the law.

Mr. DUFF: Is it the intention of the minister to appoint immigration officers at Canadian ports where there are none at the present time?

Mr. CALDER: There is provision now under section 8 that when at a port of entry there is no immigration officer under this Act the chief customs officer at that port, or any subordinate customs officer designated by him shall be, ex officio, an immigration officer. So if we have no immigration officer at any particular port the customs officer acts.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does this apply to the coasting trade? Subsection 2 seems to prohibit the paying off of seamen and officers by the master at any port of entry. I think it would be a very cumbersome regulation if it applied to our coasting trade; that is to say, if the master of a ship sailing from one Canadian port to another has to get an immigration officer aboard before he can discharge any out of his crew on arrival in port. This is a new section, and if this question has not been considered I wish the minister would consider it. I am referring to section 22, subsection 2.

Mr. CALDER: The Act, as a whole, which contains a good many provisions of this character, is made applicable only to vessels carrying immigrants from some place outside of Canada to Canada, and it has never been construed in the sense suggested by the hon. member.

Mr. DUFF: This clause is very clear. it means that no seaman can be discharged from a vessel at any port in Canada unless the captain goes to the immigration officer and secures a permit. As regards our coasting vessels, that is ridiculous. I can understand why, in the case of foreign sailors coming into Canada, the captain should report the matter to the immigration officer, but there is no reason why Canadian sailors who go to South America or the West Indies and come back should not be discharged on their arrival in Canada.

Mr. CALDER: If the hon. member will refer to the end of subsection 3, he will notice that it says:

> Provided that this section shall not apply to Canadian citizens or persons having Canadian domicile.

If a boat leaves for South America and sailors return on that boat and they want to land in Canada, is it going to be assumed that because they are sailors, they are Canadian citizens? We cannot afford to take it for granted that every man who happens to be a seaman on a boat is a Canadian citizen, therefore, some person must make an examination, and the proper person to do it is the immigration officer.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that. When sailors join a vessel, they sign articles on which their names, their place of birth, their residence and other particulars are entered. When that vessel comes back with the same crew and goes through the customs, there should be no necessity for the captain to go to the immigration officer if all the men are Canadian citizens. If, on account of sickness, a vessel has to land one or two of the crew, say at Buenos Aires or some other port in South America, and has to ship one or two foreign sailors in their places, immediately on the arrival of that ship at her destination in Canada, the captain should report to the immigration officer that he has certain sailors on board who are of foreign birth, but the Canadian sailors should be at once released and paid off.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I think the section to which the minister drew attention covers the case. I did not know it was there when I raised the point.

Section agreed to.

On section 23—officers on immigrant ships:

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose the word "officers" would include female as well as male officers.

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 24—deputy minister:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is there to be any Superintendent of Immigration after this?

Mr. CALDER: The department has been reorganized with a deputy minister, and Mr. Scott, who was Superintendent of Immigration, is acting as assistant deputy minister. He still retains the title of Superintendent of Immigration. but as a matter of fact the deputy minister of the department carries out the administrative duties which he formerly had.

Section agreed to.

On section 2, subsection 2—non-immigrant classes:

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Under this subsection, would accredited officers of recognised bodies of organized labour be permitted to enter Canada from the United States, or England, or Scotland, or Ireland, or any other country? For instance. would such men as Samuel Gompers and Arthur Henderson be permitted to enter?

Mr. CALDER: I do not think there ever has been or would be any difficulty at all, because people are constantly coming and going between the United States and Canada.

Mr. JACOBS: Last night I suggested that we strike out the enumeration of the various classes referred to in this subsection, and substitute for it the words:

> And all persons entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their respective callings.

I think that would be fuller. As I remarked last night, we may possibly have overlooked some callings, and if we adopt the suggestion I now make. the section would probably read better.

Mr. CALDER: I understand from the officers of the department that we might have a good deal of trouble with many classes if that suggestion were carried out. For that reason I am not prepared to accept the proposed amendment. We have

had similar provision to this in the Act for a good many years, and the officers of the department tell me that it is very necessary we should not throw the door open as suggested.

Mr. JACOBS: Suppose a judge or a cabinet minister, the Secretary of the Interior, we will say, wants to come in from the United States, he could not come in under this clause.

Mr. CALDER: Oh, yes, he could.

Mr. JACOBS: I am glad to know you will not bar the doors against him.

Subsection agreed to. Section agreed to.

On section 3—prohibited classes:

Mr. CALDER: I move that paragraph (p) of subsection 6 be replaced by the following words:

Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies and who were or may be interned on or after the eleventh day of November, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen in any part of His Majesty's dominions or by any of His Majesty's Allies.

Mr. JACOBS: I cannot see very much change there.

Mr. CALDER: It is only a slight change in the wording.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CALDER: I move that paragraph (r) be replaced by the following words:

Persons who have been found guilty of high treason or treason for an offence in connection with the war or of conspiring against His Majesty or of assisting His Majesty's enemies or of any similar offence against any of His Majesty's Allies.

Mr. JACOBS: This is an improvement over the section as it stands, but is not the section capable of still further improvement? I think it would be improved by adding after the word "enemies" the words "during the war," and I so move.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CALDER: I move that paragraph (s) be replaced by the following words:

Persons who at any time within a period of ten years from the first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, were or may be deported from any part of His Majesty's Dominions or from any Allied country on account of treason or of conspiring against His Majesty or of any similar offence in connection with the war against any of the Allies of His Majesty or because such persons were or may be regarded as hostile or dangerous to the Allied cause during the war.

Mr. JACOBS: I think that is a considerable improvement, and it is quite satisfactory to me.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. CALDER: I beg to move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I notice that we provide in this Bill—

The CHAIRMAN: The minister's motion is undebatable, but if the minister cared to withdraw his motion—

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: By subsection 3 of section 2 we are providing for fining ourselves, because "transportation company" means and includes the Dominion Government. I do not think we should provide for punishing and fining ourselves; that is very unusual, and furthermore, it is no good, because if we pay the fine it is simply transferring the money from one pocket to another.

Mr. CALDER: The real purpose of that subsection is not to get after the Government, but after the officers who are not carrying out their duties. Subsection 5 of section 76 of the existing law, which has to be read in connection with this, provides as follows:

Every duty imposed under authority of this Act upon a transportation company shall be a duty devolving on every director, official or employee thereof, and every duty imposed upon the master of a vessel shall be a duty devolving upon the owner thereof.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If the fine is imposed it will be imposed on the officers?

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Progress reported.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

House in Committee on Bill No. 18, respecting Bankruptcy.—Mr. Guthrie—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 6—Receiving order shall vest property in trustee:

Mr. McKENZIE: The trustee is a very important person and should be selected with a great deal of care, and I would like the minister to make it clear that there will be nothing haphazard about the appointment of trustees. We should have some assurance that they will be good, honest, capable men.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): The Committee dealt at some length with the question of the appointment of trustees, on which there was some difference of opinion among some representative bodies in Canada. It was considered that one of the defects in the operation of the Insolvency Act of 1875 was that a very poor class of trustees was permitted to administer that Act. In drafting the clauses of the present Act a good deal of care was therefore taken. The provisions for the appointment of trustees are under section 14. They are to be appointed by the Governor in Council upon application to the Secretary of State, and a sufficient number of trustees is to be appointed throughout Canada who will have a limited territorial jurisdiction. They will be required to give adequate security for the due performance of their duties and for the prompt payment over of funds which come into their hands. There are other provisions in the Act with regard to security. An order for increased security may be made upon the application of creditors where very large estates have to be handled. The security has to be kept in force until the trust is finally administered, and there are a great many safeguards in regard to the discharge of the trustee. Altogether, I think, we have very well guarded both the appointment and the security. The standing security is $10,000. The Secretary of State prepares the list of applicants and submits it to the Governor in Council. I apprehend that from time to time the list will be enlarged as the business increases, if it does increase.

Mr. McKENZIE: Giving the trustee unlimited territory does not commend itself to me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Unlimited what? I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understood the minister to say that within his province there is no limit to the jurisdiction of the trustee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Subsection 2 of section 14 provides that every trustee shall be appointed with authority limited territorially. That can be discussed when we get to that particular section.

9 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: If there is a section under which we can deal specifically with the appointment of jurisdiction and territory, I will defer my remarks on that point until we get there.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Receiving orders and assignments to take precedence of attachments, executions, etc.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What effect will this have on the local Acts now in force?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That question raises rather a wide subject. By the British North America Act, bankruptcy and insolvency are specially placed within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The various provinces, in the absence of a Federal Act, have passed what to some extent may be regarded as insolvency legislation. In Ontario there is an Act respecting assignments and preferences by insolvent persons, and there is another Act known as the Creditors' Relief Act, both of which I think would be deemed to be insolvency legislation. Such Acts were passed not only in Ontario but probably in all the other provinces at a time when there was no bankruptcy or insolvency law; and when the matter was decided on an appeal from the province of Ontario to the judicial committee of the Privy Council it was held that in the absence of Dominion legislation upon the subject the provinces, within certain limitations, were entitled to legislate. But that if there were Dominion legislation, provincial legislation would be annulled. If this Bill should become law, all provincial legislation dealing with the subject of bankruptcy and insolvency would, in my opinion, become null and void.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the judgment to which the minister refers?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is the case of the Attorney General of Ontario vs. the Attorney General of Canada with respect to the Ontario Act relating to assignments and preferences. It is reported in Appeal Cases 1894, page 189.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you a copy of the judgment declaring that provincial acts shall be null and void?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, the head note is as follows:

> Held that the provisions of section 9 of the Ontario "Act respecting assignments and preferences by insolvent persons" which relate to assignments purely voluntary, and postpone thereto judgments and executions not completely executed by payment, are merely ancillary to bankruptcy law, and as such are within the competence of the provincial legislature so long as they do not conflict with any existing bankruptcy legislation of the Dominion Parliament.

I have not the report before me but I have some notes both as to the argument and the judgment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend recite the words where it is positively stated that the enactment of a federal bank-

ruptcy Act shall render null and void provincial legislation on this subject?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have not the report but that is the necessary result of the judgment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to hear it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There may be a note in this volume from which I am reading. I cannot lay my hand on it at the moment but I will have the judgment hunted up and laid before the Committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I notice that a number of these sections are marked "new." Will the minister explain the basis of this legislation and where the sections are taken from that are not marked "new"?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The basis of the Bill is the English Bankruptcy Act. It is not possible to apply all the sections of the English Bankruptcy Act to the situation in Canada. The sections which have been taken exactly from the English Act are so marked. The other sections are marked "English section modified." Where the word "new" appears after the section that signifies that the section is not in the English Act but appears for the first time in the present Bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—composition, extension, or scheme of arrangement, subsection 1:

Mr. JACOBS: I think it would not be a bad idea for the Solicitor General to explain the meaning of this entire section. There are a lot of words which I think could be boiled down to a few paragraphs. The Solicitor General, who has been sleeping with the Act for the last year, knows it by heart.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The intention of section 13 is to provide an easy method of composition between a debtor and his creditors and to legalize a scheme which may avoid bankruptcy proceedings. I do not know that there is anything in the section that needs to be elaborated. I think the section itself makes the proceeding very plain. It provides that if an insolvent debtor desires to meet his creditors, such debtor after making an assignment may have a meeting with them. He may lay his affairs before his creditors and after an examination of the debtor by the creditors, if they desire to examine him, a settlement as between the two may be arrived at subject to the approval of the court. There is a provision that the court may refuse its approval if in its opinion the terms of the proposal are not reasonable or not calculated to benefit the general body of the creditors. That is to prevent anything like collusion between one or two of the principal creditors and the debtor.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The creditors are notified in due form and delays are provided for?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are a great many subsections but they are all matters of procedure, and it is for the purpose of effecting a suitable arrangement between debtor and creditors and avoiding bankruptcy proceedings. The property, in the meantime, does not pass out of the hands of the trustees.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The court sanctions the agreement arrived at between the creditor and the debtor and creditors?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, and if the court thinks there is collusion or the arrangement is unreasonable, it withholds its sanction.

Mr. BUREAU: Is it permissive? I see it says "Where an insolvent debtor intends to make a proposal—" Does that mean that the debtor will be precluded from making an arrangement with his creditors for a composition?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, but after a man has made an assignment to a trustee a question arises as to his further rights over his estate. It is no longer vested in him. But the section preserves that right to the debtor.

Mr. BUREAU: That is, after the assignment?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Either before or after.

On subsection 12—Approval binding on creditors, but does not release debtor from judgments.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is, from particular judgments—judgments for seduction or alimony, or a judgment against the party as co-respondent in a matrimonial case, or for the necessaries of life. From these he is not released.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that the marginal note is very misleading.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It should be "from certain judgments."

Mr. BUREAU: It is only binding on a creditor who loses his interest.

Mr. GUTHRIE: On a creditor and a debtor.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose the debtor asked for an order and it is approved by the courts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is binding on all parties, but not in specially obtained judgments for seduction, alimony, the necessaries of life, and the like.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In our province the party may be sued for damages and if he does not pay the damages in which he is mulcted he may be sent to jail. Is he saved by this paragraph?

Mr. BUREAU: It does not release a debtor from judgment, does it?

Mr. McMASTER: Only certain judgments.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the judgments are enumerated. For example, he is not released from judgment against him in an action for seduction, or under an affiliation order, or for alimony, or under a judgment against him as co-respondent in a matrimonial case, or for necessaries of life, or alimentary debts, except to such an extent and under such conditions as the court expressly orders in respect of such liability. My hon. friend knows that under our Civil Code there are some parties who are liable to contrainte par corps, imprisonment for debt.

Mr. BUREAU: In a case of slander also.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, in a case of slander. Furthermore, a curator and a tutor are liable to imprisonment if they do not render faithful account of their stewardship—the Code provides for that. Under this subsection the debtor may be allowed to go free. Will the Solicitor-General let the paragraph stand, and give his attention to it?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no objection to the clause standing, but it must be remembered that if this Bill passes it is to be a modification of, or an addition to, the law of a good many provinces. In the various provinces there are certain laws now in force. The effect of this Bill, should it pass, will be to modify or annul them, and the very case cited by my learned friend may be one of those affected. Personally I think a judgment for debt would be affected, but a judgment for imprisonment would not. I am not prepared to say that the effect of a compromise under this section, ratified by the court, might not operate as a discharge of the debtor, which would render him free from any subsequent proceedings. I have never had a case of the kind put to me before, and the Committee which dealt with this Bill has not discussed it.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I point out that the whole of this rests in the judgment of the court. If, as my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) suggests, a tutor has embezzled funds belonging to his ward, or a curator has embezzled funds belonging to an estate, when the matter is brought to the attention of the judge he forthwith refuses to allow a composition to be made—and that appears in several parts of this Bill—until the actual assignment. That is to say, where an assignment actually takes place it is specially declared that no composition can be made without the consent of the judge, and no discharge can be given unless the judge consents. Now, if the facts show that the debtor has been guilty of a criminal offence no judge would permit a composition or discharge to be given.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under subsection (7) it is provided:

> The court shall, before approving the proposal, hear a report of the trustee as to the terms thereof, and as to the conduct of the debtor, and any objections which may be made by or on behalf of any creditor.

Mr. LEMIEUX: "Any creditor?"

Mr. GUTHRIE: "Any creditor," and the Court would refuse its approval to the proposition. I think that would be one of the matters which would be brought to the attention of the court to be dealt with.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am only partially satisfied with the explanation of my hon. friend, and therefore I would ask him to allow subsection 12 to stand.

Subsection allowed to stand.

On section 13, subsection 19—Composition not binding in certain cases without assent.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any provision that at the final hearing for discharge all judgment creditors shall be notified and have an opportunity of being heard?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We will come to the clauses dealing with that feature presently.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 14—

Mr. LEMIEUX: I move that section 14 be considered subsection by subsection.

Motion agreed to.

On subsection (1)—Appointment of trustees.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How is the appointment going to be made?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Application is to be made to the Secretary of State, and he submits the names to the Governor in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are those trustees salaried officers?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. The fees are regulated by a subsequent section, and have to be voted by the creditors.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What guarantee will be given as to the solvency of these men?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The security is the best guarantee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The $10,000?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the general security. In addition to that there is a special security for each estate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will there be a limited number of trustees for each province, or will the appointments be open to any accountant or business man of repute?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Of course, the Act is a new departure and we do not know just how many trustees will be necessary throughout Canada; but there is a provision that every person who applies to be appointed as an authorized trustee shall state in his application full particulars of his qualifications, ability and previous business experience; then there is the security, which must be substantial and approved. I think that in practice probably the class of men who will make application will be chartered accountants, judging from the deputations that appeared before the Special Committee which considered the Bill. They seemed to take a very deep interest in it, and I think probably it would be men of standing of that class who would be able to qualify in security as well as in ability.

Mr. McMASTER: Is there any disposition on the part of those in charge of the Bill to limit the number of trustees?

Mr. GUTHRIE: None whatever. I do not know that there would be any objection to appointing a very large number, but at the same time I think in a province like Ontario or Quebec one or two from each county would be ample; in cities like Toronto and Montreal, naturally more.

Mr. McMASTER: I would not like to see this made a close corporation. It seems to me only fitting that men who can satisfy the authorities as to their responsibility and ability should be free to have their names placed upon the list.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the provision. It is open, there is no limit at all upon it.

Mr. JACOBS: Is any provision made for the payment of interest upon the sum which the assignee is obliged to deposit with the Secretary of State? When he puts up a cash deposit it seems to me there ought to be some provision whereby he would receive at least as much interest as the owners of Victory bonds.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think if the trustee puts up cash security he certainly ought to be entitled to a return by way of interest; but I believe in practice it will work out in the form of guaranteed bonds. However, if my hon. friend thinks a clause should be inserted for the payment of interest in the case of cash deposits, that would seem to be quite reasonable.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Why not have these trustees appointed by the Solicitor General of each province? From my perusal of Hansard I understand that one of the principal causes of the failure of the Act in force from 1875 to 1880 was the appointment of trustees by the Governor in Council.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree with my hon. friend that the chief criticism of the old Act of 1875 was directed against the official assignees as they were called at that time—

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were very unpopular.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —on the ground that they were not the class of men who should have been appointed as trustees in important matters; they gave rise to the greatest dissatisfaction. I do not know that it would decrease the difficulty at all to have the Lieutenant Governor in Council in each province to make the appointments. I should think it would be quite as well to have the Governor in Council handle the matter, as this is a Federal Act. On this question many commercial bodies made strong representations to us; in fact, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, I think, the Wholesale Grocers' Association, and one or two others seemed to think that the question of a proper trustee was most vital, and this is largely their suggestion, although not exclusively, because I think the Canadian Manufacturers' Association desired us to go a step further and have a special department of the Government administer the whole Act. The Committee did not think that a wise thing—

Mr. McMASTER: They did not suggest, I suppose, that their claims should be privileged?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. The Committee did not think that either a wise or a feasible thing, and they left the administration with the superior courts of each province. I know the Committee was unanimous in regard to the clause now under consideration, and their endeavour was to hedge it around with every kind of reasonable security in order that the great defect of the former Insolvency Act might be remedied. I think hon. members will find, if they read the whole clause, that we have pretty well succeeded.

Mr. MOWAT: On the question of appointment of trustees, my recollection is this: As this is a new measure, the wholesale merchants and the retail merchants were watching it closely in their own interests, and a suggestion was made that the trustees should be appointed by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I forget which, on the nomination of the boards of trade; but some of the retail merchants thought they were not very well represented on those large bodies, which were mostly composed of wholesale men, and they demurred. Thereupon the Committee thought it better to leave the section as it is now, and both sides assented to it before the Committee. It was thought that as such large security was required, and the business had been heretofore in the hands of well-known firms of chartered accountants and assignees, probably no difficulty would arise.

Mr. McKENZIE: The question of appointing the trustee is left rather loose in this Bill. The credit of the individuals who have to deal with the trustee generally, and also the interest of the creditors are in his hands; in fact, the manner in which the law will be administered throughout the country is largely, if not altogether, in his hands. The administration of this legislation is a very vital and important part of the administration of justice. If a man dies and leaves an estate, the law provides certain machinery by which that estate is handled and divided amongst his relatives. If, while living, he finds that his estate must be divided amongst his creditors, why should there not be a clear, well defined and safe way in which that can be done? I do not think it is a good proposition that Mr. A., who has a large business and who is about to fail, should be able to say to his neighbour or his brother or his brother-in-law or some friend: You make application to be appointed trustee and I will then assign to you. That can happen, and will happen, and that is going to bring this legislation into disrepute. Combinations will arise and schemes will be formulated and carried out to the discredit of this measure and much to the loss of individuals and the production of fraud on creditors. This should not be left to the haphazard of anybody making an application. The Governor in Council should take the responsibility of appointing trustees as they appoint judges, and then we should have some safeguard that there was no special influence or connivance on the part of the merchant to get his particular chosen friend appointed a trustee. Not too many trustees—perhaps in country places one man in every county or one in every two or three counties—should be appointed. Let a good man be appointed and let him be paid a good salary by the Government, and let a tax be collected by the Government from each estate to furnish, if necessary, money for the payment of that salary. If the Government take the matter in hand absolutely in that way, and take the same responsibility as they do in the appointment of county court judges or judges of the Supreme Court, then they will look about for men of standing and responsibility, and we shall have stronger reason to believe that first class men and men who will do the proper thing in the handling of those estates will be appointed. Somebody suggested to me not long ago that if that is done, it will be patronage. Well, let it be patronage, if necessary, but the Government will be taking the responsibility of the kind of men they will appoint, and it is of the highest concern to the whole country that this legislation should be administered with as much care, strictness and honesty as any other branch of justice in Canada. I should like to impress upon the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) the great importance of the class of men he is going to permit to be appointed as trustees under this legislation

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can fully agree with what has been said by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) as regards the appointment of trustees. The sole object of the Government in framing this clause, and of the special committee in passing it, was to secure the very highest possible class of trustees. My hon. friend says that the same care should be taken in the selection of trustees as is now taken in the appointment of County Court judges. I assume that will be done, but in addition to the requirements which are usually looked for in the case of the appointment of County Court judges, we ask for very heavy

securities. Suggestions were made that the appointment of trustees should be kept within various restricted classes. We were very strongly urged to confine the appointment of trustees to chartered accountants, but that suggestion did not meet with approval. We were also asked to limit the numbers, to appoint a very small number for each province, but that was not approved. It was considered better to have a free field, to have no limitation as to number, to have each applicant produce his own qualification and the required security, and then to allow the Governor in Council to deal with the matter. There would be no opportunity of collusion between an insolvent debtor and a trustee. The trustee is not clothed with full powers to manage or dispose of the estate. He is under the control first of the creditors, second, of the inspectors, and third, of the court. He has much less power than assignees have to-day in Ontario. If there is a suggestion of collusion between a trustee and a debtor, the creditors can remove the trustee at the first meeting on a simple motion, on a simple majority vote—majority of numbers, and amount of claims. I should welcome any suggestions from the Committee whereby the appointment might be safeguarded in any way. The special committee spent a great deal of time on this section, and we thought we had safeguarded it as far as human ingenuity could do so. But if any concrete proposal is made, we shall give it the best consideration we can.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The trustee will be an administrator?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under this Bill, he is an officer of the court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why not leave the appointment to the provincial authorities?

Mr. GUTHRIE: As this is a Federal law, why do so?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Criminal Code is a federal law, yet do the Provincial Governments not appoint the judges?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is true. There may be something in the suggestion, but this is a federal law in relation to a federal matter, namely, commerce, and I think the federal appointment is the proper and logical one.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: This may be a federal law, section 91, subsection 21, of the British North America Act says that the federal power shall have the right to legislate on bankruptcy and insolvency; but at the same time, section 92, subsection 13, says that the provincial power shall have the right to legislate on property and civil rights. This affects civil rights and property. We have in our civil procedure in Quebec some fifty or sixty articles or sections relating to the abandonment of property. The law has been in force for a long time and has been of great service to the public. I think it would be much better to leave the appointment of the trustees to the attorney general of the province.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot see any greater safeguard in that suggestion than is contained in the Bill. The attorney general of the province, being human, is just as liable to make mistakes as the Minister of Justice. My hon. friend says this is to some extent an infringement upon property and civil rights. It certainly is, I admit that; but the British North America Act says that to this extent we may infringe upon property and civil rights. When this question of property and civil rights was raised before, in the case of Cushing vs. Dupuy, the Privy Council held:

> It would be impossible to advance a step in the construction of a scheme for the administration of insolvent estates without interfering with and modifying some of the ordinary rights of property, and other civil rights, nor without providing some mode of special procedure for the vesting, realization and distribution of the estate, and the settlement of the liabilities of the insolvent. Procedure must necessarily form an essential part of any law dealing with insolvency. It is therefore to be presumed, indeed it is a necessary implication, that the Imperial statute, in assigning to the Dominion Parliament the subjects of bankruptcy and insolvency, intended to confer on it legislative power to interfere with property, civil rights, and procedure within the provinces, so far as a general law relating to those subjects might affect them.

That is the law as interpreted by the highest court we have, and that was a decision on this very question of bankruptcy. If this Bill becomes law and the Act is administered in this country, there will be some interference with property and civil rights as we know them to-day in the different provinces. The only other suggestion my hon. friend has made was as to the payment of salaries. That, too, was discussed by the special committee and the consensus of opinion was that payment should be made by fee, as set out in section 40 of the Bill.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, fifty or sixty articles of our civil code may be annulled by this law?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Only those affecting insolvent persons or their estates, and only to the extent that it is necessary to administer this law.

Mr. JACOBS: The same dictum with regard to property and civil rights being overridden by the Federal Parliament was given by the Privy Council in the case of the Union Bank vs. Tennant some twenty-five or thirty years ago, in identically the same terms. It was a question of the Bank Act infringing on the civil code of the province of Quebec.

Mr. MOWAT: In regard to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Archambault) I have a quotation here from Lefroy's Canada's Federal System, which is recognized as an authority by all the courts and law schools. In discussing the case where provincial legislation as to voluntary assignments was held as not interfering with a bankruptcy law, Lefroy says (page 123-4):

> The provinces must yield to the Dominion, and Acts which come into collision must remain in abeyance until repealed by the legislature which passed them.

Discussing Cushing vs. Dupuy, 5 Appeal Cases. he says:

> When we find bankruptcy or insolvency mentioned as a subject for the exclusive legislation of the Dominion we must necessarily understand that the organization of an insolvent court and administration of justice and proceedings are excepted from section 92 of the British North America Act (i.e. property and civil rights).

That is his opinion.

Mr. McKENZIE: The first subsection of section 14 is new. Would the minister tell us the procedure adopted in England for the appointment of trustees?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In England they are appointed by the courts.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why not adopt that system here? When you appoint a receiver, which is closely akin to this, you have to go to the court. Constitute the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, for instance, a court in this case. Why not throw the responsibility upon the court to appoint the trustee as they do in England?

Mr. GUTHRIE: One difficulty that we have striven to overcome is the delay and expense in connection with applications to the courts. One complaint that has come to us from all over Canada is that the expense of cases that go before the court, notably the cases of companies under the Winding-up Act, is so great and the procedure so tedious that creditors have become disgusted. An outstanding case in British Columbia to-day is the case of the Dominion Trust Company. I believe that eighty per cent of their assets have been expended in courts, liquidators and the like. If one thing was impressed upon the Committee more than another it was that we should avoid as far as possible court procedure and court appointments. In England, I am told, the trustees are selected by the creditors, but they have to be formally approved and appointed by the court. One of the criticisms upon the English system to-day is its dilatoriness and expense. We are trying to improve on that by avoiding as far as possible applications to the courts. We have not been able to avoid them absolutely, because we have given the courts a general supervision, but wherever the creditors can themselves decide—and they are more largely interested than anybody else—we allow them to do so. I think all the interests that appeared before the Committee, and there were a great many, preferred this method of appointment to any other that was suggested, except those who advocated the administration of the Act by a department of the Government and the establishing in Canada of a bankruptcy court in every province. That proposal was seriously advocated, but was not entertained. I think we have provided, so far as is humanly possible, all necessary safeguards.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have almost altogether the English Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, we have not.

Mr. McKENZIE: Almost. I have read it very closely, and here and there there is something new. But it is almost the English Act, under which the trustees are appointed by the court. Why depart from that feature of the Act when we are practically adopting the whole of the rest of it? To my mind, the reasons given by the Solicitor General are not strong. It is suggested that the appointment of the trustee by the judge involves expense and delay, and instead of that the Secretary of State recommends the appointment. But after it gets into the hands of the court and there is entirely the same procedure.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not the appointment.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not the appointment, but the procedure. Every move then must be subject to the direction of the court. You cannot do anything without the consent of the court. You cannot accept the trustee's estimate of the value of the estate without the consent of the court. If a man

in Nova Scotia seeks to be appointed as a trustee, somebody makes a motion before a judge of the Supreme Court of that province. The judge can familiarize himself with the conditions of the case in a very short time, and the applicant will be appointed largely as a result of the court's investigation into his character. The Secretary of State has to deal with the whole of Canada and is not in a position so readily to ascertain the qualifications of the applicant, and in that way he can be more easily imposed upon. He has to consult someone perhaps two thousand miles away as to the character of the person making the application. The advantage in this respect is decidedly with the English practice the matter could be settled ment by the court. A man in Sydney would have to communicate with Ottawa, nearly 2,000 miles away, whereas if we followed the English practice the matter could be settled on the spot. Seven times in the year we have judges sitting in Sydney. Altogether I think that instead of expediting matters you are only creating much more clumsy, expensive and inoperative machinery.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I understand that, first, official assignees are to be appointed on personal application, stating their qualifications, and then security is to be given in the sum of $10,000. I understand also that only these official assignees can be appointed trustees of the estate. Section 15 says that "a majority in number of the creditors who hold half or more in amount of the proved debts," and so on, may, at their discretion, substitute any other authorized trustee for the trustee named in the receiving order. I do not understand why only official trustees appointed by the Governor in Council can be appointed as trustees of the estate. Take a big fishing business like that conducted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie)—this is merely an illustration—it would require a man conversant with that particular business to take charge of that estate and successfully wind it up. But they can only appoint an official trustee from that district, and a man who might have special qualifications for the position could not be appointed by the creditors. The same thing applies to shipbuilding concerns and lumbering industries, which require men with special knowledge. I do not see why the creditors' power of appointment is taken away. In England, and under our own Insolvency Act of 1869 and 1875, the creditors have the power of appointment. I would like the minister to explain why the majority of creditors, over 50 per cent, should not have the right to select the assignee of the estate, subject to the approval of the court, and why the choice should be limited to a particular class appointed by the Governor in Council. A certain number of people will apply and give securities and bonds, but in connection with large estates the creditors might not wish to have them, owing to lack of the particular qualification.

10 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The object in confining the trustees to a specially appointed list is to see that they all give the necessary security. The creditors can change the trustee but they must have a man on the appointed list, so that no irresponsible person may be permitted to act. It was to remedy a difficulty under the old system. It must be borne in mind that a trustee under this Act is an accountant. He cannot act in regard to the debtors' estate unless he is authorized by the inspectors and creditors. So that in the case cited by my hon. friend, if you want men particularly familiar with the shipping business, you have the appointment of suitable inspectors. The creditors have full charge of that matter. The trustee is more or less an accountant and has really very little to do with the disposition of the estate except in so far as he is authorized to act by the inspectors and creditors; the inspectors have the real control. The trustee cannot sell the assets, cannot either keep the estate running or close it up, and is under the authority of the creditors and inspectors. What is most required of the trustee is a prompt accounting, and the great difficulty in the past has been that the trustees did not pay over dividends when they were declared. That was the real difficulty, which, even with this security, many people apprehend in connection with this Act. These people say that dividends are declared, and the trustees neglect to pay over small amounts, and accumulate a fund for themselves, and so they ask heavy penalties against trustees who do not pay unclaimed dividends into court or into some fund of the Government. It is the intention to make the trustee accountable, to see that he provides adequate security, and as far as possible, to keep him from mixing up with the estate, save under the control of the inspectors and creditors.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I can remember very well, under the old Insolvent Act, when an assignee was appointed there were always inspectors appointed. We know that

in the working out of the Insolvent Act the inspectors are appointed in different places, but they do not control the estate. This Act does not give them control of the estate, it vests in the trustee all the property and all the rights, you may say, of the insolvent. In the practical working out the trustee will have the absolute control of the property, the right to dispose of it and to manage it. The provision with regard to inspectors, in the practical working out, has never been a success. The inspectors are not paid for the work. They have other matters to attend to. They are only called in on special occasions to give advice. Then we come back to this principle: Why should the creditors be deprived of the power to control the estate? They are the persons interested, and if all the creditors unite and say that they want So-and-so appointed trustee of the estate, and if that is approved by the court, why should you prevent it? I object to one particular class having control of all these insolvent estates. You have to appoint accountants and no one else. The very worst man you can get to manage a business concern is an accountant. An accountant's business is to look over the books and add up figures. He has to be a book-keeper and he is a book-keeper. He is not a manager; he cannot control and manage an estate as a business man can. If you were appointing a manager of a business you would select a business man, not an accountant. You hire the accountant for one purpose, and that is to look over the accounts. I cannot understand this principle of taking the control of the estate, or of the assets, away from the creditors who own them. A man is an insolvent, he makes an assignment to his creditors and they unite and say that So-and-so should be appointed as assignee to control the estate. Why should that power be taken from them? Why should they be limited to a particular appointment or to a particular class?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not contemplated, under the provisions of this Bill, that the trustee will be asked to carry on the business. It is not the common experience, after an assignment takes place, that the business is carried on; it is wound up. One of the chief objects of the Bill is to see that it shall be wound up properly. It may have to be carried on, but it is not contemplated that the trustee shall do it. The creditors may appoint a manager. The insolvent himself may be appointed by the creditors. There is a special provision that the insolvent, who is the man most familiar with the business, shall be appointed if the creditors agree.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: You say that the creditors may appoint as manager whomever they think fit. Why not go farther in principle and let the creditors have control of the estate if they desire it? Insist on a majority of three-fourths of them if you wish. Why should you not allow the creditors to take control of the estate and appoint as trustee whomever they may want to appoint?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The largest creditor bodies of this country, the Canadian wholesalers, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the retailers have all passed favourably upon this clause; in fact, it is drafted very largely in accordance with their views. They do not approve of appointing any one as a trustee or of anything that might open the door to the appointment of the friends of any man or set of men as trustees or of anything of that kind which is not in accordance with the interest of the creditors. Under this you get a high class of trustees, men who are experienced accountants—although not necessarily accountants because there is no limitation of that kind in the Act. If you allow these men to do this work and to become familiar with the procedure, you will find it will work out to the interest of the creditors, and they are the ones chiefly concerned in the amount of their dividends. Cases have come within my own knowledge where at a meeting of creditors this man, or the other man, is appointed assignee of the estate because he is broke and needs the money. We have been trying to avoid that by appointing men of high standing who do not need the money or who are not in an impecunious state. Many of the old assignees were so, and as a result there was a great deal of discontent with the administration of the Act.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: As a member of the special committee that had to do with this Act, I sympathize very much with the views expressed by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. McLean) but I want to say that the principal proposal that he has made should be made in regard to the very small estates. I think I would be within the mark in saying that fully fifty per cent of the failures that take place in Canada are for amounts under $1,000. Therefore, it becomes necessary to keep down expenditure in dividing up the estate. Otherwise the result will be that even though a bankrupt might be able to pay fifty cents on the dollar if the estate was well managed, in the final

analysis, the heavy expense will eat up the estate and you will have nothing to distribute to the creditors. The hon. member for Royal (Mr. McLean) is absolutely right in his contention with regard to small estates in the country, if the local creditors can appoint a man who is on the spot. The official trustee will have to travel anywhere from two hundred to four hundred miles, he will have to live at a hotel and his general expenses will run the liquidation cost away beyond the amount that would be incurred by a local man. Under these conditions the suggestion of my hon. friend is a satisfactory one. But it must be remembered that these estates will run anywhere from $1,000, or $2,000 up into millions and what is thought fit or proper for a million-dollar or five-million-dollar estate will be very unfit for a thousand-dollar or five-hundred-dollar estate. It must be remembered that as a rule the creditors are scattered all over the country and that many of them are in foreign countries and are unable to be represented at the meeting. I have had some experience in regard to small estates, as I dare say the hon. member for Royal has. If he has had the same experience as I have had he will know that after one or two meetings have been called with regard to an estate running from $1,000 to $5,000 and a statement has been presented showing that the estate is hopelessly involved, the final meetings of the creditors will be attended by five or ten per cent of the creditors at the outside. The others say it is hopeless, that there is no use of throwing good money after bad, and they do not attend the meeting at all. Their interest is lost in the estate if they think it is not going to produce any dividend. The winding up of a small estate with expensive machinery will mean that very little will come out of it. As I say, I have been at a good many creditors' meetings myself, being mostly there in the capacity of a man who had sold goods, and my experience has been that the number of those present is infinitesimal in comparison with the number of those who are entitled to be present. The British and United States creditors are usually unrepresented. Of course, you may say: Let them look after themselves. But the credit of Canada suffers if there is not an equal distribution of the estate. As the Solicitor-General has said, we have considered this Bill in Committee. We stayed with it for weeks, and the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) will bear testimony, I think, that the Committee worked as faithfully on this measure as on any Bill that has been dealt with in the House in recent years. For weeks and weeks we sat three and four times a week, and we heard all sorts of evidence. I was one who held just about the same notion that my hon. friend here has expressed, when I went to that Committee. I thought that the man on the spot was the cheapest to act as trustee, and he might often be a most efficient man, but then there was the question of security, and in large estates that is an absolute necessity, because if a man is going to get possession of money that he does not distribute there is going to be the dickens to pay. That is where the estate has been entrusted to a man and he is not paying up as he should. Now the inequalities in the size of estates, the situation of the town or city in which the estate is—all these things have to be taken into account. I somewhat reluctantly assented to the proposition embodied in the Bill as being perhaps, after all, the best solution of a very difficult job, but I quite agree that the creditors are the men first concerned, and the most concerned, and they should have a good deal to say as to the trustee and how the estate shall be handled, and perhaps should decide whether or not it should be retained for a time or whether it should be sold off. There is a variety of things to consider, but the average estate has to be wound up, or ought to be wound up, and an accountant is necessary—a man who knows how to keep accounts and who will give an account of the money received and the money disposed of. He is hedged about in this Bill as far as we can hedge him as to his expenditures, and is held down to what we thought was the minimum. I do not say the clause is absolutely perfect by any means, or absolutely just in every respect, but taking it altogether it may be the best solution. As to the objection of my hon. friend from Royal, there is difficulty in appointing a man on the spot; often the place where the estate is is very small or it is in a very out-of-the-way district. As regards large estates, you need a machinery that can handle it, as well as the smaller estates, though I think this is expensive for the small estates and I do not favour a trustee going a distance of two or three hundred miles if it can be avoided. However, the Bill provides for the creation of districts, if I remember well, and probably a trustee will not have to go that far. In my opinion the machinery that has been provided has been well thought out, and

I hope it will be found by the House on examination that the course provided is as safe and wise as could be adopted under the circumstances.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken quite understood my point. It is quite true these official trustees could be appointed, and there would be no objection to them. But suppose there are estates where the creditors represent three-fourths, in amount, or a majority number, and they say "We do not want to leave it to the official trustee, we want to appoint a trustee of our own." Provided that man gives security to the satisfaction of the judge, why should not he be appointed? That is the point I want to make. This question does not arise in the ordinary cases. In those cases the creditors may agree to the official trustee; but in such a case as I have mentioned why do you deliberately take away from the owners of the property—because if a man is insolvent his creditors own the estate—the absolute control of that property? If the creditors do not want to take control the official trustee carries on the estate; but here you are raising this barrier. If the creditors are united in the matter—representing say three-quarters of the amount involved, and also, if you wish, a majority number—and if they want to appoint a special person for a particular purpose, why should they not have that power of appointment? There surely can be no answer to that.

Section agreed to.

On section 14, subsection (4)—General security to be given by trustee.

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that the minister amend the subsection so that in case a cash deposit is made by the trustee he will be entitled to interest, say at the rate of five per cent per annum, during the period in which the money is deposited with the Government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has my hon. friend prepared an amendment?

Mr. JACOBS: I was merely making the suggestion.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If my hon. friend will prepare an amendment I will consider it.

Mr. JACOBS: If the minister will allow the subsection to stand I will prepare an amendment and hand it in.

Mr. McMASTER: I have another suggestion for the minister. It is provided here that the bonds shall be executed to His Majesty, represented by such departmental officer as may be designated by the Governor in Council. In the case of Montreal business, would that be some officer located in Montreal?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, it devolves upon some particular officer of the Government who has to take the bond and execute it to His Majesty. There has to be some one named for the purpose of enforcing it.

Mr. McMASTER: Before whom are these bonds to be executed?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The bond would be executed to His Majesty as represented by the Secretary of State.

Mr. McMASTER: Under our procedure in the province of Quebec, judicial bonds are usually executed before one of the deputy prothonotaries of the Superior Court, or one of the clerks of the Court of Appeal. The point I want to get at is whether the Bill indicates the procedure to be followed or not. Perhaps that is unnecessary. The matter may be governed by rules and regulations drawn up for the carrying out of this Bill; but if the point has not been covered it seems to me it might be wise to indicate before what officer these bonds may be executed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I should think that would be a matter that would be dealt with in the rules and regulations, but at any rate the bond will have to be satisfactory to His Majesty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not think a higher rate of interest could be provided for than is paid by the Government Savings Bank.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not? We are paying five and a half per cent to the public for the use of their money?

Subsection allowed to stand.

On section 14, subsection (6)—Security.

Mr. McMASTER: That does not seem to me to be quite fair to, say, the young chartered accountant who has been in business only a short time. He has got to put up security, but a trust company has not. Why should a trust company be put in any better position than a firm of chartered accountants or an individual chartered accountant? It seems to me that the chartered accountant and the trust company should be put exactly on the same level.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Of course, the theory is that the trust company is already approved and has in all cases made deposits with

the Government as security—not with this Government but with the provincial governments.

Mr. McMASTER: Not for this purpose.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But for all trust and guarantee purposes. As to their solvency generally, they are required to make deposits—at least I know they are in the province of Ontario, and I think a similar practise prevails in the other provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about the Dominion Trust Company?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have trouble enough. I know in the province of Ontario we accept approved trust companies as trustees for the most sacred trusts without additional security. Parliament incorporates them for that specific purpose, among others. I do not think, therefore, that we should derogate from our own grant and say: You must get another company to secure you. I see the distinction which my hon. friend has pointed out, but I think it is only reasonable to accept any reliable trust company without security of this kind.

Mr. McMASTER: The guarantee to be given is merely for the purpose of securing the carrying out of what I might call professional work. The trust company there is not primarily a trust company; it is a receiver or trustee. I think it is eminently unfair to chartered accountants to say: Although you come in competition in this line of business with trust companies, those trust companies, just because they are trust companies, shall not be required to make any deposit or security, but you, being an individual, must do so, no matter how high your reputation may be or how considerable your solvency. It seems to me that the law should be fair and equal, and I submit with confidence that you are giving an unjust advantage to the trust company over the ordinary firm of chartered accountants, or chartered accountant, as the case may be.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the case of a receivership in any province to-day, when the court appoints a private individual as receiver, it insists on security, but if it appoints a trust company it excuses security. That is a matter of adopted practice here and, I think, in every other country, simply because experience has shown that so far as security is concerned the bonds and pledges of these companies on the whole are better than private securities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my memory serves me well, there was a very long discussion in the Toronto press on the securities of trust companies after some land mortgage companies had not "delivered the goods." Does the minister remember that discussion?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have seen some criticisms—I have made some.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It seems to me that in our province trust companies are assigned to special work—they administer estates.

Mr. McMASTER: They can, but they do not generally do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And they can act as trustees in bankruptcy under this Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But it is a special venture to which generally they are not assigned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There have been a number of cases where they have been constituted receivers for the purpose of winding up insolvent estates.

Mr. McMASTER: They do not do it much in our province.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not see why a trust company should not be put on the same plane as an ordinary trustee. It may not be a difficult matter for a trust company to provide the necessary security; it probably would be a more difficult matter for the individual trustee to do so. While it may be said that I was a party to the drafting of this particular section, still I am willing to admit that the argument of my friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) seems to me to be pretty strong in favour of seeing that no particular advantage is secured by the trust company over the private individual. It will not be a hardship on the trust company to furnish security, and that being the case, why not put them all on the same plane?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It seems to me there is quite a difference between a trust company acting in this capacity and a private individual. If my friend from Brome wanted to start a bank he would not be able to do so; banks have charters under which the Government impose certain restrictions before they are allowed to receive money. Trust companies likewise are obliged to live up to certain requirements, and their bonds are looked upon as a proper investment for trust funds in many cases, which seems to indicate that the law recognizes that the security of trust companies is such that it cannot be questioned,

because any violation of trust is a very serious matter for anybody.

Mr. JACOBS: Take the case of the Dominion Trust Company.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I can quite see that the private individual is going to be somewhat at a disadvantage, but if he follows this as a business, once he gets his $10,000 bond underwritten by a bond company—and most men of any integrity can get that done—he will not be obliged to go on multiplying that security indefinitely. Presumably he will be in a position to pay the necessary premium on his $10,000 bond. But the trust company will not have to do that, because it is in a superior position financially, and is so acknowledged by the Government of the province. I think my friend from Brome. who is also a member of the Committee, will remember that we thought there was quite a difference between an individual, so far as security was concerned, and a trust company subject to very special laws and regulations which it must live up to.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: Do these trust companies have to be appointed by the Governor in Council as official trustees?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I said it was open to them to be so appointed.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: They cannot be appointed trustees of an estate unless they have been previously appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Certainly not.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: That is a very good provision, because recently a small company was incorporated in New Brunswick for some particular purpose—I do not know why; in other provinces small trust companies have been incorporated; therefore it would be necessary for the Governor in Council to be very particular before appointing trust companies as official trustees to see that they have proper assets and also authority under their charters to act as receivers or trustees.

Mr. MOWAT: In Ontario the Committee will see that the trust companies are those approved according to the laws of the province. In practice these trust companies are on a list approved by the province, and the province sees to it from year to year that they do not give guarantees in excess of the security which they put up; they have to keep bonds on deposit with the provincial government commensurate with the liabilities under their guarantees.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

Mr. McMASTER: Does that occur in all the provinces?

Mr. MOWAT: I do not know. although I assume it does. If there is any practice that a trust company should be approved by the province, this does not apply. The idea of the Committee was to give the public the impression of security; we were not thinking of benevolence towards young chartered accountants.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not want benevolence; I want justice, and it is fundamentally unjust, when you come to distribute professional trustee work, that the professional man, individual or in a firm, is obliged to put up security, while a trust company which is going to do the same work through its clerks or employees, is not obliged to do so. I quite see that, as a rule, a trust company should, just because it is a trust company, give a guarantee of security, but that does not always happen. There has, during the last few years, been a very striking failure of a trust company, and many people lost money through it.

Mr. JACOBS: A straight failure?

Mr. McMASTER: I did not say "straight failure," I said a very striking failure. These trust companies are not, I think. obliged to put up deposits with the Federal Government, which is relying upon other jurisdiction, and that being the case, would it not be better to put the chartered accountants and the trust companies on the same level? Some provinces may not be as careful as they should be with regard to trust companies. I cannot say, because I do not know.

Mr. JACOBS: British Columbia, for example.

Mr. McMASTER: They may allow trust companies to operate in unbusinesslike fashion; that is, they may allow them to issue more security bonds than they are able to guarantee. Therefore, instead of having the Department of the Secretary of State or the Federal authorities depending upon nine different jurisdictions for the security which is to be given to the creditors, why, on this ground as well as on the ground of fairness, should not the trust company and the ordinary man doing this trustee work be put on the same level?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The Government of Ontario has that deposit already, so why require the company to put it up again? The company has to be approved by the laws of the province.

Mr. McMASTER: The deposit which the trust company has made with the province of Ontario is not for this specific purpose, but in connection with other activities of the company. This is to secure another activity of the trust company, and I do not see why we should make the distinction.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The security is in proportion to all the business done by the trust company.

Mr. JACOBS: A trust company is no more honest than the people composing it. A year or two ago, we had the instance of the Dominion Trust Company of British Columbia which went to the wall and caused the loss of large sums of money to the public who put their faith in that institution. I still believe, with the hon. member for Brome (McMaster), that this clause should be amended, and I therefore move:

That in subsection (6), of section 14, the words "notwithstanding the provisions of this section it shall not be necessary for trust companies approved according to the law of the province to provide such security" be struck out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will ask my hon. friend to allow that motion to stand until the Bill comes up for consideration tomorrow, and I will come to some conclusion in the meantime. I am not by any means wedded to the present clause. It is, however, following the general practice, and to strike it out would be an innovation. I would not like this Bill to go forth with a slap in the face to the great trust companies of Canada. I would like it to go forth with the accepted usage of measures dealing with trust companies.

Mr. JACOBS: If that is the only slap in the face they will get, let it go at that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Our people are educated that investment in the funds of trust companies is a wise and proper thing. I believe that to be so, and I would not like it to be said that we have no faith in trust companies. We are dealing here, on a very important measure, with what appears to be a very trivial matter.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not consider it a triviality to do what I believe to be justice to individual professional men.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think the case will arise once in a year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The Governor in Council has the power to appoint a trustee and they will not appoint a trustee whom they do not regard as solvent. Therefore, by selecting a trust company, the Governor in Council shows that that company is deemed to be solvent. It is rather a reflection on the party selecting the trust company that an insolvent company might be selected. We really come back to the former position, that the selection of a trustee who will carry on his duties without a bond must be made by the Government, and in exercising that selection they will take into consideration whether or not the company is solvent.

Amendment stands. Subsection stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned.

Friday, May 2, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATER POWERS.

FURTHER DOCUMENTS AS TO ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER COMPANY'S DAM.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Yesterday I laid upon the table of the House certain documents relating to the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company to construct certain works in the St. Lawrence river. The House then intimated a desire to have those documents printed, and in order that the record may be complete I now beg to lay upon the Table these further documents: Interim Order and opinion of the International Joint Commission in the matter of this application; and statement of the case of the Government of Canada on such application.

With the consent of the House I beg to move:

That the documents relating to the application of the St. Lawrence River Power Company to construct certain works in the South Sault channel of the St. Lawrence river, laid upon the table of the House on May 1st, and the interim order and opinion of the International Joint Commission on the said application and the case of the Government of Canada, laid upon the table to-day, be printed forthwith, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are there not any plans in connection with that matter which should also be published?

Mr. ROWELL: I have no doubt plans were filed in the case before the International Joint Commission, but the Government

is not in possession of any plans so far as I know.

Before this motion is carried, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to draw attention to a provision of the minutes of Council stating the case of the Government of Canada? I do so in order to correct what appears to be a misunderstanding outside this House as to the position of the Government in reference to the development of power in the St. Lawrence river. I will just read this extract:

It is with this purpose also that the Canadian Government deems it appropriate to refer here to the proposal made in the Order in Council of the 2nd September, 1918, that the two Governments should take immediate steps jointly to prepare and carry out a scheme looking to the most economical and comprehensive development of the waters of the St. Lawrence River in the interests of the people of both countries. Even though the utilization of only a portion of the whole capacity of the river can be immediately contemplated, yet the endeavour should be to design at the outset a complete scheme into which successive developments might be fitted from time to time as and when the occasion might demand. Without some such scheme there is always present the great danger that the ultimate possibilities of St. Lawrence navigation may be neglected or even irreparably injured; for it must be borne in mind, not only that navigation is the paramount national and international use of this great highway of commerce, but that the possibilities of the stream in this respect have been as yet by no means fully developed. On the other hand it is certain that the subordinate and incidental but important use of these international boundary waters for power purposes can never be rendered as efficient and productive through a policy of simply permitting a haphazard series of unrelated private enterprises as through a carefully considered and comprehensive scheme of development carried out under public auspices by the two countries; and obviously it is only by agreement and concerted action between the two countries that such a development can be undertaken.

But, as already intimated, this is not all; there is, in addition to the economic advantages, the much more important consideration affecting the status of the treaties and conventions between the two countries. For the adoption of the proposed joint project as an international policy would, it is conceived, be calculated to obviate many occasions for public dissatisfaction and misunderstanding that on the one side or the other might otherwise arise from time to time in respect of private exploitations of the uses of these waters. Unquestionably these uses are becoming more and more regarded as public uses, and it follows that the responsibility for their development should be undertaken, and the benefits of such development enjoyed, by the public. Indeed, for this reason and in view of the other considerations here adduced the Canadian Government is trongly convinced that nothing should be allowed to prejudice the chance of such a comprehensive power development of the St. Lawrence waters, and so far as its consent may be necessary, it will, therefore, be unable to sanction further private enterprise of this nature.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that from the Canadian Government?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: That is a portion of the Minutes of Council adopted by the Canadian Government and forwarded to the American Government as indicating our policy.

Motion agreed to.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 83, for the relief of Albert Greensward.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 84, for the relief of May Jane Lyons.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 85, for the relief of Rose Kent Miller.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Elizabeth Winters.—Mr. Mowat.

PEACE TREATY—EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. M. R. BLAKE (Winnipeg North): I would like to bring to the attention of the Government an article which appeared in the press of April 30th, stating that an eight-hour day had been included in the Peace Treaty, and to ask the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs if the Government has any information on the matter.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: We expect to have text of the treaty very shortly, and it is possible that on Monday an answer may be given to the question of the hon. gentleman.

NAVAL SERVICE—PRIORITY OF DISCHARGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I desire to give the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) the information that he asked for yesterday in regard to the demobilization of the men in the naval service.

The numbers of active service ratings borne on the books of the Naval Service Department on November 15, 1918, were:—

Officers	700	
Men	4768	5468
Officers borne April 15, 1919	200	
Men	1758	1978
Total number demobilized		3490

Demobilization is being carried on as rapidly as possible, priority being given to men who entered early in the war.

The men from the overseas divisions are being discharged as they are returned from England.

The men on the stations at Halifax and Esquimalt are manning the vessels on hand, which have to be maintained in proper condition. The number of vessels is being reduced and men are discharged as quickly as is consistent with this service.

WORKERS' MEETING IN TORONTO.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): I wish to call the attention of the House to a very grave incident that occurred in Toronto yesterday. I read in this morning's Ottawa Citizen the following:

One of the speakers at to-night's meeting was loudly applauded when he addressed the gathering as "comrades and fellow Bolsheviki" . . . . . "We all know that the propaganda started at this meeting will make for revolution" . . . . "We are in the first throes in Canada of a world-wide revolution. We are governed here by Orders in Council issued by the financial interests of this country. You must arise in your might and defy this Government, which has taken away the right of free speech."

Does the Government intend to take any action with regard to this matter?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): It does not seem to me that any Government action is called for. I should think that the speaker at that meeting might have been influenced by fallacious arguments put forth by hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that the country is being governed by Order in Council, and not, as is the fact, under constitutional principles.

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS IN IMPERIAL SERVICE.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): A number of young Canadians who enlisted in the Imperial service under an arrangement with the Canadian Government are now being discharged from the Imperial service in England. I received a letter this morning in connection with one case where a young man went over from Canada in 1915, was wounded early in 1916, and went back to his regiment after his recovery. The regiment was sent to India and the young man arrived back in England late in March, was discharged on the 8th of April, and left England on his own resources. No provision has been made for his getting back to Canada; he may return as best he can, and without any remuneration for the delay. It seems to me that this is a situation that should call for some action on the part of the Government with a view at least to doing justice to these young men.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): About ten days ago I learned that some Canadians who had joined the Imperial forces were desirous of getting back to Canada and were unable to make the necessary arrangements for transportation. These included some flying corps officers. I transmitted a cable to the overseas minister requesting him to arrange with the War Office for the immediate repatriation—at the Canadian Government's expense, the cost to be charged back to the Imperial account—of Canadians who were in the Imperials for discharge. I also transmitted to the War Office a request that Canadians who had joined the Imperials and had been granted commissions—a large number of men from our universities got commissions in the Imperials—be given the privilege of taking their discharge and returning to Canada; and that arrangements be made for their repatriation. The overseas minister replies that he has taken the matter up with the War Office and will use every endeavour to see that this request is complied with.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What business has the War Office with these men who are on discharge? It is the duty of the Canadian Government, not of the War Office, to get them home.

Major-General MEWBURN: These men enlisted in the Imperial service, not in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Once they are discharged, it is our duty to bring them home.

Major-General MEWBURN: They are not all discharged.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They should be.

PRIVILEGE—MR. EDWARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I rise to a question of privilege. This morning's issue of that great family magazine printed in Ottawa, called the Journal, and edited by one P. D. Ross, Esquire, contains an editorial headed "An Unjust Aspersion," in which the editor says that I used these words—at least, they are credited to me; the words are in quotation marks, and as my name appears in the same paragraph, the inference is that they were used by me:

A number of militia officers walking around in uniform who never went to the front and never wanted to go.

Mr. Speaker, I did not use those words in this House or out of this House. I made no reference whatever in my remarks to men "walking around in uniform." My remarks clearly indicate that I was referring not to men in uniform, but to men who had been connected with the militia and had been out for drill for many years, but did not put on the uniform when war broke out or during the continuance of the war. I do not care to be represented as casting aspersions on men who were in uniform, and I have never made any reflections on such men. It was enough for me that they were in uniform; it was then up to the Government or to the Militia Department to say whether they went overseas or whether they could best serve their country here. Of course, a little matter of fact like that does not bother the editor of the Ottawa Journal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman has made his denial; it would not be in order for him to go any further.

Mr. EDWARDS: I wish to resent emphatically the unjust charge which is editorially levelled against me, and to say that a man who has been in receipt of some $80,000—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: —in the last five years out of this Government—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: —had better occupy his time in other ways than by—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: —casting reflections on members of this House.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

House in Committee on Bill No. 18, respecting Bankruptcy—Hon. Mr. Guthrie—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose last night, we had reached clause 14, which was being considered subsection by subsection. We had reached subsection 6.

On section 14, subsection 6—security:

Amendment (Mr. Jacobs) agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 7—security to be kept in force:

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Did I understand the minister to state yesterday that he had received no complaints against this Bill from boards of trade, municipal councils, or Provincial Governments? Is it not a fact that the premier of the province of Quebec sent in a communication objecting to this Bill?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No protest from any Provincial Government has come before me. Copies of this Bill, as it left the special committee last year, were submitted to the Provincial Governments, and it is possible that the premier's objection may have been sent to some other department of the Government. I will make inquiries about it.

Mr. McKENZIE: What certainty have we that these bonds will be kept in force? A good bondsman to-day may be absolutely worthless as a bondsman to-morrow. I think we should provide that the security shall be continuous.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The intention certainly is that the security shall be continuous. Subsection 4 provides:

> No authorized trustee shall accept any assignment or trust or execute any duties under this Act unless and until he has given security to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, by bonds or otherwise, executed to His Majesty as represented by such departmental officer as may be designated by the Governor in Council, for due accounting and for payment over and transfer of all moneys and property received by him as such trustee.

No trustee is permitted either to accept or to execute any assignments unless the security is there. I assume that the officer who is designated will see to it that the bonds are kept renewed from time to time. A trustee would not be entitled to act if he was in default of his security. I do not know that it is usual to provide that the security shall be continued in force, but perhaps a clause might be added that if for any reason the security lapses the trustee shall be disqualified. But I think the inference that the security must be maintained is very plain.

Mr. McKENZIE: I certainly think that the courts of the provinces would be able to handle this better than the Governor in Council. I do not know what definite knowledge the Governor in Council could have, of a bondsman in British Columbia or the Yukon, for instance. The Governor in Council would not be able to get the information from a remote place as expeditiously as the courts. I do not wish to interfere very much with this Bill, but it does seem to me that if any function at all in connection with this Act is to be discharged by the courts, it is the approval of the bonds. In case of default, the most expeditious and convenient way would be

to apply to one of the judges of the provinces to have another bondsman substituted, so that this machinery might be kept in proper shape.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not quite agree that that would be the most convenient way. I am satisfied that there is some official of the Government to-day who deals with the approval of security much more expeditiously than any court could. I do not know just what department of the Government looks after this work, but securities are being passed on almost daily. Under subsection 4 some official has to be designated for the purpose of examining and accepting the security if approved. I fancy he will be familiar with all classes of security. I am satisfied that in practice the security will be that of a guarantee company. It may be that in some cases a private bond will be submitted, but I doubt very much whether the Government would accept a private bond. The Ontario Government does not. It used to, but now it will only accept the bond of a guarantee company. That has been found much more satisfactory, and I think that practice will be followed by the Dominion Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why, then, does not the minister specify that it shall be the bond of a guarantee company?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Bill does not insist on that. It says the bond shall be to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council. I am not sure that the Governor in Council has prescribed any particular form of bond in regard to the public service of Canada, but I know that in the vast majority of cases the security is in the shape of bonds of a guarantee company. In Ontario the only security that will be accepted in these cases is the bond of guarantee companies. What the rule is here I am not prepared to say at present, but it must be to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council. I have no doubt that the official designated under subsection 4 will see that the security is in proper form.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have the greatest possible respect for the present or for any Governor in Council. I know that there are a great many large questions engaging their attention, and these gentlemen are usually very busy, and I can hardly conceive that they will be able to give the necessary attention to ascertain whether or not the security is adequate. I do not believe they will have the time to devote to matters of that kind, and that is why I say that a judge sitting in chambers or in court whose particular business it is to consider questions such as this should be the proper functionary to deal with this matter. However, if the minister can assure us that the security will be absolute and that the trustees, after receiving the money of the creditors, will not abscond, depriving men of the few dollars coming to them out of the estates, I would not be very greatly concerned. I do not think the Government of the day, or indeed any government, can have any particular knowledge about securities, for government officials who have to do with the taking of bonds have come to me and asked my opinion of men in different parts of the country, as to whether their bonds should be accepted. If they had machinery of their own I do not think they would have bothered me. I do not wish to repeat, but I would urge on the minister the great necessity of seeing that the operations of this Bill will not be farcical and that there will be no dishonesty and corruption.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the drafting of the Bill we thought we were making assurance doubly sure by providing in the next subsection that there shall be a double security—not only the original security of $10,000 but the security of each individual estate. I think the security has been made absolute.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Would not the fact that the Governor in Council is the custodian of the security indicate that the Government is the proper authority to release the security when it is assured that the obligations of the trustee have been fulfilled? It appears to me that the security is quite safe when deposited with the Governor in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: But the bond may or may not be good.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The Bill provides that the security will be absolute. It will be a trust company or bond company whose credit is beyond reproach. If the suggestion of the hon. member were followed the court sitting in the district would give orders to the security holders in Ottawa to release the funds, and we would have the anomaly of the smaller commanding the greater body. The fact that the security is with the Governor in Council seems to me to lay the onus on the Governor in Council to see that the bonds are not released until all funds have been paid over satisfactorily.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend does not quite understand my objection. If the

minister will see that it is to be a guarantee company or some form of security that is absolutely permanent and secure, I have no fault to find. But my objection is that the Governor in Council may be imposed upon to accept a bond signed by two or three bondsmen who are not good, or who, though they may be all right to-day, may be insolvent themselves to-morrow. If I were looking for a bondsman in the town of Brantford I would very much prefer the hon. member's judgment than that of the Government as to whether or not that bondsman were satisfactory, because he would have specific knowledge.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can assure the hon. member that the Government will see to it that the security is absolutely good and permanent.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not see anything in the Bill providing that in the event of the trustee's failure to carry out all his undertakings the security given to the registrar is to be turned over at once to the substituted trustee. Subsection 8 has no reference to this matter. Perhaps it is in another part of the Bill, but I think it is the intention of the Bill that this security should be turned over to some person acting on behalf of the creditors.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not understand what my hon. friend means. There is a provision for the removal of a trustee. Section 15 provides:—

> An authorized trustee may be removed and another substituted or an additional authorized trustee may be appointed for cause, by the court.

Mr. JACOBS: That is not the question. The trustee when appointed is obliged to give a second security by bond or otherwise to the registrar that he will carry out his undertakings. Should he abscond with all the assets of the estate there is no provision whereby the new trustee can make application to the registrar for the payment of any security which the absconding trustee has put up.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is to be assumed that if there is a shortage or default the registrar can enforce the bond.

Mr. JACOBS: For the benefit of the creditors?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: That is the spirit of the Bill, but I do not see any clear provision to that effect. Of course, it is clearly understood that the creditors have no interest in the first security of $10,000. That will be turned over to the Secretary of State or some proper official and will form part of the consolidated revenue fund for that year. It is with regard to the second security I am inquiring.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does my hon. friend suggest that the clause should go further, and say that the registrar shall enforce the bond for the benefit of the estate?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a necessary implication. We need not express it in language, but I have no objection to doing so. Otherwise there would be no object in the bond.

Mr. JACOBS: It properly comes under subsection 8.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I think that the position taken by the Solicitor General is absolutely correct. These official bonds are given to the officers of the court and the officers of the court, on default, by order of the court, will sue on the bonds for the moneys which, upon recovery, are paid to the credit of the estate. That is the practice in regard to official bonds of that description. We have very many cases of that kind and there has never been any difficulty in working it out in a practical way. It would not be necessary to add the clause suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs). It seems to be sufficiently stated in the clause in the Bill. The bond can be enforced by the officers of the court subject to the direction of the court.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We might add the words:

> And the said bonds shall be enforceable by the registrar for the benefit of the said estate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The section specifically says that the bond:

> For the due accounting and payment over and transfer of all moneys and properties received or to be received by him as such trustee in respect of the estate of such debtor.

You might as well put a clause in stating that in the event of default you should have power to collect the bond. It is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. JACOBS: But the registrar is the officer of the court and if the money is recovered by him, without any specific instruction, he may be obliged to turn it over to the provincial government or to the court proper. I think the suggestion made by the Solicitor General will be satisfactory.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 8—additional security to be given by trustee:

Mr. GUTHRIE: The amendment proposed would have to be made to this subsection and I think we had better let it stand until I have drafted the amendment.

Subsection 8 allowed to stand.

On subsection 9—meeting to be called if security not given:

An hon. MEMBER: Read.

The CHAIRMAN: If it be the desire of the Committee that I read the clauses, I am quite willing to do so, but, as the Bill consists of some 66 pages and has already been considered by a special committee, I do not think the Committee will ask the Chairman to do more than he is required to by the practice and the rules. According to May, page 369, the practice in England is:

> The Chairman proceeds to read the number of each clause, which is thus brought under the consideration of the committee.

Bourinot, page 522, says:

> The chairman usually calls out the number of each clause, and reads the marginal note, but he should give the clause at length when it is demanded by the committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: It must be demanded by the Committee and not by one individual member. I am quite willing to meet the views of the Committee, and if the Committee so desires, I shall read the clauses.

Mr. JACOBS: We like to hear your voice, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: After the consideration of this Bill was commenced, I noticed that six or seven clauses were disposed of inside of five minutes. This is a very important Bill and the members have the right to have the clauses read in order that they can follow them properly. It is important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the desire of the Committee that the clauses shall be read?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. McKENZIE: As the Chairman is not reading the clauses, I suppose the members will have to read them in the presence of the Committee so that we will hear what the clauses are and have some conception of their consecutive order and effect. It is impossible to enact laws by reading the numbers of clauses or the marginal notes. We are warned in the Interpretation Act that no Act is to be interpreted by the marginal note. It is almost impossible to understand a clause, paragraph, or subsection by reading the numbers 8, or 7, or 5. While I fully agree with the Chair that he should not always read the clauses, I think that when there is a specific demand for the reading of any one clause, the Chairman should exercise his discretion and read it. This clause is:

> Unless the creditors, either at the first meeting, or at a meeting convened by notice—

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is subsection 8. We are now at subsection 9.

Mr. McKENZIE: Very well; subsection 9 reads:

> Should the trustee be unable or fail to give the security required, in the manner and within the time hereinbefore provided, he shall within ten days from the expiration of the said thirty days, by notice in writing, convene a meeting of creditors for the purpose of appointing a new authorized trustee, and should he neglect or refuse to call such meeting, he shall be guilty of an offence and subject to the penalties provided by this Act.

That seems to be all right.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Provided the trustees fail to perform that duty, who is punishable; what is going to happen?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are penalties.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: There are penalties, but penalties will not help matters. Is there any other provision for calling a meeting and electing a trustee?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, there is provision for calling the creditors together and electing a new trustee.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 11—security surrendered:

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a question in regard to subsection 11 which I might mention to the Committee. Some of the commercial bodies take the view that the trustee should not be released or securities surrendered, until there should be a final accounting which would satisfy the court that the trustee had properly fulfilled all his obligations. Perhaps subsection 11 had better stand until a little more consideration can be given to the amendment which has been proposed to the end which I have just indicated.

Subsection 11 allowed to stand.

On section 15, subsection (1)—new trustee may be substituted:

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I would suggest to the Solicitor General that he take into consideration the advisability of making the following amendment to subsection 1 of section 15:

Also that creditors representing more than three-quarters in amount of the proved debt may, subject to the approval of the court, appoint any person or corporation in place of the official trustee.

The point I want to make is this: As the Bill now stands the creditors only have the power, if they wish to change the trustee, to appoint another official trustee. In other words, the control of insolvent estates is absolutely given to a class designated as official trustees who are appointed by Order in Council. In my own province of New Brunswick, which is a small province, and you can see the difficulty and hardship which would occur there. Probably the only men that would qualify and give the $10,000 security required live in the cities of Fredericton, Moncton, or St. John. The cases of insolvency that are frequent there are those of traders in the remote towns of the province—it may be a lumber business carried on in the upper parts of the province, or a fishing business—a particular type or class of business followed in a particular locality some two or three hundred miles from the cities I have mentioned. Suppose in that county there is an official trustee whom the creditors wish to remove; he may be counsel or lawyer for one of the parties, and because of that, or for some other reason, is absolutely disqualified. Now if the creditors want to appoint another trustee they would have to select one in a city where such a trustee could be found, located some two or three hundred miles away. The Committee can understand what an enormous additional expense would be incurred in connection with a small estate in a case of that kind. As to chartered accountants, there is in the province of Ontario a large class of such qualified men, or trustee companies. In my province I only know of one chartered accountant and he is so very busy that it would be difficult for him to give attention in a case of this kind, even if he were appointed. Therefore, I think it would be advisable to adopt this amendment, so that creditors representing three-fourths in value of the estate should in these particular cases have the right to appoint a trustee to manage the estate. The Committee must remember that when a man becomes insolvent his property is vested in the creditors. They become the owners of the property and on proving the debt are given the right to control it. Now, you say, by this proposed legislation, "You have the control, but if you do not like the official trustee you can appoint another person, but he must be an official trustee also." Why should you not leave to the creditors themselves the right of selection and let them appoint whom they think fit?

Mr. FRIPP: What person is desiginated by the words "official trustee?" Does that mean a trustee appointed by the creditors, or the official trustee?

Mr. H. H. McLEAN (Royal): The official trustee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The interpretation clause gives the following definition:

One of the persons appointed by the Governor in Council under authority of this Act as proper persons to be trustees in bankruptcy, or otherwise hereunder, or one of such persons named in a receiving order or in an authorized assignment to act, or who is otherwise hereunder authorized to act, as a trustee in bankruptcy, or under an authorized assignment.

And so forth. That is the definition of an "authorized trustee."

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is the debtor free to use his own trustee if he does not wish to accept the official trustee?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. MOWAT: Where does the hon. gentleman propose to insert the words contained in his amendment?

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: At the end of the subsection after the words "has been made." I wish to ask the Solicitor-General if I am correct in saying that the creditors can only appoint an official trustee?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Personally I have no objection to the amendment. I would point out however that it impairs the symmetry of the Bill as drafted, and may involve us in difficulties as we proceed. I must remind the Committee that the drafting of this Bill has been a highly technical undertaking. The various sections are very much co-related, and if we disturb one we are apt to disturb a good deal of the structure of the Bill. Mr. O'Connor, who was largely concerned in the drafting is otherwise engaged for a while this afternoon, and I would like to discuss the amendment with him before I give an opinion in regard to it.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: I have no objection so long as the Solicitor General will take

the matter into consideration, but I would like to see an amendment drafted embodying the views which I have expressed. I have gone over the Bill carefully and if I can assist him in the drafting I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know my hon. friend is very experienced in such matters, and if he would draft his amendment I will give it the very best consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: All I have to say in regard to the proposition is that in Nova Scotia we had a provincial insolvency law which contained a provision such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) has suggested, and by reason of the way in which it was abused the provision was repealed and we reverted to the condition under which only a regularly appointed trustee can be chosen to manage the estate. We found that in certain sections fictitious accounts would be made out. Certain parties would get together and create the
4 p.m. condition under which they appeared to own more than half the value of the estate, and in any case where they wished to do so, would override the other parties concerned and appoint their own man. I am simply stating that so that the Solicitor-General may know that in our province the experiment has been tried and abandoned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There has been considerable difficulty in Ontario on the same question.

Mr. MOWAT: Before the amendment is further considered, let me point out a trouble which may arise and which we endeavoured to avoid when considering the Bill in Committee. Suppose there were two or three large creditors of an insolvent. They might vote in an outsider, who was friendly to them, and they might get away with the state in that way; whereas if the management is left to an authorized trustee, his reputation and business will be such as to render him absolutely unprejudiced and not favourable to one party or the other. It was brought up in Committee, when the Bill was under consideration, that one or two powerful or influential creditors might influence the winding up of the estate so that the small creditors would come out at the small end of the horn.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If I understood the hon. member for Royal (Mr. McLean) correctly, he believes that one creditor, who might own three-fourths of the liabilities, and wished to change the trustee, should be able to do so. We have already adopted a clause that I think would interfere with that, and which requires that there should be a majority of the creditors, in such a case, as well as two-thirds of the amount of the debts involved. Surely it would be putting a great deal of power in the hands of one creditor to do as suggested. He might happen to be a very large creditor, but the others might be very much less able to lose the amount at their disposal than the big fellow who would probably swing the estate as he wished, and control everything if he individually was allowed to appoint a trustee. It appears to me there ought to be some safeguard in connection with this matter, and it should not be in the power of one individual, who may be the largest creditor, to swing the whole thing as he pleases.

Mr. McLEAN: In drafting the amendment that objection can be easily met. I think the Bill should contain a provision that the creditors—a majority if you wish—should take control of the debtor's estate and put it in the hands of any person they think would be capable of winding it up to the best advantage. Such a provision would be especially applicable in my province, because, as I mentioned, we have not a sufficient number of skilled people to draw on in cases of this nature, and in out of the way places it would be necessary to secure a local man possessing the necessary qualifications. I think the principle is correct; the estate belongs to the creditors, and they should have control of it, rather than the Government should put A. B. in control because they have appointed him an official trustee. Under the old Act there was never any difficulty about the assignees appointed by the creditors; the difficulty always was with the official assignee. He was the man who made away with the estate.

Mr. FRIPP: He got all the estate.

Mr. McLEAN: When the official assignee got control of an estate you could not get an accounting from him.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is it the intention of the hon. member for Royal (Mr. McLean) that this trustee, appointed by a majority of the creditors, should give two bonds?

Mr. McLEAN: Yes, it is already provided for I think by section 14, but we can see that the other sections are sufficient to require that the trustee appointed shall give the necessary security.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend (Mr. McLean) states that the creditors should be put in control. That is not altogether

the intent of this Bill. The object of a Bankruptcy Bill is to protect the debtor too, and, unlike any provincial legislation on the subject, this Bill provides under certain conditions for the discharge of the debtor, and the trustee has to represent the debtor in these matters, so that he is not altogether a trustee for the creditors. In fact, it has been argued that one great object to be attained by a Bankruptcy Act in Canada is the discharge of the honest debtor, and the trustee must act for him in that connection. However, in framing the clauses in regard to the appointment of trustees and the security to be given by them the Committee was influenced not only by representations made by Canadian mercantile bodies, but also by the arguments of exporters from Great Britain. Delegations representing them called upon me, and they were very insistent upon the question of official trustees with undoubted security. They say that as a rule they are minority creditors, and their experience in Canada has been very disappointing, that many times where dividends were declared out of small estates they got nothing—the dividends were never paid. They think our legislation in the various provinces has been highly deficient, and I must say that they are perhaps more insistent than any other mercantile interest doing business in Canada.

Mr. McLEAN: But in England they allow creditors to appoint trustees.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Every appointment in England must be submitted to the court for ratification.

Mr. McLEAN: We can have a similar provision in this case.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Those exporters say that if something is not done to regulate insolvency proceedings in Canada, it is ultimately going to injure our credit. The Committee had these matters brought before them and were very much impressed by that state of affairs, and I have no doubt that in framing these sections the main idea was to have an official class of trustees thoroughly approved and thoroughly secured. I would not like to see any departure from the course adopted by the Committee, but I appreciate the reasonableness of my hon. friend's contention, and if he will let me have his amendment I will consider it.

Mr. COPP: I was not present yesterday afternoon when this Bill was under discussion, and the Solicitor-General may have made the explanation that I am asking for now. I think a great deal depends upon my hon. friend's suggestion as to how many authorized assignees are appointed in the province or how closely they are located.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The committee purposely refrained from placing any limit. We do not know, and we will not know, until we gain experience, just how many trustees will be necessary to administer this Bill. It was supposed that one or two in each county might be sufficient, but of course in large centres more would be required. However, the door is wide open; any man can make his application, state his qualifications, and give his security. I do not know how many will apply. This strange situation might arise: After this legislation is enacted no man may apply; then there is no machinery for carrying out the provisions of the Act. I will have to make a suggestion in that regard, that the Act do not come into force until proclamation by the Governor in Council, because machinery will have to be adopted after the Bill is passed, forms will have to be prepared and rules of practice prescribed, and we will have to see to it that an adequate number of qualified trustees are available.

Mr. PROULX: What will be the form of security, by private surety or security bond?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is nothing in the Bill to preclude private sureties, but the bond has to be to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council. In Ontario the practice of the Government has done away with all private sureties.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do I understand the minister to say that no trustee will be appointed unless he applies for the position?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He must himself apply to the Secretary of State.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is a curious way of dealing with the matter. The best men would probably not apply, and I think our experience would be that some worthless fellow who wants to get a job would apply, and if his was the only application the minister would be bound to give the appointment to him, I suppose?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, his application has to be approved.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: It strikes me that provision should be made for appointments by the Governor in Council where no application was received. I notice that the districts are very large, a whole province is a district, and the trustee may reside five or six hundred miles away from the greater

number of creditors. I think that difficulties will arise under such circumstances. It seems to me it would be preferable to have a trustee in each county.

Mr. MORPHY: Not having read the whole Bill and not having been a member of the Committee, I find a good deal of difficulty. But I think the hon. member for Royal made a very strong point, namely, that conditions might arise entailing a great deal of expense travelling over long distances and so forth in the conduct of the bankruptcy proceedings, both for the authorized trustee and others whose duty it would be to attend. It seems to me that the greatest security both to debtor and creditors would be ensured by providing that three-quarters, in number, of the shareholders might ask for the appointment of a trustee. Subsection 2 of section 15 says:

> An authorized trustee may be removed and another substituted or an additional authorized trustee may be appointed for cause, by the court.

Why should not the member for Royal have, under that section, by an application to the court, all the remedies which he seeks, for cause? Is there anything to show what is "for cause" in this Act? If for any cause, then the Act can be worked out as it stands. I think that three-quarters, in number, of those present at a meeting might apply to the court having jurisdiction in the locality and thus bring about the very thing that the member for Royal desires. In that case, owing to the way this Act is framed, you would have to provide that such changed trustee should be compelled to give the same security as is provided for trustees under the Act.

Mr. FRIPP: That would not seem to me to be the proper reading of subsection 2. Surely it is intended that the court shall appoint only where there is a failure on the part of the creditors to appoint. The creditors are to appoint the trustee; if for any reason they fail to appoint, application for the appointment of a trustee is made to the court. If this is not the proper interpretation of the subsection, there might be two trustees, one appointed by the creditors and one appointed by the court.

Mr. JACOBS: I would have no objection to the suggestion of the member for Royal if the trustee named by the creditors would submit to the rules laid down in this Bill with regard to trustees generally; that is, give security to the registrar and become, so to speak, an ad hoc trustee. As the Solicitor General observes, we have a large number of rules dealing with the obligation of the trustee, one of which is to examine the debtor and to report to the court concerning the method of administration of his business, and generally, to act in a sort of quasi-judicial capacity. Take the case of a man who has been carrying on a large business. He owes, say, a million dollars, $750,000 of which is due to the bank. Under the suggestion made by the member for Royal the bank could oust the regular trustee from that estate and put in one of their clerks or office boys. The debtor requires the assistance of the trustee for the purpose of placing his case before the court, and indicating that he was carrying on his business honestly. The trustee must act as between the debtor and the creditor; consequently it would not be right to give to one person the entire management and administration of an estate. The hon. gentleman also suggested that in remote districts of a province it would be a difficult matter for the trustee to attend. But it is not necessary that the trustee should camp on the premises of the debtor. In suits at law the parties go before the courts in the principal towns of the province. In all cases of importance that arise in the hon. gentleman's own province, the litigants go to Fredericton, St. John, or Moncton, for the purpose of obtaining justice. There is no reason why the estate of a debtor in the villages of say Blackville or Doaktown in New Brunswick could not be properly administered from St. John. It is not necessary that the trustee visit the premises, unless it be to find out how the debtor carried on his business—and that could be done by a detective, I fancy. If the trustee wanted to know something concerning the manner in which the debtor managed his business, he could have the debtor visit him at the town where he, the trustee, happens to reside; then put the debtor through his courses and get the required information. It would be a mistake to depart from the rule laid down in the Bill that every trustee appointed is to be an official trustee and clothed with certain powers.

Mr. LOGGIE: In a county like Northumberland, where the towns of Blackville and Doaktown are located, probably there would be only one official trustee who could fulfil the conditions and give the necessary security. If the creditors thought that some other gentleman than the official trustee should handle the estate, apparently no provision to that end could be made unless some one could undertake to give security for $10,000. It seems to me that

we would not go very far afield if we provided, that in cases where creditors representing seventy-five per cent of the total claims so desired, some other gentleman might be appointed to handle the estate. I realize that a trustee so appointed should give security, though perhaps not so large a sum as that involved in the general security. There is another point. In many country districts there are estates in connection with which the liabilities do not exceed $1,000. If an official trustee acted in cases of that kind, a great part of the estate might be eaten up in costs. Besides, another clause of the Bill provides that if the official trustee is not satisfied with his percentage of the assets of the company he need not act, unless some creditor gives him so much money to go on with the work. It does seem to me it would be proper to relieve estates having liabilities of not more than $1,000 from the operation of this Act altogether, and let them come under the provincial Act.

Subsection stands.

On subsection 5—trustee not bound to act unless tendered fees and disbursements:

Mr. LOGGIE: This is the other subsection I had reference to. I think the trustee should be bound, no matter how small the estate, for his five per cent, if that is the rate, because every estate may not be remunerative as far as the official trustee is concerned.

Mr. NESBITT: This subsection says that if the estate is not sufficient to provide the necessary disbursements and a reasonable remuneration, the trustee need not act. He would hardly want to act if the estate would not pay the disbursements.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Quite so. I have known estates which have not paid the trustee's fee and the cost of advertising.

Mr. LOGGIE: The provincial Act should apply in cases of that kind.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 17, subsection 3—to insure property of debtor:

Mr. JACOBS: I think it would be well to add to this subsection after the word "situate," in the last line, the following words, "and in all things to act as a prudent administrator." I do not think the subsection as it stands goes far enough.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot see what advantage there would be in adopting the proposed amendment. The language is very specific:

> The trustee shall . . . . . insure and keep insured in his official name until sold or disposed of by him all the insurable property of the debtor, to the full insurable value thereof, in insurance companies licensed under the laws of the province wherein the insured property is situated.

Mr. JACOBS: But suppose he does not take reasonable care of the property turned over to him—the care the average man is obliged to take of his own property. I think we should hold the trustee responsible.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think he would be responsible. I think it would rather derogate from his position to add those words.

Mr. JACOBS: The law of the province of Quebec declares what the duties of the trustee shall be, and obliges him to act as a prudent administrator.

Mr. MOWAT: The subsection says "Insurance companies licensed under the laws of the province." Now some companies are licensed under the Dominion.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To do business in the province.

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, I think it means licensed to do business in the province.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The subsection says that the trustee shall insure "unless otherwise directed in writing by the inspectors." I cannot imagine a case where it would not be necessary for the trustee to insure.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can imagine a case where in the opinion of the inspector it might not be necessary to insure, if the risk was slight and the insurance very expensive.

Mr. JACOBS: If it was an asbestos business, insurance would not be required.

Mr. MOWAT: Every Dominion company has a provincial license, as I understand it, but in the John Deere case it was held that a Dominion company need not take out a provincial license. The trustee by this subsection would be bound to insure the property in a provincial company, whereas our best companies are Dominion companies.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They may have taken out a provincial license.

Mr. MOWAT: But they are not required to do so.

Mr. McMASTER: I beg to move to strike out the words "licensed under the laws of" and to substitute therefor the words "duly authorized to carry on business in."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On Section 19, subsection 1—Trustee to have right to sell patented articles.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not understand the import of this clause. Is it to give the trustee more right to dispose of patented articles than the original holder has? That seems to me to be the meaning of it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the meaning. A case was tried in the West in which the debtor was limited by his contract to sell patented articles at a certain price. He became insolvent and the question arose whether his assignee would be bound by that price. and it was held that he was not.

Mr. McMASTER: Is that consonant with legal principles? If I manufacture something and have the right to say to the dealer. "You shall sell at such a price," and the dealer becomes insolvent, is it right that the trustee in charge of his estate shall be relieved from the debtor's contract with me, and shall have rights in the goods which the original debtor had not? It seems to me that you are attacking contract.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The courts have declared it to be right in the case I have mentioned, —in re the Berlin Gramophone Record Company, tried in Calgary or somewhere in the West.

Mr. JACOBS: I may tell my friend from Brome that if this clause were not inserted the trustee would possibly never be able to sell the goods at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the idea.

Mr. JACOBS: He has to sell at auction, and must sell to the highest bidder.

On Section 20—Powers exercisable by trustee with permission of inspectors.

Mr. COPP: Are the inspectors also creditors in all cases?

Mr. GUTHRIE: They are to be appointed by the creditors at a meeting of the creditors are themselves creditors.

Mr. COPP: Is there not some danger in that? If the inspectors are creditors of the estate and are able to give permission to trustees to sell the property by private contract they might very well buy it themselves.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think there is a prohibition against that in the Act.

Mr. COPP: I do not see that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was argued that this power should only be exercised by the creditors, but in a country like Canada where distances are so great it is very difficult and expensive to have a full meeting of creditors; otherwise I would have favoured the idea that creditors should authorize the sale. The creditors can do so if they see fit at the first meeting, but as a rule the sale is not authorized at the first meeting. Creditors will be more careful in future in the appointment of the inspectors.

On section 26, subsection 1,—Property not to be removed from province.

Mr. FRIPP: Is the Solicitor General taking the responsibility for these clauses being right? We have not time to read them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have given the best care and attention I can to the Bill, but a special committee dealt with these questions very exhaustively. Most of the provisions are taken from the English Act; some are modified and some are new. The Bill has been in print for a long time and I assumed that it was thoroughly read. However, I see no objection to our taking time to do so now.

Mr. MAHARG: Does the Solicitor General think that an Act that has been proved satisfactory in an old country like England will be equally satisfactory in a comparatively new country with large areas yet to be developed? That point should be carefully considered. I see certain sections, passed apparently without the consideration of the House, that will not be at all satisfactory to newer parts of the country and will no doubt be objected to, and provincial legislation will probably have to be enacted to annul them, if this House persists in passing them at this time.

Mr. MOWAT: We usually look upon my hon. friend (Mr. Maharg) as representing the farmers' interests. The farmer is excepted from the operation of the Act. Does my hon. friend say that he makes use of this somewhat threatening language after consultation with commercial bodies?

Mr. MAHARG: While I am credited with being the representative of the agriculturists, our body does not take that narrow view in any instance whatever. We are anxious to promote the good of the whole country. We have thousands of men throughout our own province who, if the terms of this Act are taken advantage of, would be put out of business. They come there with very little capital. There are many times when, at the wish or whim of any creditor, a man who owed

$200 could be forced into bankruptcy—at the expense of the agriculturists, if you like to narrow it down to that, in a particular district.

Section agreed to.

On section 27—continuance of business by trustee:

Mr. McMASTER: By whom will the trustee be directed to continue the business?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The inspectors have power under section 20 to authorize the trustee to continue the business. He can only do so under the limitations of subsections (a) and (b).

Section agreed to.

On section 28, subsection 2—how claims are to rank where different estates:

Mr. CANNON: I think that subsection is a direct infringement of civil rights in the province of Quebec. I do not see how this law and our law in Quebec can be reconcilable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That may be the effect of it. The subsection is pretty plainly worded:

> If any debtor who has made an authorized assignment or against whom a receiving order has been made, owes or owed debts both individually and as a member of one or more different co-partnerships, the claims shall rank first upon the estate by which the debts they represent were contracted, and shall only rank upon the other or others after all the creditors of such other estate or estates have been paid in full.

If the converse of that proposition is, as stated, the law of the province of Quebec, it would be an infringement upon what is known as property and civil rights, but that is only in so far as the administration of the estates of insolvents is concerned. To the extent proposed, I think, under the authorities, we have the right to go.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that under our constitution this Parliament has the right to legislate as to insolvency and bankruptcy, but the right of the Federal Parliament is limited to anything outside of civil rights. Everything that appertains to civil rights is given by our constitution to the provinces, and if this Parliament should legislate concerning civil rights in Quebec I do not think the law would be constitutional.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. gentleman was not in the House last night when I gave the leading authority on the question at issue. It has been held by the judicial committee of the Privy Council in a number of cases that while it is to some extent an infringement upon the rights of property and civil rights in the various provinces, the fact that power has been conferred upon the Federal Parliament to pass legislation in respect to bankruptcy and insolvency, confers upon it the further right to take any incidental steps that may be necessary, or to infringe upon civil rights or property rights in so far as it may be necessary to give effect to bankruptcy and insolvency legislation, but no further. The case that is the leading case on the subject arose thirty or forty years ago in the province of Quebec, and it was specifically decided when, under the Insolvency Act of 1875, the defence was set up in a particular case that certain provisions of the Act were an infringement upon property and civil rights in the province of Quebec. The judicial committee held that that was undoubtedly so, but that it was a necessary consequence of the provision of the British North America Act, which gave to this Parliament authority to pass this legislation. We are not seeking to infringe on the rights of any province more than is necessary to give effect and validity to the particular legislation now in question.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—settlement and preferences.

Mr. FRIPP: I would like to lodge my protest against section 29. It is altogether too drastic. I have not had time to consider it, but it seems to me that if it passes it will be impossible for anybody to make any provision for his family whatsoever.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a very technical section and will require study and deliberation. After he has had an opportunity of considering it, I am satisfied that my hon. friend (Mr. Fripp) will conclude that all bona fide and valuable settlements are protected. Certain others are not protected. As sections 29 to 33, inclusive, are very important and involve a great many considerations, I suggest that they stand in the meantime. I trust that the Committee will in the interval familiarize itself with these sections, as they cannot be digested with a hasty reading . They are difficult. I therefore beg to move:—

> That the consideration of sections 29 to 33, both inclusive, be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

On section 36 subsection (1)—Insolvent corporations.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This subsection is an innovation so far as the Bankruptcy Law of this country is concerned. We have made the present Bill apply to all corporations in Canada with the exception of banks, trust companies, insurance companies and railways. Hitherto, as the Committee is aware, proceedings for the winding-up of corporations have taken place under the Winding-Up Acts. There have been very grave complaints from time to time that the procedure under these Acts is very tedious and very expensive, and it has been considered that a much cheaper mode of winding them up could be had under the simple provisions of the present Bill. To that end we have incorporated in this Bill the main or important provisions of the Winding-Up Acts and have endeavoured to harmonize them with the general principle of the Bill. To that extent this is a radical change from the legislation introduced last year when this clause was not before the Committee.

Mr. FRIPP: Do I understand that these sections practically incorporate what we have been working under under the Winding-Up Acts?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, modified in some cases, and where the sections have been modified it is noted at the end.

Mr. FRIPP: So the trustee practically proceeds as though he were acting under the Winding-Up Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

On subsection 6—Demand on contributory by trustee.

Mr. McKENZIE: May I ask if there is anything embodied here except a transfer of the provisions of the Winding-Up Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a new provision and the reason for it is this: Under the Winding-Up Act the liquidator was an officer of the court and he, as such, settled the list of contributories. As soon as that list was settled it was returned to the court and was practically a judgment. That has to be altered, because there is no liquidator in this case, and the proceedings whereby the trustee settles the list of the contributories now follow.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection (8)—Recovery of amount from the contributory.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there a right of appeal from the decision that may be made by the trustee? The subsection as worded would indicate that the trustee had power to make a judgment that would be binding.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This subsection has been somewhat criticised. It says:

> If at the expiration of thirty days from the date of the service of such demand the contributory has not paid to the trustee the required amount, the trustee may, with the approval of the inspectors of the estate, institute in a court having jurisdiction in debt to such amount, an action or other proceeding for the recovery thereof.

The trustee has to sue under this provision, and has to avail himself of the ordinary remedies of the court. Under the Winding-Up Act the proceedings as to the list of contributories took place under the liquidation proceedings and when the list was settled it became a judgment. In the meantime appeals could be had. If any contributory was dissatisfied or objected to his name being on the list, under the provisions of the Winding-Up Act,

5 p.m.

he could go on appealing, but under this provision the trustee settles the list of contributories. A contributory may object and may serve notice of objection and the trustee may hear him. When the trustee settles the list he makes a demand on the contributory for the amount that is due. If the contributory refuses payment the trustee has to bring an action in the courts just as in the case of an ordinary action for debt.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no objection to find with the procedure if all the means of defence that a debtor or shareholder can enjoy are open to him, but I would not like him to be limited by any finding the trustee may make.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only limitation is under subsection (7) which we have just passed, which requires that a man who objects to payment and proposes to defend shall give notice of the grounds of his defence to the trustee, and he shall not thereafter in an action set up a new defence.

Mr. FRIPP: I think this is an improvement on the Winding-Up Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been suggested that we should allow a trustee to act practically as a judge and settle the list as if he were a liquidator, but a liquidator acts directly under the control of the court, and a trustee does not to the same extent. I therefore think that the trustee should be permitted both to fix the amount and pronounce the judgment. The creditor who may say. " You are acting under a wrong impression.

I do not owe this money," should have a right to defend the action, and that right the Bill gives him.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection (9)—Excessive or unjust demands.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a case where a contributory who says the amount claimed from him is in excess of what is required to liquidate the estate can apply to the court.

Mr. MORPHY: By action or by ex-parte application?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It would be by application under the rules for an order of the court.

On subsection 10—Order of Court.

Mr. JACOBS: I am not in favour of permitting this subsection to remain in the Bill. It says:

> If the court considers the demand to be grossly excessive or unjust it may order the trustee to pay personally the costs of any such application.

As I understand it, the trustee acts under the instructions of the inspectors, and it would not be wise to have this subsection remain as it is. The trustee is an officer of the court acting under instructions, and a clause of this kind may sometimes have the effect of preventing him from doing what his duty requires him to do.

I cannot conceive of a case where the trustee would make an excessive or unjust claim upon any party. He is merely acting in his capacity as trustee, he has nothing to gain by it, and what would be his object in so acting? He might be removed by the court at the request of the creditors or of the inspectors if he does anything which he has no right to do. But why single him out in this particular case and say: "If you do this—the act complained of in the section—you will be obliged personally to pay the cost?" While in connection with all the other acts he may do in winding up the estate there is no such penalty. I move that the clause be struck out.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The object of the clause is to prevent the trustee acting as against any particular contributory spitefully or maliciously to embarrass him. It was suggested that a trustee might harass a contributory by excessive demands, and, if so, the court should have power to review, by saying: "You have made an excessive and unjust demand upon this contributory, and any expenses he has incurred by your so doing you ought to pay." I do not see much object in retaining the clause, and I leave it to the Committee.

Mr. JACOBS: It is not in the English Act, and therefore I think we ought not to make experiments.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is this to make the trustee pay if the contributory fails to pay?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, this is against the trustee personally if he act maliciously or without good faith.

Mr. FRIPP: We might leave this to the courts. I second my hon. friend's motion that this subsection be struck out.

Mr. NESBITT: Is it not quite sufficient as it is? If the court considers the demand to be grossly excessive or unjust it may order the trustee to pay personally the costs. It does not say the court shall order payment. It is a protection to the ordinary human being who may be a contributory if the trustee should happen to have a little spleen to work off on him, and it is only reasonable protection under the circumstances. The clause is very carefully worded, and, personally, I would not vote for it to be struck out.

Mr. McLEAN: I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt). It seems to me that every safeguard is thrown around this section. As he points out, if the court comes to the conclusion that the demand is grossly excessive or unjust it may order the trustee to personally pay the costs. Why should he not pay those costs?

Mr. JACOBS: Personally?

Mr. McLEAN: Why should he not, if he takes proceedings which the court pronounce to be grossly unjust? Why should not the poor contributory be protected? The trustee is entitled to get legal advice, and to charge the estate for that advice, and if he takes proceedings which the court pronounces to be excessive or unjust, why should he not personally pay the costs? It is the ordinary rule in other cases; the court often orders a trustee or executor under a will to pay the costs personally if he acts wrongfully. I think the section ought to stand.

Mr. FRIPP: The court has power now in any proceedings to make an official pay the costs himself. Why put the clause in?

Mr. MOWAT: I support the motion for another reason. I do not think when we are trying to establish the fact that we

have a highly respectable and competent class of business men whom we are going to make authorized trustees that we should at the same time suppose for a moment that they would make unjust or excessive demands. I think it is very unlikely that any such contingency will ever arise, and I do not see why we should assume it is likely.

Mr. MORPHY: I think the burden should rest as much on the inspectors who approve his action as upon the trustee; if one is liable they all should be liable.

Mr. MOWAT: This is left entirely to the trustee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think the inspectors have anything to do with the settling of the list.

Mr. MORPHY: I think they ought to have.

Amendment negatived.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 37—

Subsection 2—Abstract of receipts and disbursements.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a clerical error in that subsection. In line 39 after the word "sheet," the words follow "dividend sheet, dividends" etc. The words "dividend sheet" should be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FRIPP: Is there any time limit within which the estate must be wound up?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is no time limit; that is under the creditors' inspector.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 7—Division of property.

Mr. MORPHY: It is said that the English section is modified. In what way?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is merely an extension of the time within which a creditor may prove his claim. If he has not proved it within the time prescribed he may apply to the court. The modification is this: We say: "within such further time;" the English Act says, I think: "within sixty days."

On section 37, subsection (9),—no action for dividend:

Mr. JACOBS: What is the meaning of this subsection?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not clear as to the meaning of that; I ask that this subsection stand.

Subsection (9) stands.

On section 40, subsection (1)—remuneration of trustee:

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: Provision is made in the Act that general meetings may be called by the trustee at any time he thinks fit, or by order of the inspectors. In the notice calling the meeting, it is not necessary for the trustee to specify the purpose for which the meeting is being called. A couple of creditors attend and vote whatever remuneration to the trustee they see fit. In such an important matter as this, proper notice should be given to the creditors of the purpose for which the meeting is called. I would ask the Solicitor General to consider this subsection with a view of drafting an amendment to provide for such notice.

Mr. GUTHRIE: At the first meeting of creditors there is generally a fairly good representation of creditors, and general directions are given for the management or winding up of the estate. At that time no one knows what the estate is going to realize or what amount of trouble the trustee will have; consequently, the remuneration of the trustee is seldom fixed at the first meeting of creditors. The difficulty is to get an attendance of creditors at all at the next meeting; the dividend as a rule, is so small that there is no inducement to them to come. In general practice the first meeting is the only meeting of creditors; the subsequent meetings are meetings of inspectors. This section provides that the creditors, or, in default of the creditors. the inspectors, may decide the amount of the trustee's remuneration. This provision is almost identical with the Ontario Act in respect to assignments and preferences. If we were sure that the creditors would attend and that a majority would vote the salary or remuneration, all well and good; but they will not attend.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: Subsection (2) provides that the remuneration of a trustee shall be limited to five per cent. If he wants to get more than five per cent he should get it at a meeting at which a majority of the creditors are represented. If he wants to get that extra remuneration he must arrange that the creditors be present at that meeting in person or by proxy, and those creditors should know what they are to vote for. Otherwise, he will get the remuneration fixed by the Act.

Mr. FRIPP: This matter dealt with in this clause has been the subject of a great deal of—shall I say—malfeasance in office by assignees and inspectors. In my experi-

ence, assignees and inspectors sit down and simply vote themselves a large remuneration. The creditors, as the Solicitor-General has said, in anticipation of a small dividend, do not pay much attention to the matter. We hould curb the generosity to themselves of these gentlemen. The words "or of any creditor" should be struck out so that the subsection will read:

The trustee in bankruptcy or in authorized assignment proceedings shall receive such remuneration as shall be voted to him by the creditors at any general meeting, or by the inspectors in case the creditors fail to provide therefor, subject to review by the court upon application of the trustee.

I would like to see the court review the remuneration which the trustee is to get.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why should not the creditor apply for a review by the court?

Mr. FRIPP: In practice, the creditor does not apply, and we have to protect the creditor against excessive charges on the part of the trustee or his inspectors.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is what this clause proposes to do. If the creditors vote too much to the trustee, a single creditor may go to the court and say that it is too much.

Mr. FRIPP: I want to put the boot on the other foot. I want the trustee to satisfy the court, whether the creditor takes any action or not, that the remuneration which he votes to himself or receives by the assistance of the inspector is a proper one. The remuneration should have the approval of the court before it is payable for the very reason suggested by the Solicitor General—that the creditors do not pay any particular attention to the estate after the assignment has been made. It is all left to the inspectors, and the inspectors are very often appointed by the trustee himself, in this way: The trustee, or the assignee as we now call him, having a majority of the creditors' claims in his hands, writes to the creditors or gets their proxies and appoints John Brown and William Smith, friends of his, as inspectors. Very often it is a conspiracy between the assignee and inspectors to pay themselves large fees which they have not earned. I want the trustee to satisfy the court, in the absence of any action taken by the creditors themselves, that his remuneration is reasonable.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Suppose the creditors or the inspectors say to the trustee: "We are going to give you a very small amount." Why should he not have the right to go to the court? The creditors may give too much or too little. I think the remedy should be reciprocal; if either party is dissatisfied, let him have the matter reviewed by the court. I do not anticipate any difficulty, because the next section, I think, will be the guiding section.

Mr. LOGGIE: The point made by the hon. member for Royal (Mr. McLean), I think, is well taken. Many creditors may not be present at the meeting at which the remuneration is fixed, as they may not have known the matter was coming up. Would it not be well to provide for notice being given that the matter of remuneration will be considered at the meeting?

Mr. NESBITT: I quite agree that the notice should state that the remuneration will be considered at the meeting, but I would not like to see the trustee bound to get a majority value of the creditors there, because in many cases it might be impossible. If they took any interest in the matter, the notice would bring them. I think the majority of the creditors present should have the right to fix the remuneration. As to the contention that the creditors should not be allowed to appeal to the court, I think they should; the trustee should also be allowed to appeal if he thinks his remuneration unsatisfactory.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know that the inspector should have anything to say about the remuneration of the trustee. I think the subsection would be improved by striking out of line 20 the words "or by the inspectors in case the creditors fail to provide therefor."

Mr. FRIPP: There is another reason why the trustee, in the absence of any action taken by the creditors, should satisfy the court that his remuneration is reasonable. This Act is passed in the interest of the debtor as well as the creditor. Now the debtor is not protected unless the court passes on the remuneration.

Mr. McLEAN: The amendment seems quite satisfactory except that it does not provide for notice being given that the matter of remuneration will be discussed at the meeting. All hon. members seem to agree that that should be included.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I honestly think we are making a little too much out of this. The remuneration fixed by the creditors is subject to review by the court upon application of the trustee or of any creditor.

Mr. McLEAN: Our experience has been that in a number of cases, estates have

been robbed by the creditors giving too much.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 2—limited to 5 per cent:

Mr. JACOBS: I have received communications from various firms in Montreal who hope to be appointed trustees under this Act. They object to this section particularly, because it limits the remuneration to 5 per cent of the cash receipts. They represent that a small estate of $1,000 to $1,200, which may give them no end of trouble, would pay them only $50 or $60. They think the percentage should be increased, and I should be glad to get the opinion of the Committee on the matter.

Mr. MORPHY: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to discuss cutting down the percentage in the case of larger estates, I think the discussion would be worth while.

Mr. JACOBS: That is quite true.

Mr. PARENT: We are told that this Bill among other things seeks to reduce the cost of winding up companies. Under the Winding-Up Act the liquidator generally does not get as much as 5 per cent, particularly in real estate cases. In the city of Montreal the judge limits the fee of the liquidator of a real estate company to about 2½ per cent, while on moveable property he allows 5 per cent. This subsection allows 5 per cent for both real estate and moveable property, and if one of the objects of the Bill is to reduce the expenses of the proceedings, I do not think it is going very far in that direction. The courts in Montreal and Quebec are giving 2½ per cent on real estate, and I submit that this 5 per cent should be reduced to 2½ per cent.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This 5 per cent is only on the net cash and not on the value of the real estate. In most cases the real estate will be found to be heavily encumbered. If it is too much the court can reduce it under this clause.

Mr. PARENT: Not under this subsection.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It says:

> subject to review by the court but no application by the trustee to review the allowance shall be entertained unless the question of his remuneration has been brought before a meeting of creditors or inspectors before the preparation of the final dividend sheet.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the trustee get nothing at all?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think he gets anything unless the creditors vote it. He might have a lot of trouble and get no cash, and the creditors, I assume, would take that into consideration in fixing the remuneration.

Mr. MOWAT: Some estates are lean and some fat; he can take his chances.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General to line 27. "subject to review by the court." At whose instance shall the review be had? I suggest that it be provided that the review shall be at the instance of any party interested.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps we might make it at the instance of the debtor, or of the creditor, or of the trustee.

Mr. MORPHY: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But that is implied, is it not? That is what it means.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not see the use of subsection 2 of section 40, because subsection 1 covers the case completely. The clause says:

> Where the remuneration of the trustee has not been fixed under the next preceding subsection before the final dividend the trustee may insert in the final dividend sheet and retain as his remuneration, etc.—

Why not make it incumbent on him to have it fixed? That would obviate the difficulty we now have of attempting to fix what we consider proper remuneration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The difficulty in practice has been that the creditors did not meet and did not fix the remuneration. In our province I know of case after case where the assignee has gone to the judge, under the provisions of the Ontario Act, because the creditors have failed to fix his allowance. Under subsection 1 they have a right to do it, but if they do not the man cannot be deprived of all his allowance. Let him take his 5 per cent and if it is too much or too little it can be reviewed. As the hon. member for North Perth suggests, in the 27th line, after the word "court," we might add the words "upon application of any creditor, of the debtor, or of the trustee." I move that the subsection be amended accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PARENT: Here there is likely to be trouble. The clause reads:

That it shall be subject to review by the court but no application by the trustee to review the allowance shall be entertained unless the question of his remuneration has been brought before a meeting of creditors or inspectors.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The words "or inspectors" ought to be struck out of line 30. I move that they be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On Section 40, subsection 3—Disbursements to be taxed.

Mr. PARENT: Who is the authorized official?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The taxing officer has not been appointed, but the general rule provides for a suitable taxing officer, probably the registrar of the court. That is a matter of procedure.

On Section 42, subsection 3—Meeting of creditors by request.

Mr. H. H. McLEAN: As the Solicitor General has pointed out, at the first meeting the creditors are generally represented, but at subsequent meetings there are only a very small number of creditors. Would it not be advisable to provide that the trustees shall specify in the notice the purpose for which the meeting is called and the business to be transacted?

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a good deal of difficulty about notices of creditors' meetings. The question arises of what may and may not be discussed, and you very often find that the meeting has gone a little beyond the notice. It is something that opens the door to litigation, because the notice may not be specific enough in naming the business to be transacted. I would prefer to allow the notice to be general in character. The creditors know there are only a limited number of things to be brought before the meeting which can affect them. They have a right to attend and hear everything discussed, and if they do not they take the risk.

I would not be too specific in this notice.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 7—adjournment:

Mr. JACOBS: This subsection reads:

(7) If within half an hour from the time appointed for the meeting a quorum of creditors is not present or represented, the meeting shall be adjourned to the same day in the following week at the same time and place, or to such other day as the chairman may appoint, not being less than seven nor more than twenty-one days. (Eng. Sch. I No. 25.)

[Mr. Parent.]

Why say " to the same day and following week "?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have taken these rules exactly from the English procedure.

Mr. JACOBS: The last part of the subsection renders the first nugatory.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think so.

Mr. MORPHY: I would think that "after" would be preferable to "from" in the first line.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would not like to change the wording of the English sections if we can avoid it. Most of them have been judicially interpreted. If you change a word you are going to change the effect of the section.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 9—right of creditor to vote:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Subsection 9 provides that:

A person shall not be entitled to vote as a creditor at the first or any other meeting of creditors unless he has duly proved a debt provable in bankruptcy or under an authorized assignment to be due to him from the debtor, and the proof has been duly lodged with the trustee before the time appointed for the meeting.

Section 6 of the Act provides for the appointment of a trustee and the majority of the creditors at the meeting appoint the trustee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not see how these two sections harmonize.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The trustee is appointed by the assignment. The assignment is to the official trustee and then the creditors confirm or revoke it. When the debtor makes a statutory declaration he has a right to vote at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But section 6 provides that the trustee is the man who gets a majority of the votes of the creditors at the meeting.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, the trustee is the man authorized by this Act to receive the assignment, and to whom the assignment has indeed been made.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I understand that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Section 6 provides that if the creditors so desire they may remove, or confirm him. Section 6 applies where there is no assignment but where there is an application in the court and a receiving order is made.

Subsection 9 agreed to.

On section 43, subsection 2—appointment of inspectors revocation and remuneration:

Mr. JACOBS: Subsection 2 provides that:

The powers of inspectors may be exercised by a majority of them.

I would suggest that the clause be amended by adding, after the words "majority of them" the following words: "at a regular meeting called for that purpose." I remember that in my own practice a few years ago where the majority of the inspectors decided upon a certain line of action but not at a meeting held. A resolution was prepared and sent around to the various inspectors. Three of them signed, two of them failed to sign and the court held that inasmuch as no meeting was called for that purpose the resolution was void. I think that was a good judgment, and in order to avoid any such contingency under this Act I think it might be well to make clear that the inspectors must meet in order to come to a decision.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What are the words you suggest?

Mr. JACOBS: My suggestion is to add after the words "majority of them" the words "at a regular meeting called for that purpose."

Mr. GUTHRIE: For what purpose?

Mr. JACOBS: Or, I would move that after the words "majority of them" the following words be inserted "at a meeting of such inspectors."

Mr. MORPHY: I think it is not likely to improve the operation of the Act to have it so restricted. If inspectors were a thousand miles away they should be able, by telegraph, to send their consent to a meeting and also their views.

Mr. JACOBS: There ought not to be inspectors a thousand miles away.

Mr. MORPHY: I would suggest that the hon. gentleman proposes the additional words "at a regular meeting called for that purpose." I would suggest the addition of "or by writing under their hand."

Mr. JACOBS: The point that was made in the case I referred to was that had the inspectors presented their views they might have been able to influence the other inspectors to adopt those views. You cannot arrive at unanimity of opinion or arrive at any opinion unless you have the parties together. The case went to the court of review and the decision was maintained.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps we might give further consideration to the clause. I would like to have gone on with the Bill to-night, but I am sorry that I shall not be able to be present. I would be obliged if the Committee would agree to rise now and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. JACOBS: When shall we take up the consideration of the Bill again?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Early next week; whatever day will suit hon. members will be satisfactory to me.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The House in Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

CANADIAN WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION.

Bill No. 45, respecting the incorporation of the National Wholesale Grocers' Association of Canada—Mr. Sheard.

On section 1—Incorporation:

Mr. ROBB: Before that carries, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the mover of the Bill would explain the amendments.

Mr. J. D. REID: The member in whose name the Bill stands is not here. I would ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. STEELE: Mr. Chairman, the second section describes pretty fully the objects of the Bill. It came before the Private Bills Committee recently. The Bill had been submitted to the law officers and also to the Department of the Secretary of State, and the committee scrutinized it very carefully. We made some amendments, and we believe that in the shape in which it is now presented to the House there can be little objection taken to it. However, if it is desired to go into details perhaps it would be better to let the Bill stand.

Mr. ROBB: Does the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee say that this Bill was passed by the committee unanimously?

Mr. STEELE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 12—committees of inquiry:

The CHAIRMAN: Section 11 has been struck from the Bill. Section 12 becomes section 11, the following words beginning in the thirty-seventh line having been deleted:

upon oath (which oath any member of said committee is hereby empowered to administer).

Section agreed to.

On section 13—Restraint of trade:

The CHAIRMAN: A new section has been added to the Bill as No. 13:

Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to authorize any action that will operate in restraint of trade.

Section agreed to.

On section 12.

The CHAIRMAN: The title has been amended to read:

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to bring to the notice of the Government section 12, as it appears to me to be an innovation:

The association may, by by-law or resolution, provide for the appointment of committees of inquiry to inquire into any matter affecting the manufacturing, import, export, as well as internal or domestic interests of Canada, as affecting the grocery trade, and such committees may examine upon oath (which oath any member of said committee is hereby empowered to administer) any party who appears before them, and the evidence so taken may be used to assist the association in arriving at a decision with reference to the matter under consideration.

Heretofore all such public matters have been dealt with under the provisions of the Public Inquiries Act, and the Government has the right at any time to appoint a commission, and many such commissions have been appointed. This is the first time in our history, so far as I know, that we have empowered a private concern to establish a commission to go all over the country examining people upon oath.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. member that that clause has been slightly amended. The words: "upon oath (which oath any member of said committee is hereby empowered to administer)" had been struck out by the Committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the "oath" remains there all the same.

Mr. McKENZIE: Even so I wish to discharge my duty by bringing it to the notice of the Government, as it is an innovation and something which should not exist.

[Mr. Steele]

No body of merchants have any business in their own private interest to make inquiries of this kind or to put any one on oath. The Government is responsible for all legislation that goes through this House whether private or otherwise, and I submit that it should not allow this section to pass.

Mr. ROWELL: The matter had not been drawn to the attention of the Government before. I agree with my hon. friend that it is quite an unusual provision in the case of the charter of a private corporation, and I think the Bill had better stand in Committee until the Government has had an opportunity to consider this section.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 56 (from the Senate) for the relief of Eva St. Lawrence Cronk.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 57 (from the Senate) for the relief of Helena Clara Gabriel.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill No. 58 (from the Senate) for the relief of Gretna Harris Hawkins.—Mr. Mackie (Edmonton).

Bill No. 59 (from the Senate) for the relief of Samuel Burgoyne.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 60 (from the Senate) for the relief of James Arthur McGregor.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 61 (from the Senate) for the relief of William Lewes Evans.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 62 (from the Senate) for the relief of Richard Wilson Crashley.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate) for the relief of Gladys Agnes Wilson Hawkins.—Mr. Jacobs.

SUPPLY.

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Post Office Department—Salaries, including Deputy Minister at $6,000, H. B. Verret, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General at $4,500; Superintendent Mail Contract Branch at $5,000, Controller Railway Mail Service, Controller Postal Stores and Superintendent of Staff Branch, at $4,000 each, $979,770.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé): When the House adjourned on Wednesday preceding the Easter recess, it was understood that on going into Supply on the Post Office Estiates we would discuss the principle of the motion I had introduced earlier in the session concerning certain amendments to the Post Office Act, the desirability of which is only too apparent. In order that my hon. friend (Mr. Rowell) may appreciate the situation, I shall first of all read what the

hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), minister of I don't know what department, said on that occasion in answer to my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Sinclair) and myself:

I should like to have the opportunity of giving consideration to this matter and of bringing it before my colleagues and if my hon. friend will bring up the subject again, say on the Post Office Estimates, I should then be in a position to give the view of the Government.

So I avail myself of this opportunity of discussing with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) this important question of enacting more drastic legislation respecting the daily and the weekly press, periodicals, etc.

This question came up on various occasions before the western conventions last year and two years ago. Indeed, the resolution which I put on the Order Paper was simply a copy of the resolution which had been adopted by the Grain Growers of Alberta, if I mistake not. It read as follows:

That in the opinion of this House all newspapers, magazines, trade journals and other periodicals publishing articles designed to influence public opinion shall be compelled from time to time to publish sworn statements setting forth the names of the owners, managers, editors, stockholders, bondholders and of any other person having an interest in such newspaper magazine, trade journal or other periodical.

We all realize that the press in this and every other country wields an enormous power. Indeed, when one can control the press, he may to a certain extent control for the time being public opinion. The weapon is a most dangerous one. It may constitute a beneficent power provided it is not corrupt. Unfortunately, in this country, as in the United States and in some countries of Europe, not excepting England, the press has not always lived up to its primary function, which is to enlighten public opinion and to exercise a proper control over the several constituencies. The other day when I brought this matter before the House I gave as an example of the evil influence of lax legislation in regard to the press the camouflaging of a paper by its proprietor in such a way as to make it appear to be speaking for one party whilst it was really speaking for the opposite party. That has actually happened in the good city of Montreal in the case of the Montreal Herald, a century-old paper, which has had for its directors and editors the most remarkable writers of the English-speaking minority in Lower Canada,—a history of the last century could not be made complete without referring to the files of the Montreal Herald. It so happened that during a period of at least fifty years the Montreal Herald was the accredited organ of the English-speaking Liberal minority in the province of Quebec. It had, besides, a large constituency outside of Montreal, and with the exception of the Montreal Witness, which was by far the most respectable paper we had in this country, it wielded perhaps the greatest influence.

Unfortunately it fell into the hands of a certain Mr. Brierly, who obtained control of it through tricks that were mean and ways that were dark, and after the elections of 1911, as it was perhaps easier to swim with the current, he made a bargain with the managers of the Tory party, into whose hands it passed, although for a while it kept the appearance of its primeval honesty and virginity, and the change of ownership was known but by few. It was heralded as the organ of the Liberal party in the district of Montreal. Some of us know that some very prominent gentlemen in the Tory party had control of it, but the paper masqueraded as a Liberal organ. Finally it passed directly into the hands of Mr. McGibbon, a prominent Conservative in the district of Montreal, who had some tramway and power schemes of his own. But he thought it was more profitable for him to sell the paper outright to Lord Atholstan, then Sir Hugh Graham. Sir Hugh Graham, who is a keen business man, did not want in the field any rival of the Montreal Star, and therefore considered it politic to maintain the Montreal Herald as an ostensible rival, the Herald getting the skim milk and the Star the cream. The Star was the organ of the Conservative party and had a large circulation, while the Herald was as insignificant as a paper could be. It published four pages, while the Star issued twenty-five, thirty and forty pages. Yet that lean and insignificant journal, the Herald, was represented as the organ of the Liberal party. Some of us, though only a few, knew perfectly well that the Herald was the property of Sir Hugh Graham. But, sometimes the saying "there is honour among thieves" is falsified, and a case before the criminal court in Montreal gave us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and it was proven that the Star and the Herald were the property of Lord Atholstan and that the Herald was kept in the field merely as a camouflage, and that it was not the organ of the Liberal party but the instrument by which Lord Atholstan endeavoured to pre-

vent any other enterprising journalist from establishing a paper in the interests of the honest Liberal party in Quebec. I may say that since then the Herald has been released, so to speak, and has become the property of Mr. Leithead, who wrote me the other day protesting against the suggestion that the Herald was the property of any other person than himself, and affirming that it was now really an independent journal. I must give him the benefit of his declaration; I believe it is now an independent paper. I have read it since Mr. Leithead became the owner, and I do not think it has any more connections with its former proprietor, Lord Atholstan. This merely to show the tricks that can be played on the public by some enterprising gentlemen, and how dangerous a weapon a newspaper may become in the hands of an unscrupulous editor.

I have another case in mind. In 1904 my hon. friends' friends, Mackenzie and Mann, undertook to defeat the Laurier Government, and the first thing they did was to obtain the control of a certain paper in Montreal having a large circulation, which fact was pretty well known. But this evil is not peculiar to Canada. I am sorry to say that in England it prevails and has been detected. I have a pamphlet published in the United States, and it should not be necessary to refer to it because the facts to which I shall allude are well known to every member of the Committee. We all know that during the last general elections in Great Britain the great "dope" or Cellulose scandal was uncovered, and a close investigation of that scandal might perhaps have caused some heartburnings in Great Britain on the part of several gentlemen of world repute. The London Chronicle was one of the old standard papers of Great Britain. Its influence, moral and otherwise, was very great, and its editor Mr. Robert Donald—a good Scotch name—enjoyed the highest reputation throughout the continent. Indeed, his articles and reviews of current events were read in every Chancellery on the continent. But one morning the world was aprised of startling facts. On October 5, 1918, the London Globe announced that Lord Beaverbrook, whose friends were hopelessly involved in the scandal, had been trying to buy the Chronicle for some time, and that the alleged purchaser, Sir Henry Dalziel, represented him and others. The immediate resignation, October 5, of Mr. Robert Donald, who for twenty years had been managing editor and for seven years managing director of the Chronicle, following his exposure of the Walter Long-Colonel Grant Morden, or Marden, letter and its bearing on the "dope" scandal, astonished all Fleet street, yet no reference to the "dope" scandal has been published in America in connection with the sale of the Chronicle.

The New York Times, October 5, the date of the sale, published the following comparatively innocent cable dispatch from London:

> Commenting on the sale of the Daily Chronicle, the Westminster Gazette points out that the sale of the newspaper cannot be considered on the same level as the sale of a butter business, as men who can command millions have learned how they can use these millions to sway public opinion. The London Globe says widespread regret will be felt beyond the confines of Fleet Street at the news of the sale. We do not even know who the new proprietors are, though some time ago it was stated that the ubiquitous Lord Beaverbrook was endeavouring to acquire our contemporary.
>
> We nevertheless sincerely regret the transaction because under the editorship of Robert Donald the Daily Chronicle has acquired a remarkable position as a fearless and independent organ representing the best side of liberalism, while rigidly avoiding infection and defeatism, and subordinating every minor issue to victory.
>
> The Chronicle has been fearless in attacking financial scandals in which prominent politicians were implicated. The National News sees in the transfer a disquieting attack on the influence and independence of the press.
>
> The Editor and Publisher (New York), October 19, 1919, in a statement dated London, October 16, declares: "Announcement of the purchase of the London Daily Chronicle coming without any preliminary indication, caused the biggest sensation in Fleet Street since the announcement of Lord Northcliffe's coup giving him possession of the Times. Negotiations for the transfer were conducted so quietly that even Robert Donald was completely surprised by the announcement. He resigned immediately."

You can see that even in old merrie England, so Conservative in her traditions, so honourable in her transactions, there are, as unfortunately there have been in the United States and in Canada as well, editors who will sell their pens for a mess of pottage. I drew the attention of the House the other day to the evil influence which to my mind such a state of affairs can produce in the country. It creates demoralization and it certainly leads to revolution. If the plain people of this country begin to realize that the press can be bought, as it has been bought, they will also believe that the public men can be bought and can be controlled. It is an evil day for Canada when that impression gains ground and, unfortunately, it has gained ground.

I have said fearlessly and I repeat this evening it was a scandal that on one given day, and before the elections of 1917, the whole of the Liberal press in the province of Ontario made a right about turn.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are honourable exceptions. I have one in my mind especially; the London Advertiser remained true to its traditions, and there are others. What has disgusted the public, Mr. Chairman, and made it apprehensive and what has caused it to believe that this is really a true state of affairs, is that at the same time Sir Clifford Sifton and Mackenzie and Mann were closeted at the Chateau Laurier here in Ottawa and Parliament was rushing through the Canadian Northern deal. It was passed under closure because these things must be expedited, and they were expedited.

Mr. HOCKEN: The hon. gentleman mentions the change in the press of Ontario. Does he want the Committee to understand that it was due to corruption?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has listened to what I have said. I think I have been more severe even than the statement he is making now. I think he is very mild. Would you believe, Mr. Chairman, that in a certain city not far from Ottawa, where certain papers had in their constituencies Liberals and Conservatives alike, Liberal candidates were obliged to pay for the report of a political meeting? At that particular moment the whole of the press of Canada was plastered with placards insulting the late leader of the Liberal party, and insulting his native province, in order to stir up the feelings of the people of Canada for the "unity" of the Dominion. Who paid for these advertisements? Who paid, Mr. Chairman? We know just half of the truth. My hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) has found that the amount expended by the Government on newspaper advertising since August 4, 1915, is $2,099,048.44, as follows:—

Amount expended by Government on newspaper advertising since August 4, 1915:

Department of Agriculture	$ 85,433.79
Department of Auditor General	6,822.16
Civil Service Commission	1,759.42
Under Secretary of State	4,634.46
Department of External Affairs	745.29
Department of Finance	710,947.56
Department of Indian Affairs	8,431.64
Department of Inland Revenue	86.48
Department of Interior	185,576.94
Department of Justice	172,428.41
Department of Labour	423.44
Department of Marine	14,967.49
Department of Militia and Defence	73,077.52
Department of Mounted Police	$ 3,328.26
Department of Naval Service	32,432.91
Department of Postmaster General	75,535.74
Department of Public Works	64,489.21
Department of Printing and Stationery	123.38
Department of Railways and Canals	9,400.63
Department of Secretary of State	5,490.72
Department of Trade and Commerce	16,304.72
Department of Immigration and Colonization	622,951.03
Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment	3,607.24
	$2,099,048.44

Mr. J. D. REID: In how many years?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Since August 4, 1915, and before 1917. We only know half the truth yet. We do not know what has been paid by Order in Council. We do not know what amount has been spent by the President of the Privy Council in his new department.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Will the hon. gentleman give us a specific instance of the wrong advertising which has been carried on so that we may get a clear grip of the situation?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have a collection of the placards which were so freely plastered in all the newspapers of Canada with the exception of those of one province. I keep those placards as a memento for future generations and for future reference. If my hon. friend, who is fair-minded, were to read to-day what was published in the press of Canada during the months that preceded the elections in 1917, he would blush with shame for his country, because he loves Canada as I do. Do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is a pleasure for me to bring this matter before the Committee and before the country. I am doing my duty as a public man and doing it fearlessly, knowing that I shall probably receive, as I have already received, an avalanche of attacks from the press of this country. But we are not here to exchange bouquets only; we are here to speak the truth and nothing but the truth; and I want the Canadian Parliament to do what the United States Congress has done, in order, if possible, to put a stop to such a state of things in the interests of the good name of Canada. Now what is the privilege enjoyed by the press of Canada? By chapter 9 of the Statute 45 Victoria, we give the newspapers and the periodicals of this country a very great privilege. Let me read the preamble and the first clause of that statute:

To encourage and facilitate the dissemination of useful information in Canada, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

(1) On and after the first day of June in the present year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, newspapers and periodicals printed and published in Canada, mailed by the publisher in the post office at the place where they are published and addressed to regular subscribers or news dealers in Canada, resident elsewhere than in the place of publication, shall be transmitted by mail to their respective addresses free of postage: Provided, that in order to be entitled to such free transmission, the publication for which it is claimed must conform to the following conditions:—

1. It must be known and recognized as a newspaper or periodical in the generally received sense of the word, and published regularly at intervals of not more than one month:

2. The full title, place and date of publication, and the distinguishing number of the issue must be printed at the top of the first page, and also on any paper purporting to be a supplement to it, and sent with it:

3. It must be addressed to a bona fide subscriber, or to a known newsdealer in Canada.

In the same Statute the powers of the Postmaster General for preventing an evasion of the said conditions are enumerated. It will be apparent that the press obtains at the expense of the public exchequer a very important privilege. If we wish to mail a newspaper to a friend it will cost us one cent—during the period of the war that postage has been two cents—but a newspaper can mail a paper to one of its subscribers free of postage. Now let us see what that privilege means in dollars and cents. My hon. friend (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) put certain questions on the Order Paper not long ago, and those questions were answered as follows:

1. What was the gross postal revenue derived from newspapers for the year 1918?

A. $291,539.21.

2. What is the estimated expenditure for the same year in so far as newspapers are concerned?

A. The department has no data on which a close estimate of the expenditure involved in handling newspapers can be made, except that newspapers make up about sixty-five per cent of the bulk of the mails. The total expenditure for the carriage of mails and the cost of mail bags during the fiscal year 1918 is $8,293,515.24.

3. What is the average daily weight of newspapers carried in the mails?

A. 239,731 pounds.

Now, sixty-five per cent of the total cost amounts to $5,390,784, and we only received from the newspapers $291,539. If this sum is subtracted from the other amount it will be seen that the press of Canada is very heavily indebted to the exchequer of this country, and we therefore have the right to expect that that press will respect the privilege which is given to it by this Parliament. What has been done in the United States, where they have suffered from the same evil? In the country to the south they have adopted the following law, of which my resolution is practically a synopsis:

9 p.m.

That it shall be the duty of the editor, publisher, business manager, or owner of every newspaper, magazine periodical or other publication to file with the Postmaster General and the postmaster at the office at which said publication is entered, not later than the first day of April and the first day of October of each year, on blanks furnished by the Post Office Department, a sworn statement setting forth the names and post office addresses of the editor and managing editor, publisher, business managers, and owners, and, in addition, the stockholders, if the publication be owned by a corporation; and also the names of known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders; and also, in the case of daily newspapers, there shall be included in such statement the average of the number of copies of each issue of such publication sold or distributed to paid subscribers during the preceding six months:

And there is a proviso that this drastic law shall not apply to religious, fraternal, temperance and scientific publications. But the United States Congress went even further and exacted from every newspaper editor that:

All editorial or other reading matter published in any such newspaper, magazine or periodical, for the publication of which money or other valuable consideration is paid, accepted or promised, shall be plainly marked "advertisement." Any editor or publisher printing editorial or other reading matter for which compensation is paid, accepted or promised, without so marking the same, shall, upon conviction in any court having jurisdiction, be fined not less than $50 nor more than $500.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the two amendments which were made to the post office laws in the United States to cure the press of that country of the gangrene which there, as here, was infecting its vitals. Is there any fair-minded gentleman in this House who has the honour of his country at heart, and respects his fellow citizens of whatever creed, race or political affiliation, who will object to similar legislation here?

In my younger days I was a journalist myself, and I compare an editor to a school teacher—and when I look at my good friend from Toronto (Mr. Hocken) I am inclined to say that I compare him to a preacher, for, indeed, he was a preacher during the last general election. The editor of the Orange Sentinel was not satisfied with writing vitriolic, evangelical editorials against French Canadians and Roman

Catholics, but he had to take the pulpit and preach to the faithful in the name of the Lord in order to retain in power the masters of the Administration,—Sir Joseph Flavelle, Sir Clifford Sifton and Mackenzie and Mann. I remember an incident mentioned in the history of the French Revolution, Mr. Chairman. A lady who played an important part in that revolution, Madame Roland, was, like many others, sent to the guillotine—as perhaps, if the wave of Bolshevism reaches Canada many editors will be. On her way to the guillotine as she passed near the statue of Liberty she stopped for one moment, and, bowing reverently before the statue, exclaimed, "O Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" And when I read that the editor of the Orange Sentinel and my good friend the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), addressed the faithful from the pulpit in Toronto, I paraphrased the words of Madame Roland: O Religion, how many crimes are committed in thy name! Indeed, the press and pulpit during the last general election were strong for the Tory party, but I notice of late that some of the millionaire Methodists of Toronto are protesting against the Methodist church issuing a political platform. Mr. Parsons delivered an address the other day and said: "I will take my religion from the conference, but not my politics on the tariff issue; and if I am going to be lectured by my minister on the tariff issue, well, I may not continue a member of the church." It is the old story, Mr. Chairman,—the chickens are coming home to roost.

But I am asking seriously if any one would oppose the amendments which I suggest by this resolution. Once more I say that the editor is to be compared to the schoolmaster. The school-master is surrounded by the most drastic legislation so that he may be worthy of his class and his students imbibe what really education should give to them. And the editor should be as closely safeguarded by Parliament—protected, so to speak, against himself, and thereby his constituency, the larger class, the public, also protected. The United States have declared that the backers of newspapers shall be known; and if we had had similar legislation here, when Lord Atholstan got control of a newspaper in Montreal the public would know that it was he and not Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party. I hope the Government will accept my resolution and will bring down during the present session the necessary legislation to cure an evil which, unfortunately, exists in Canada to-day.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I had the honour of seconding the motion when this question was up for discussion in the House a few days ago, and I may be permitted to say a few words in reference to it. What is asked for is publicity, and it seems to me that there can be no reasonable objection to the acceptance of the proposal of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux).

We were crowded for time to discuss this question when it was brought up just before the Easter holidays, and the acting minister then suggested that the present would be the appropriate time to deal with it because it would involve an amendment to the Post Office Act. The chief reason, I suppose, for making the proposed regulation an amendment to the Post Office Act is the convenience of enforcing it. The owners or publishers who refused to comply with that regulation could be deprived of the use of the mails. I do not say that the press of this country is mercenary; I have a little more respect for it than that. But some very sudden conversions have taken place especially in Western Canada and have not been clearly explained. We have it on the authority of an ex-minister of the Crown, a very prominent man in this House and in this country who has had large experience, as a member of this Government, that there is such a thing as "sweetening" the press. In Nova Scotia, at the last general election, we had a fund which was popularly known as the "slush fund." It was in the hands of a prominent gentleman in Halifax who supported the Unionist movement and was available to any newspaper in Nova Scotia that would publish Unionist propaganda in its editorial columns. Large rates were offered to the newspapers for this purpose, and while some of the old Liberal newspapers remained true to their allegiance, others of them yielded to the temptation and accepted the money. This fund, I understand, was not confined to Nova Scotia; it was common to the whole Dominion. It would be very interesting to know where this "slush fund" came from and how much it amounted to—but we have not yet been told. I do not think it can be successfully denied that a great many of the newspapers have abandoned their time-honoured place of the defenders of the interests of the public and have become mere organs of the present Government. They are no longer newspapers but merely party

organs, they do not even tell the public the things that happen. If you read the accounts of what takes place in this Chamber, you will find that very little is made public that reflects on the Government, and that many things are omitted that ought to be reported. Of course, that may occasionally be accidental, but it is very marked in the case of certain newspapers that are supporting the present Administration. I think it was last autumn that some ministers made a trip to the Pacific coast and certain things happened out there, at Vancouver and elsewhere, that found no place in the eastern newspapers. We discovered them later, but they were not among the press despatches. Very little publicity was given to the disclosures that were made at St. Johns Quebec, last summer; they were hardly mentioned in many of the prominent eastern newspapers supporting the Union Government. The speech of my late honoured leader at London, Ontario, was not reported in the eastern papers; and that was a very marked incident. A few weeks after that, an interview given by Hon. Walter Scott in which he announced that he was withdrawing his support from the Union Government did not appear in many of the eastern papers. Now, there was a time when things like this did not happen; when these items would be welcome as a matter of news, but at the present time in many newspapers matters of that kind are suppressed.

There also appears to be a great reluctance on the part of the Government to give to the members of the House information in regard to money that has been paid to newspapers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) drew attention to the fact that during the last few years over $2,000,000 had been paid out to Canadian newspapers in advertising—and that is not at all a complete statement. He mentioned also the fact that the country is every year contributing some $5,000,000 for carrying the newspapers in the mails. We are contributing $50,000 per year to the Press Association. The statement was made by the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) a few days ago that a million and a half dollars were being contributed to the publishers by the manufacturers of paper under some regulation made by the present Administration with regard to the price of print paper. So that it would appear that we are making very large concessions to the press, and that gives us a right to demand publicity in regard to the ownership of the newspapers.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

I said that there was a great deal of reluctance on the part of the Government to give information in regard to the payment of money to the newspapers. When an hon. gentleman asks a simple question regarding the amount of money that has been expended for any special purpose, he naturally expects a prompt answer; but he does not get that kind of answer when the question relates to the amount of money paid to the press. Let me give you a few instances. On March 31, the member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) put the following question:

> During the year ending March 26, 1919, what amounts were paid by the Government for advertising to the following papers: Dundalk Herald, Flesherton Advance, Markdale Standard, Durham Chronicle, Hanover Post, and Grey (Durham) Review?

Now, that is a very simple question, and you would expect the minister to instruct one of his clerks to find out how much money had been paid to these small newspapers, and to give the answer. But he does not do that; he puts it down as an order for return. That is only a sample brick. Some time ago the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) asked the following question:

> What amount was paid to the Ottawa Journal and the Ottawa Journal-Press for Government printing, advertising and job work from 1896 to 1911 inclusive?
>
> What amounts were paid to the Ottawa Journal and the Ottawa Journal-Press for Government printing, advertising and job work in each of the years: 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

That also was put down as an order for return. Then, take another. On March 19, the member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) asked the following question:

> What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Halifax Herald for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

That also was put down as an order for return. The same day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Proulx) asked what amount had been paid by the Government to the Toronto News for printing and advertising; this also was put down as an order for return. He inquired also what amount had been paid by the Government to the Toronto Mail and Empire for printing and advertising during five fiscal years, and that also was put down as an order for return. The Orders of the Day are full of cases of that kind. Information regarding the amounts paid out in connection with the Victory Loan was also denied to the House.

Mr. BURRELL: It must be quite obvious to my hon. friend why information of this kind should be submitted in the form of a return rather than in the form of a question. It involves replies to a series of questions concerning all departments of Government, of which there are a great many, covering a number of years and requiring a great deal of time to prepare. The information has not been delayed unnecessarily at all, but rather expedited. The answers to the questions with regard to the Halifax Herald and Mail have already been laid on the Table. I am sure my hon. friend will recollect that the practice in Parliament has always been in cases of this kind to ask for an order for a return.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think my hon. friend will say that it is purely a coincidence that every one of these questions has been put down as an order for a return. Some of these returns come very slowly. Questions were asked last session, more than a year ago, which were put down as orders for returns and have not been answered yet. Some of the questions asked covered a period of years, and others one year only; but in every case the Government denied us the information. The only explanation I can think of is that the Government are aware they have been paying altogether too much money to the papers. They have been attempting to corrupt the press—I do not say they have succeeded—and they are very anxious to conceal the facts. But I do not propose to discuss that phase of the question further.

My main purpose in rising is to ask the minister to consider the reasonableness of the proposal of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve. There are many reasons that could be urged in favour of accepting this proposal, and there is no strong reason against it. The proprietor who is conducting a respectable newspaper is doing a splendid work, and he will be glad to let the public know that he is the owner of such a paper. The man who is conducting a yellow journal that he is not very proud of, and which takes a course that cannot be approved by the public, will naturally want to conceal his identity; but we are not interested in a man like that. The proposal is a progressive one and ought to be accepted by the Government. It will increase the respect for truth. Slipshod exaggerated and untrue statements do more than anything else to destroy confidence in the press. If the ownership were made known, I submit that it would be a strong additional inducement to the proprietor to exercise care. It would tend to eliminate the influence of the mercenary press, or at all events to make it harmless, by removing the mask of secrecy and showing the proprietor in his true colours. It would elevate the tone of the press, and place an additional handicap on what is known as yellow journalism. I submit, therefore, that it is in the public interest that this proposal should be adopted by the Government, and I respectfully invite the minister now in charge of the Post Office Estimates in this House to give the proposal his most serious consideration.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): I should like to express my appreciation of the very high tribute paid to my versatility by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. He classes me as editor, school-teacher, and preacher. Now that is a pretty wide range of public activities for one individual, especially when he happens to be also a member of Parliament. I make no pretensions to being a preacher, Mr. Chairman. If I were in some isolated spot where a real preacher could not be found I might make a few moral remarks for the benefit of the inhabitants, but that is not my forte; it is something I have never cultivated. Perhaps my hon. friend will be pleased to know that on that single occasion when I did occupy the pulpit after the regular service I made quite a hit with the congregation, who told me afterwards that my remarks were very much to the point, and that as a consequence they thought Union Government would get more votes. That brief experience was not altogether unsatisfactory to myself, however the hon. member may regard it. Unfortunately, the collection was taken up before I spoke; they might have got a little more if they had not taken it up till after.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the text?

Mr. HOCKEN: My text was the preservation of civilization and liberty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By the Orange Sentinel.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is a text that might inspire any man, be he preacher or editor. I might say that I endeavoured to the best of my ability to use that text on the platform as well, when I had the assistance of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) who is no more adept at preaching than I am myself. I was interested to learn from the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) that $2,000,000 had been spent in advertising by the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: More, from what we know, but that is only half the truth.

Mr. HOCKEN: Perhaps he has forgotten that through the expenditure of that $2,000,000 this country was enabled to raise hundreds of millions of dollars in war loans, and to educate the people in regard to food control and many other things. It was a perfectly legitimate expenditure, and I deny absolutely that it was of such a character as to influence any newspaper one way or the other. I do not think it had the effect of "sweetening," as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) puts it, any newspaper in which these advertisements appeared. The hon. member for Maisonneuve couples that in a way with the expenditure in connection with the political campaign which is not altogether a fair thing to do, because they were from entirely different sources. I think those who were conducting the campaign prepared the copy for the newspapers, and it appeared very plainly as an advertisement. That was a commercial transaction in respect of which no complaints could be made against the newspapers; it was a perfectly legitimate and proper thing for the newspapers to do. In fact, some papers in our province printed one page favouring one party and another page favouring another—an amazing impartiality that perhaps other newspapers would have been just as willing to exercise if they had been offered the copy. There have been newspaper transactions in the city of Montreal, well known before they were revealed in the criminal court, which every person must condemn.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. HOCKEN: No person will condemn them more vigorously or more sincerely than the men who are actively connected with the press. The purchase of one newspaper by another newspaper proprietor, and the continuance of that newspaper supposedly as the mouthpiece of the party to which the proprietor is opposed, can only be described as something discreditable. At least it is something that no decent newspaper man would attempt to condone for a moment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Puck and Judge are both owned by one man.

Mr. HOCKEN: But they are not influencing political opinion in the same way as the paper mentioned by my hon. friend. My friend from Maisonneuve about three weeks ago made some general remarks about the newspapers of Ontario, and one of the principal papers there challenged him to name one Liberal journal in Ontario which declined to support the party in the last election and which had been bought. He has not named one, and will not. He will not name one outside of this House, and that is the test after all. I know that in my city the two principal Liberal newspapers—in fact there are only two daily Liberal newspapers there—are conducted by men of as much integrity as any hon. member. I know the men who publish both those newspapers, and up to 1917 they were as ardent Liberals as any man in Canada had been, and had rendered splendid service to the Liberal party. Their defection was not due to any "sweetening" nor to any purchase, but to the fact that they believed there was involved a principle which they had to maintain on their conviction. Any man who stands up and condemns a newspaperman for making a change of that kind because his convictions compelled him to do so, is guilty, I think, of an offence as bad as misrepresentation on the part of a paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend permit me to say something here?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not care to name any editor, but my friend is an hon. gentleman and whenever it pleases him to receive my confidence I will give him the name of a very prominent western journalist who, at the very time when the whole press was veering round, came to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's residence on Sunday and in my presence declared, with tears in his eyes that he had to quit the paper with which he was connected. That paper was published in the West, was a very prominent one and for many years had supported the Liberal party, but had just been acquired by a certain organization, and this man was told that unless he agreed to write against his leader and his party he would have to quit. I will give the name of that gentleman to my hon. friend whenever it pleases him to receive my confidence in this matter.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not know everything about the West—

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have given the precedent of the Herald.

Mr. HOCKEN: —but I am speaking for the newspapers of Ontario. Some things may happen two thousand miles away of which I do not profess to know everything.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Distance makes no difference; there is the telegraph.

Mr. HOCKEN: Was it the city of Toronto?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, sir; not in the city of Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Winnipeg?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Winnipeg, says my hon. friend. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are all intelligent men; at least we are elected as such. What will the ordinary elector of the West think when it is known that Sir Clifford Sifton is the owner of the Winipeg Free Press, which supported Reciprocity in 1911, when Sir Clifford Sifton was the principal instrument in the defeat of reciprocity? What will the ordinary elector think of the association of the two names? That is precisely why I am advocating this change in the law.

Mr. HOCKEN: I know that the defection of the principal papers in our province from the Liberal party in the last election was due absolutely to principle, and my information is that the same is true of practically every Liberal paper in Western Canada. We must remember that in the last election there was before the people of the country a question of principle that exceeded in importance any other in our history, and it is unjustifiable to condemn these men for a change in party allegiance at that time because they followed their patriotic impulses. The hon. member for Guysborough complains that the London speech of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not printed in the East. I do not know how far east of Ontario it was printed, but up our way the friends of the late Liberal leader complained that it was being printed too much. It was not only printed but reprinted in its essential parts, and its laudation of that noble race the German people, at the time they were devastating France and committing atrocities unparallelled in history, was something that the people in that part of the country did not want to see in print quite as often as it appeared. So that while my hon. friend from Guysborough may have a complaint against the papers in Nova Scotia I do not think he has any ground for complaint on that score as regards the papers in Ontario.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is my hon. friend opposed to the proposal to amend the Post Office Act as indicated by the resolution?

Mr. HOCKEN: I thought I would leave that for my peroration. I want to say a word for the newspapers, because there are not many newspaper men on the floor, and we are a very respectable guild as a rule. I do not like to see the newspaper men attacked without some reply, however inadequate it may be, from my lips. Complaint is made about the amount of money spent in advertising. The value received from that advertising was two to three times what it cost, and some of these great public movements could not have been carried out without advertisement. It was only in this great emergency that the Government learned the truth of the old saying, which I am sure the hon. member for Maisonneuve has heard before, "It pays to advertise." It certainly paid the Government to advertise the Victory Loans, and the amount of advertising used brought results that any commercial man would be delighted to have at the same cost. Just a word to my hon. friend from Guysborough in regard to his complaint that these returns are too long coming down. I discovered among other things that in connection with a return which covers the different departments of the Government, it took three clerks seventeen days to get the information for that return from one department. That will indicate the amount of work there is in going through the files to get out every item asked for by a question that is on the Paper. I believe the Government is not to blame for that. As to the principal proposition that was laid down by the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), I am quite in accord with it. I think the public interest would be served by something of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought that a good preacher would come to my views.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not speaking now in my ministerial capacity but in my capacity as an editor. I think that while there have not been many abuses of that kind in Canadian journalism up to the present time, undoubtedly there have been some, and the way is open for a great many more. We are not rich enough in this country for that kind of thing but abuses of that kind have occurred in the United States. Personally, I would not object to seeing a law of that kind enacted; in fact, I would go further and I would make another suggestion for the consideration of my hon. friend. I do not think a newspaper should get the mail privileges if it is sold for less than the mechanical cost of production. We have had papers sold for a dollar a year in this province when the white paper cost $4 or $5 a year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And daily papers at that.

Mr. HOCKEN: Daily papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Star.

Mr. HOCKEN: And La Presse and La Patrie. It takes a whole baggage car to carry the Sunday edition of La Presse or La Patrie every Saturday. Those papers, as well as the Star, are the chief offenders in that particular.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do we not pay a special subsidy for a Grand Trunk train every morning to distribute the Toronto papers in western Ontario?

Mr. HOCKEN: If you pay a special subsidy it is not very much, because the Toronto papers do not circulate in the west to any extent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In western Ontario?

Mr. HOCKEN: I think that subsidy would be properly spent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To defeat the Free Press of London?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, and the Advertiser. I am sure that when I tell the hon. gentleman one feature of it he will agree with me that it should have been paid up to the present at least. Until a very recent date the only morning paper published west of Toronto in Ontario was the London Free Press. I am sure he will agree with me that under circumstances of that kind the Globe should have been subsidized to cover that territory. He may not agree with that at the present moment but he will agree with it prior to 1917 because it enabled the Liberal party to get its morning paper distributed to the St. Clair river and all through there almost as quickly and as early as the London papers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To complete the statement, the Toronto Globe, the Toronto World, the Toronto Telegram, the Toronto News, the Toronto Star and the Toronto Mail all joined before 1911 to ask that the train be reinstated. It was a happy family.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is the morning train?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, the morning train.

Mr. HOCKEN: Whatever interest the Star, Telegram and News might have in it I am at a loss to understand, because they could not possibly make any use of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was done for them was done for all the others.

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. HOCKEN: It could not be done for the evening papers because the train went out between three and four o'clock in the morning. May I draw the attention of the Committee to another matter? I do not see anything in the Estimates to provide for additional remuneration to the sub-postmasters. In our city, in Montreal, and in the larger cities, there are quite a number of these sub-postmasters. They render a most valuable service. They are a great convenience to many hundreds of thousands of people and they are paid a salary of $200 a year with an allowance of one per cent for the sale of postage stamps. Nothing is paid for the premises in which they carry on this business and the amount that they make altogether is utterly inadequate for the service rendered. The cost of the rental of the space required to carry on the business would be at least two or three times what the department pays for the service that it gets. It seems unfair. These men have to give postal orders, register letters, and do all that kind of thing; they have to employ additional help in their places to do that and they have no remuneration beyond the $200, and one per cent on the sale of stamps. If a man sells $10,000 worth of stamps—and the gross sales of some of these postmasters amount to from $10,000 to $12,000—he gets $100 and these sales are made up of three, ten and twenty cent transactions, the smallest kind of merchandise sales that a man could have in any line of business. I would like the minister to tell me whether it is the intention of the Government to give some additional remuneration to these sub-postmasters.

Mr. ROWELL: First, in reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux); undoubtedly, under the Post Office Act the newspapers of Canada are carried at a substantial cost to the country. The revenue received from the newspapers of Canada is not at all equal to the cost of distributing the papers from one end of the country to the other. It has been the settled policy of Canada since Confederation to carry these papers at less than cost; in fact, it is only in comparatively recent years that any charge whatever has been made for carrying them. Originally they were carried free on the ground that they were distributing information over a large country more or less sparsely settled and that it was in the public interest that it should be distributed in order that the people in all sections of the country should receive the benefit of the news which was

published in the press. Some years ago a charge was made. The charge then made has continued practically up to the present. The custom in Canada in reference to the matter is also the custom in the United States. There, the newspapers are carried at very much less than the cost of transportation because of the position which the public press holds and the function it serves in the life of the nation. While that is true, it is equally true that because the newspapers do enjoy that privilege there is imposed on them a certain duty and obligation to the public.

My hon. friend has suggested that the resolution he submitted was the same in terms as the legislation passed in the United States. I would draw his attention to the fact that there is a very radical difference between this resolution and the legislation there enacted. The question of the publication of the names of editors and proprietors of newspapers is not a new one in this country; it has been before the Canadian public for many years; it has been advocated by several of the leading Canadian journals—and particularly by leading newspapers which my hon. friend has charged were bought in the year 1917—they have agitated for the publication of just such particulars as my hon. friend has suggested. The Grain Growers and other organizations in Western Canada have also asked that this should be done. Personally I can see no reason why the newspapers should not publicly disclose the names of their editors, stockholders, and bondholders. I have entertained that view for some years, but one reason why the Federal Government has not taken action in that regard is because it touches property and civil rights. It is a matter which is clearly within provincial jurisdiction, a province can clearly require the newspapers to publish the particulars in question, and some of them do. Any province in the Dominion that thinks it is in the public interest to require the publication of this information is perfectly competent to pass the necessary legislation under which it could be given to the public.

Coming to the point as to whether we should take action such as my hon. friend suggests has been done in the United States the whole matter has been under the consideration of the Government. It may be that it would be wise to take action similar to that taken in the neighbouring country, but I am not in a position to-night to make an announcement as to the final decision of the Government in this respect. The subject has been under consideration, and is still being considered, but before the session proceeds much further there may be a definite statement of the Government's policy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend states there is a radical difference between my resolution and the United States legislation. I would like him to point out that distinction.

Mr. ROWELL: I have not my hon. friend's resolution before me, but if my recollection serves me it calls for the publication of the names of the editors, publishers, stockholders and bondholders of publications, whereas the United States legislation requires that they shall be furnished to the Post Office Department. My hon. friend did not indicate that this information was published by the United States Post Office Department, and in that respect, judging from what my hon. friend read, I should assume there was an important difference.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I have read the United States law and I think the Acting Postmaster General is quite mistaken. That law requires this statement to be made to the Post Office Department every six months, and it must be given publication in the next issue of the magazine or newspaper furnishing it.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) did not read that to-night, and I was basing my statement upon what he read. If that requirement is in the United States law, my hon. friend did not bring it to our notice. But even if the United States Act does not require publication, I see no reason why the information should not be published here, and I should think there would be no real objection on the part of the Canadian press; there should not be any objection to these particulars being published. However, the whole matter is under the consideration of the Government, and an announcement with reference to it will be made in due course.

It would not be right for me to resume my seat without taking cognizance of further remarks by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman has deliberately challenged the integrity of the press of Canada, and he has deliberately challenged the integrity of the press of my province. I want to hurl that challenge back to my hon. friend, and tell him that he dare not repeat outside this House, where proceedings could be taken against him, that challenge against the integrity of the press, or say there that

one of the leading Liberal papers of the province of Ontario was bought at the last election.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will allow me, a few days ago the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) speaking publicly in Toronto referred to the charge I have made in the House, and he was answered by the public.

Mr. ROWELL: I was not dealing with what the hon. member for Red Deer said. I hold my hon. friend responsible for the words he uttered in this Chamber to-night. He challenged the integrity of the press of Ontario. He said it could be bought and that it had been bought.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By advertisements.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not care by what means, I say the statement is absolutely false, and there is not a shadow of foundation to support it. There is no more upright press in this country than the press of Ontario. I want to say this for the whole press of Canada, and I will include in the statement the press of my hon. friend's province: No finer contribution has been made by any class of the community to the cause of Canada and the cause of civilization in the recent war than has been made by the press and by the public journals of Canada. From the outbreak of the war the press, more than some of
10 p.m. the public men of this country, realized the magnitude of the issue which faced the Canadian people. They did not hesitate to set clearly before the people the character of the issue and all that was involved in it. During the whole period of the war their columns have been filled with news gathered at great expense, because telegraphic and cable news was particularly expensive, in order that the Canadian people might be kept posted on the events occurring in the theatres of war, as well as in all the countries with which we were brought into touch by reason of the war. From the very commencement of that great struggle the press of Canada has served a most valuable public function in forming and shaping public opinion in the Dominion, and giving the news, without which public opinion would not have sustained the carrying on of the war. And a public man is not doing credit to himself, or to this House, who challenges the integrity of that great medium of public opinion, the Canadian press.

One or two words further with reference to the situation. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) said that at a given date the whole of the Liberal press of Ontario underwent a right-about-face, with the single exception of the London Advertiser.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said with a few honourable exceptions.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend specially mentioned the London Advertiser. I say that statement is equally without foundation. The Liberal press of Ontario, for months prior to the date my hon. friend mentions, had been urging upon the Government of Canada more active and aggressive measures for the prosecution of the war. They had been urging that compulsory military service should be introduced in Canada, for without it we could not secure the necessary reinforcements. They had been urging upon the Government that the time had come—in fact, that the time had come long before—for the formation of a union or a national Government to unite the people of Canada for the vigorous prosecution of the war. When my hon. friend charges that the press sold itself I say there is no grander evidence in the history of this country, or in the history of any other country, of fidelity to high public purpose and noble national aspirations than was displayed by the Liberal newspapers of my province.

They stood by their principles, they stood by their convictions, they stood by what they believed to be the national interest to their own loss—because it meant the loss of subscribers and supporters when they could not necessarily carry all their friends with them in the course they took. They did not change their position. They declined to go back on their convictions, they declined to go back on the policy they had been advocating for months because the leader whom they would have been glad to support was unable to see his way clear to support the policy which they believed to be right. And, instead of charging those papers with having sold themselves, one should pay tribute to their fidelity to the national interest in the service they rendered the country in those critical times.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has given certain illustrations of cases where the owner of the paper entertained a different view from the policy which the paper was advocating, and he suggested that the public might be misled. I was under the impression that the public knew that Sir Hugh Graham did control the Montreal Herald. I certainly have seen it stated in the press repeatedly, and, almost immediately after the transaction took place it was published in the press. Of the other case

to which my hon. friend refers I have no knowledge. But I wish to point out that he has used those cases to justify him in attacking the advocacy by the Liberal press of a particular policy during the last general election, a matter that has nothing whatever to do with the resolution that he suggests the House should adopt. Does he mean to imply that if these newspapers had published the names of their editors and proprietors the course they pursued would have been different? Not one particle. I think it might have much strengthened their position if the public had known that the strong solid Liberals who held stock in those papers were back of the policy which was being advocated in support of the national interest.

My hon. friend has referred to the amount of advertising done. I think the answer made by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) is perfectly complete. I have absolutely no apologies to make for the money the Government has spent for advertising since I became a member of it. I believe that it is the bounden duty of the Government to keep the public fully informed as to its acts and policies.

The Government of this country is of concern to more than the members of the Cabinet, it is of concern to more than the members of this House—it is of concern to every citizen of the country. Every citizen is deeply and vitally interested in it, and the Government is serving the cause of the people in keeping them as fully informed as possible in connection with its policies and courses of action. My hon. friend has not suggested, and he cannot truthfully suggest, that the advertising which the Government has paid for was in support of any party or of any political activities. The Government was advertising the Victory loan; the campaign for greater production; matters in connection with food control; outlining the procedure being adopted in connection with repatriation. That money was wisely expended in the public interest. Every dollar expended that helps to give additional information to the citizens of this country in reference to the action of the Government in matters in which they are deeply and vitally interested is sound expenditure, if that information is useful and should be given.

But I want to say further that there was no discrimination in connection with that expenditure. All journals, irrespective of party, race, or creed, received the same advertising. My hon. friend knows that. The Government has been attacked from this side of the House because it gave advertising to Le Devoir and certain other papers in the province of Quebec. The Government may be open to criticism as to that, but it has treated the press of Canada alike irrespective of their political views, the racial origin of their editors or proprietors, or their religious faith, because in administering the affairs of the country we are trustees for the whole people and we went on the principle that every citizen is equally entitled to the information, no matter in what section of the country he lives, or what be his political leanings. My hon. friend referred to the bringing down of returns. That matter has already been fully explained and I shall not take time going into it.

Now, a word with reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). He said: "I would not like to say that the press is mercenary." He does not go nearly as far as my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, but he does suggest that there is something very suspicious about the press. I would like to put a question to him. Will he say that the Halifax Chronicle supported conscription and Union Government in the last general election because it was bought?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I did not say that.

Mr. ROWELL: I know my hon. friend did not.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister say it was not bought?

Mr. ROWELL: It was not bought.

Mr. DUFF: He cannot say that.

Mr. ROWELL: I say it was not bought by the Union Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He should ask Mr. Pearson.

Mr. ROWELL: I say it was not bought by the Union Government.

Mr. DUFF: That may be true; but the hon. minister cannot say it was not bought.

Mr. ROWELL: Hon. members ought not to make general accusations or suggestions casting aspersions upon the character of newspapers when they are afraid to back them up with particulars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The people of Toronto said: It is true; it is true. The people know that.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is trying to escape from the wholly indefensible position in which he put himself—

Mr. LEMIEUX: In spite of the concrete cases I gave?

Mr. ROWELL: —and he dare not name outside this House a single influential newspaper in Ontario and say it was bought during the last general election, because he would have a chance to prove it very, very quickly, and he could not produce a scintilla of evidence in support of his charge. Let me remind my hon. friend of this fact, that the character of a newspaper is just as important and valuable to the newspaper itself as is a man's character and reputation to himself personally. The standing of a newspaper in the community and its influence depends upon the confidence of the public. And the newspapers would have just as much right to say that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve was bought by the payment of so much cash, or something else, for adopting the course he recently adopted in Parliament, as has my hon. friend to say that those journals were bought at the last election.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Where would the money come from?

Mr. ROWELL: I saw a good deal of advertising in the last election that was paid for by the opponents of Union Government. I heard it suggested that it came from corporations, but I do not know that it did and I would not suggest it.

Turning to the question raised by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, as to the scale of pay of sub-postmasters, that has been under consideration by the Postmaster General and the administrative officers of his department for some little time, and they have decided that under the conditions existing at the present time there should be an increase in the allowances, and I am glad to give the House the information as to the increase proposed.

The former scale was this. On a revenue less than $2,000, $100 salary; on revenue of $2,000 and up to $4,000, $150 salary; on a revenue of $4,000 and over, $200 salary.

The new scale is as follows: On a revenue less than $300, the salary is to be fifty per cent of the revenue, with a minimum salary of $60 a year; on a revenue of $300 and up to $1,000, $150 salary; on a revenue of $1,000 and up to $2,000, $200 salary; on a revenue of $2,000 and up to $3,000, $250 salary; on a revenue of $3,000 and up to $4,000, $300 salary; on a revenue of $4,000 and up to $5,000, $350 salary; on a revenue of $5,000 and over, $400 salary. The Commission of one per cent on stamp sales and the usual commissions on money order and postal note business will be continued as at present. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is a reasonable advance on the salaries which the postmasters at sub-stations have been receiving, and the department confidently anticipates that the increase will reasonably meet the situation.

Mr. ARGUE: Will that apply to rural postmasters?

Mr. ROWELL: No, only to sub-stations in the larger cities. The postmasters are supposed to be benefited by the mere fact that the offices are in their stores, as is the case in many instances, and they receive a limited compensation for the important service which they render.

In connection with the rural postmasters, a change was made in July of last year. I quote the following statement, dated at Ottawa, July 20, 1918:

Postmasters are informed that owing to the higher cost of living arising out of war conditions, the Postmaster General has, after careful consideration, decided to increase the salaries of those whose revenues do not exceed $10,000 by adopting the following scale of payment which supersedes the one in force since the 1st April, 1915, as set forth in the circular letter dated the 12th May, 1916:—

50 per cent on the first $1,000 of revenue, instead of 40 per cent on the first $800.

25 per cent on all over $1,000 and up to $10,000, instead of 25 per cent on all over $800 and up to $10,000.

Minimum salary increased from $50 to $60.

On all revenues over $10,000 the salary will be calculated according to the scale in force since the 1st April, 1915, that is:—

40 per cent on the first $800 of revenue.

25 per cent on all over $800 and up to $10,000.

15 per cent on all over $10,000 of revenue, but in the case of an office where the revenue is over $10,000 and up to $10,870, the salary will be the amount payable on a revenue of $10,000 under the new scale, that is $2,750, in order that the Postmaster may not receive less than one whose revenue is $10,000.

Allowance for Forward Duty:—

The rate of remuneration is 10 per cent on the revenue of the offices for which direct or indirect forward duty is performed. (No change).

Allowance for Rent, Light and Fuel:—

The allowance of all Postmasters is increased 25 per cent.

Allowance for Night Duty:—

An allowance is paid for night duty when a Postmaster is required to be in his office after 9 p.m. or before 7 a.m. The minimum allowance is $10 and the maximum $100, according to the time employed, and the work done. (No change).

Compensation for the transaction of Money Order, Savings Bank, and Postal Note business.

Money Order Business:—

Four cents for each Money Order issued, and one cent for each other order paid. (No

Savings Bank Business:—

27½ cents on every $100 deposited. (No change).

Postal Note Business—

One cent for each postal note sold. (No change).

All increases, either in salaries or allowances, will take effect from the 1st April, 1917.

Owing to the fact that the revision of salaries based on the revenue for the year 1917-18 has been delayed by the consideration of the Postmasters' application for increases, it will not be possible to pay salaries according to the new scale in September quarter. In the salary warrants issued during December quarter all arrears due from the 1st April, 1917, will be included, or overpayments deducted as the case may be.

The rural postmasters held a conference recently and sent a deputation to wait upon the Postmaster General urging that a commission be appointed to investigate the present rates of pay, their representation being that an investigation might result in an increase in their compensation. The view of the department—I give simply their view of the matter—is that having regard to the increase made last year and to the position of the revenues of the department, it is not expedient to take action this year and the matter should stand until another year.

The general revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department is a matter of interest, and must be particularly considered in connection with the question of salaries. The revenue last year was $21,345,394.45, the largest in the history of Canada. The following were, in round figures, the revenues in previous years: 1911, $10,482,000; 1913, $12,060,000; 1914, $12,956,000; 1915, $13,046,000; 1916, $18,858,000; 1917, $20,902,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it not a fact that the large figures of recent years is accounted for by revenue from the sale of postage stamps which are used for cheques, notes, and other purposes? Postage stamps are used for Inland Revenue purposes and, as it is perhaps impossible to draw the line between the two, some of the figures my hon. friend refers to are not postal receipts at all.

Mr. ROWELL: I was going to explain that. It is estimated that about $6,000,000 is the revenue from the additional one cent postage, and the other receipts of the Post Office Department on account of war tax.

Mr. EDWARDS: In what year was that extra cent put on?

Mr. ROWELL: In 1915. The $6,000,000 is on the basis of this year's revenue. The Post Office Department estimates that 28 per cent, pretty nearly 30 per cent, of the total revenue comes from the sale of the war-tax stamps.

Mr. COWAN: Does any portion of the revenue from the sale of war-tax stamps go to the postmasters? Are they paid for the extra work of handling these stamps?

Mr. ROWELL: In effect, the answer is no. It works out differently in the cities from the rural districts, and the reason is this: it is no more trouble to sell a three-cent stamp than a two, nor a two than a one; and secondly it was thought that the country should, so far as possible, receive the full benefit of the tax. It is true that owing to the increases in salaries and the expenses of administering the department—the expenses of all departments have increased—the country has not received the full benefit of the increased revenue, because it has cost substantially more to administer the department.

Mr. FIELDING: If the postmasters are paid a percentage on the sale of stamps I do not see how you can make any distinction between the stamps sold for post office purposes and those sold for inland revenue purposes. When a man buys a sheet of stamps he does not explain to the postmaster what he wants them for.

Mr. ROWELL: In order to meet that situation they lowered the scale of pay. Having reached the conclusion that approximately 28 per cent of the total revenue was due to the sale of the war-tax stamps the basis of compensation was adjusted so as to give the postmaster practically the same pay as he would have received had the tax not been imposed.

Mr. COWAN: Has that always been the rule or was not the rule changed at one time after it had been adopted?

Mr. ROWELL: When they put on the additional cent war-tax the scale of pay was put back on the same basis that prevailed before we adopted two-cent postage. My hon. friend has asked if they did not get a percentage on the total revenue for a certain period, and if there was not some change afterwards.

Mr. COWAN: I want to find out the legal position the city postmasters are in. I understand that there was a time when the city postmasters drew this percentage as part of their salaries, and that a change was made. The postmasters are claiming this percentage as their right, and I should like to know the legal position.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend is speaking of city postmasters; I was talking of rural postmasters. The city postmasters,

I understand, are paid on the basis of revenue.

Mr. COPP: What percentage?

Mr. ROWELL: It is not a percentage, but the salary is fixed having regard to the volume of business.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps it would be better if the minister were to say which offices are paid on the commission basis, and which on the salary basis.

Mr. ROWELL: All city postmasters coming under the Civil Service are paid a certain salary, but the salary is dependent on the volume of business.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where do the commission offices come in?

Mr. ROWELL: The sub-stations in the cities. The postmasters there receive a certain salary plus a certain percentage of the revenue.

Mr. BELAND: In order to ascertain the revenue properly belonging to the Post Office Department, we must deduct from the amount of $21,000,000 the $6,000,000 to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, and no. The revenue from the sale of these war-tax stamps is post office revenue, but the tax was imposed for a particular purpose. The situation undoubtedly would be this: If that additional revenue was not received by the Post Office Department, it could not pay the increases in salary without showing a deficit. I have given to the Committee the revenues from 1911. Let me now give the expenditure for the same period, in round figures. In 1911 the expenditure was $7,954,000, and there was a surplus of $1,192,000; 1912, expenditure $9,172,000, surplus $1,310,000; 1913, expenditure $10,882,000, surplus $1,177,000; 1914, expenditure $12,822,000, surplus $134,000; 1915, expenditure $15,961,000, deficit $2,914,000. Then the additional tax came in. In the following year 1916 the expenditure was $16,009,000, and the surplus $2,849,000. In 1917 the expenditure was $16,300,000 and the surplus $4,601,000, in 1918 the expenditure was $18,046,000 and the surplus $3,298,000. Had it not been for the increase in the salaries paid to the employees of the Post Office in 1918 the surplus for that year would have substantially exceeded the surplus of 1917. The difference between the surplus of 1917 and that of 1918 is more than made up in the increased payment to postal employees throughout Canada.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. DUFF: Would there not have been a deficit of $3,000,000 had it not been for the fact that $6,000,000 extra was paid into the Post Office through the extra war stamp tax?

Mr. ROWELL: It is hard to say what the exact deficit might have been. One never knows the effect of the increased cost of postage on the volume of business. I presume the cheaper the postage the larger the volume.

Mr. DUFF: I thought it was stated a moment ago that the money derived from the war tax was $6,000,000.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Mr. DUFF: Then the deficit would be $3,000,000.

Mr. ROWELL: It might be, but one cannot ascertain the exact amount, because one does not know the volume of business. The advocates of lower postage will say, and I think with a measure of justification, that the lower the postage the larger the volume of business. I cannot say that the deficit would be that amount, but I have no doubt it would have been a very substantial sum.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How does the Department differentiate between stamps used for excise purposes and those that are used for postage? Suppose a merchant buys five dollars' worth of stamp's and uses half on excise and half on postage, how does the department know the proportion used for each purpose?

Mr. ROWELL: The Department cannot tell and does not differentiate. It cannot keep a separate record of that. With regard to the deposits in the Post Office savings banks the total amounts standing to the credit of open accounts, inclusive of interest allowed, at the close of the period for the past five years was as follows:

1914	$ 41,591,286.
1915	39,995,406.
1916	40,008,417.
1917	42,582,478.
1918	41,283,478.

Mr. BELAND: Has the rate of interest been increased?

Mr. ROWELL: It is still 3½ per cent. These savings would be substantially more had it not been for the investments in Victory Loans during the past two years, and it is a very excellent record that there has really been no substantial reduction in the amount of deposits in the savings banks.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the Government to reduce the rate of postage in the near future in view of the opinion which the minister has just expressed?

Mr. ROWELL: That question was asked early in the session and the answer was given that it would be dealt with when the Budget Speech was delivered. I cannot give any further information than that.

Mr. COWAN: I understand we have no real chief post office inspector or superintendent. We have two gentlemen, one of whom is so designated, but it seems to me that we have not enough supervision, and I would like to know if the Government is considering the advisability of re-arranging the districts and placing a superintendent in charge of the whole of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: That matter has been brought to the attention of the Post Office Department and is now being considered by the minister, who feels that the present senior inspector, Mr. Ross, is doing very efficient work.

Mr. COWAN: I am finding no fault with him at all, but I think he has far more to do than he can attend to efficiently. I think that a great deal of the trouble we had with the Post Office employees last year would not have occurred if we had had better supervision, and I would urge the importance of this matter. I find no fault with any of the Post Office officials, who have given excellent service, and I have always been able to get from the Deputy and everybody else every possible attention, but these men should not be asked to do more than it is possible for them to perform efficiently.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not want this interesting discussion about newspapers to conclude without some remarks from myself, because if I were to sit silent as a publisher of one of the papers known as Liberal-Unionist it might be construed as a recognition that some of the insinuations which have been made in regard to them were correct. I want to say that the demand which the hon. member for Maisonneuve makes, that there shall be published in a prominent place in every newspaper the names of the shareholders and officers, is not objectionable to me. I do not think that any newspaper in Canada would raise any objection to this proposal, although possibly there might be an exception or two. There have been many insinuations in the past that newspapers were controlled by corporations and others who could influence them as they pleased. But I am well enough acquainted with most newspapers in Canada to say that nearly all of them are under the individual control of the men in the business day in and day out during the whole year. The hon. member may shake his head, but I am talking about newspapers I know of, and I know most papers in Western Canada at any rate. We all live a good deal under suspicion in this world, and the hon. member for Maisonneuve is living in a state of suspicion in regard to the newspapers in Canada. I know that the voice of the journals in this country since he brought this question to the attention of Parliament has been almost unanimously in favour of the publication of the names of shareholders and officers, and if there were anything corrupt about the control of newspapers in Canada they would not favour the demand of the hon. member for Maisonneuve. But the insinuation has been made, not only by that hon. member, but by many others during the past year, that the Liberal newspapers throughout Canada had practically all been purchased in order to support conscription and the Union Government. I want to say to this Committee that the amount of business—and I am speaking as the publisher of a daily newpaper—that my newspaper has secured from this Government is not worth half of the business I secure from an ordinary advertiser in my own city. The advertising that was published in my newspaper—and I think that the same may be said of every newspaper in Canada—the advertising that went into my newspaper went into every Liberal newspaper in the Dominion. The Military Service Act advertising and the Victory Loan advertising went into every newspaper, Liberal and Unionist, Labour and Church, French and English.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend said he got some business from the Government. Does he know that he had no right to receive business from the Government?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I cannot follow my hon. friend's question across the floor of the House. I will see in Hansard what he says and answer him on another occasion. As a newspaper man I want to say that I have always conducted a newspaper that supported, and that is supporting now, Liberal principles. The day when parties and leaders can lead a newspaper around and dictate what its policy shall be is past. Newspapers have minds of their own and they are going to express their own individual opinions. The best thing that can happen governments and parties is to

have a press that is honest with them and a press that will not hesitate to criticise its own party or the government it is supporting. The trouble with governments in the past has been that the press has been too servile towards them and they have not attempted to criticise them as they should have done. What the Government and the country generally will benefit most from is an independent press. Take an example from the United States. Probably the greatest newspaper there is the New York Times. It is considered to be a democratic newspaper but the Democratic government at Washington cannot rely on the New York Times because the Times expresses its own opinion always and no leader of a Democratic party can go into the office of the New York Times and tell it what it is to do. It is going to be the case in Canada in the future that no leader or partisan can go into any newspaper office and say what kind of editorials it is going to publish or what kind of an opinion it is going to express to-morrow morning or to-morrow afternoon. In my judgment the time for that kind of thing is past. Talk about newspapers being purchased by advertising! If it were the case that newspapers were purchased by advertising nearly every weekly newspaper in Canada would long ago have been owned by Lydia Pinkham or Dr. Chase. As the publisher of a Liberal newspaper I was supporting conscription long before conscription was proposed, and I was advocating Union Government before Union Government came into existence. I was not going to abandon the things I had advocated when there was a possibility of their being adopted.

I am not asking for a light to be placed in the window, because I will follow my own course, but in so far as the paper I publish is concerned, I have followed an independent course during the war. The procedure that I will follow after the war will be decided by myself, not by any party, not by Union Government, and I think that will be the case with every Liberal Unionist paper in the country. I may not agree with this Government in the future, and if some other party comes forward with principles that I believe to be in the interest of Canada I am inclined to think that the newspaper that gives me my living and in connection with which I occupy most of my time, will follow and support those principles. That is going to be the policy of the press generally throughout Canada in the future.

[Mr. Buchanan.]

All these insinuations that are hurled at the newspapers, and all these charges about them being bought by advertising or about their being corrupt, are not worth the time that has been occupied by this House in making them by a responsible member of Parliament. I make the assertion that nobody can establish under any circumstances that any newspaper in Canada was paid to support conscription or Union Government—no Liberal newspaper at any rate, and I know most of them in Canada. The Liberal newspapers in Canada are still Liberal are still in favour of the principles of the Liberal party and the principle of conscription and of the unity of the country are principles of the Liberal party. That is why they supported conscription and that is why they supported Union Government.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the Post Office Department intend to give a service on the Canadian National Railway between Ottawa and Pembroke? There are fifteen stations along that line and four or five villages that are being served from Canadian Pacific points, by stage coach as a rule. While the service given was a little cheaper in that way, yet we are paying money for the carrying of the mails by stage that is going to individuals who are not making any profit but using up time and horseflesh because they are tied up to contracts. If this money were paid over to the Canadian National railways it would be like taking it from one pocket and putting it into the other, or, into the Canadian treasury. When you figure out the loss that would be made in operating the mails on the Canadian National railway between Ottawa and Pembroke it would be more than made up by the difference in the amount paid for the carriage of the mails. I would like to ask if the department would be in a position to give a service between Ottawa and Pembroke on the Canadian National railway.

Mr. ROWELL: The matter is one with which I am not personally familiar, as I am only speaking for the Postmaster General, but I understand it is under the consideration of the department. The question that arose originally when the matter was suggested was that of expense as compared with revenue. This is a road where the expense is very substantial and where the revenue is not as great as upon other sections where a service of that kind is given. However, it is true that the revenue would come into the Canadian National

railway and the matter is under consideration.

Mr. PROULX: Is it the intention of the department to establish a mail service on the Canadian National railway between Ottawa and Montreal?

Mr. ROWELL: The whole matter of a mail service on the Canadian National railway is under consideration by the department.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I desire to say a word with reference to the position of the rural postmaster. It is true that since the last session of Parliament there has been some relief given to the rural postmasters but I am confident that an investigation of the situation in which they are placed will show that they are not being fairly treated. They are not being paid for the work they are expected to perform. Last year I took the trouble to go into the details of the scale under which they were paid and I satisfied myself at least that the new scale adopted did discriminate between the smaller postmasters in a manner that it did not do in relation to postmasters in offices where the gross revenue was from $8,000 to $10,000 and over. The new scale, or the scale in effect, as has been stated, was 40 per cent on the first $800 and 25 per cent on all over $800. It is now 50 per cent on the first $1,000 and 25 per cent on the balance. The old scale was 50 per cent on the first $1,000 and 30 per cent on all over $1,000. Leaving that aside altogether, when every other class of man in the country has had his rate of remuneration increased from 100 to 150 per cent, the rural postmasters, who are asked to perform a most important service for the public and the rural communities in particular had an increase of five or ten per cent in the rate of their remuneration.

In the constituency I represent there are dozens, yes scores, of postmasters and post offices that must be maintained—some one must be there all the time—where the remuneration would not pay for the services of a boy or girl of fourteen or fifteen years of age. The postmasters have to take all the responsibilities that go with the situation, and conditions are such that it is becoming almost an impossibility to get people of any reputation whatever to fill these offices. I have urged upon the department the importance of the post office service to the rural communities. One of the things that the Government of Canada can do to build up a contented rural community is to give them an adequate postal service, and yet in many parts of the country they are not getting it.

There is another point, to which my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) has referred, and that is supervision. I have received a letter on that subject with a request that I read it to the House. I am not going to detain the House by reading the whole of the communication, but I will give some extracts that will emphasize the point to some extent. The letter also has relation to the question of salaries and the investigation which has been made by a commission with a view to re-classifying the public service, and the first paragraph that I will read relates to that:

> Men with experience should have been consulted by the experts appointed for the purpose. We suggested this to the commission months ago, but did not get even a reply; and when one of them was here he did not see, so far as we are able to learn, any mail clerk on a route perhaps the most important in Canada, as it is the trunk line where bulk is broken both ways for all Canada.

Then the writer says this with regard to supervision:

> The other night practically all the letter mail for the West—

That is the whole of Western Canada.

> missed the train, and was delayed twenty-four hours because the transfer man failed to make the proper connections. The main trouble with the Post Office service is that there are only privates and generals. For instance, in my opinion, the most important post office official in Toronto is the chief transfer man at the Union Station, and yet he ranks only as a transfer man with the nominal pay of a letter carrier. We have no traffic experts to correlate the business. Clerks on this route have almost begged the department to re-arrange the running so that the work would be more continuous and better done, but there is always a No, no, without even an enquiry. The department does not seem to realize that all other railroad service has outstripped the railway mail service, which just stands pat until there is a public protest. . . . . The post office service is the backbone of business, and it might pay business men in Parliament to have a committee authorized to call in for consultation a few of the field men who do the actual work.

I will not take up time by reading the balance of the letter, but the extracts I have read give some idea of what is in the minds of the men who are actually doing the work. I know some of these men and they have drawn to my personal attention the conditions that exist in connection with the mail service. I will go further and say that to my personal knowledge the mails going North and West out of the city of Toronto during a large part of 1918 were delayed, not once, but sometimes four and five days a week, for twenty-four hours, for

the reason which has been stated in this letter—the lack of proper supervision. I question whether any commercial institution in the world would undertake to have a business of the importance of the Post Office Department carried out in the way that the mails are taken from the post office in large cities and placed on the trains. All over the Dominion this work is performed by a messenger without any one to supervise the manner in which it is done. If it was simply a matter of a few bags of mail it would not be so serious, but when four, five, six and sometimes seven carloads of mail matter have to be placed in such a way that it can be properly handled and properly distributed to all points in Western Canada—and the same applies to other parts of the country, but I am only speaking in regard to something that I am personally familiar with—you have a business that requires expert attention. You cannot go out on the street and hire some boy, and say: Take all this mail matter and load it on the cars and have it in such a way that the mail clerks can distribute it. The contention made by my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) is perfectly correct. The Post Office Department will give more efficient service and in the end save money by getting experts to supervise the work that is being done; by calling into its councils some of the men who 11 p.m. are actually doing the work. The railway mail clerks—these are the men I know most about—are giving good service, but they are handicapped in the performance of their duties because they are working along the same lines as thirty years ago when transcontinental trains first began to run from the East to Vancouver.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the intention of the Government to consider the feasibility of carrying mail by an air service? This is a matter of great interest to some of us on the Pacific Coast. It has been taken up by our boards of trade out there with the suggestion that this method of carrying the mails be adopted, if it is found to be possible. We have a number of aviators, very expert men, in this country, who have returned from the war, but who, on account of their inability to find occupation in their particular profession, are now leaving Canada and going to other places where they can make profitable use of their knowledge and experience.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the Committee, nor do I want to rule the hon. gentleman out of order, but the discussion which has been taking place for some time past refers more especially to item 310, Post Office—Outside Service. I take it for granted that the Committee will have no objection to this item and the one already announced being discussed together.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I did not at the time understand the question put by the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), but I have since learned what it was. I may say that I am, and have been for some years, acquainted with the law in regard to members of Parliament accepting business from the Government, and there is no danger of my being disqualified any more than other members of the House who may be shareholders in a newspaper, or any other company, except, of course, those engaged in public works.

Mr. ROWELL: The matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tolmie) refers has been under the consideration of the Post Office Department for some months. Last summer certain trial trips in carrying mails from Toronto to Ottawa, and from Toronto to Montreal, were made, the result of which was satisfactory so far as expedition in the carriage was concerned. The whole question of an air service for Canada is a very large one, and affects a good many of the Government departments. Consideration has been given to it by the Department of Militia and Defence, the Department of the Naval Service, and the Department of Mounted Police. The Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Reconstruction has been devoting particular attention to the subject, and has introduced a Bill into the House of Commons providing for the creation of an Air Board. It is really a question of practicability, having regard to the distances to be travelled. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen that in view of the present situation in Canada very great benefits would accrue if we could establish at not too great a cost the transport of mails by airplane, particularly to bridge the great gap between east and west, as it would really contribute to the unity of the country. But at the present time, as my hon. friend is aware, airplanes are expensive to purchase and to operate, and the whole matter will require the greatest care and consideration, and that is one of the objects of the appointment of an Air Board as suggested in the Bill now before the House. I agree with my hon. friend that in view of the magnificent part which our Canadian boys have taken

in the air service abroad—they have been unsurpassed in their work, and individual Canadians have distinguished themselves, above all others I was going to say, but certainly equal to any—we would like to maintain their splendid traditions in some form by developing an air service here. The matter will receive the most careful consideration of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE: I desire to draw to the attention of the House, the laxity of the postal department in answering communication of postmen and hon. members during the postmen's strike last year. I think that strike could have been averted if the deputy minister, or whoever was in charge of the department, had been prompt in answering the communications of the men. The department was to my mind, certainly lax when the strike broke out, in withholding any information as to what the men were claiming and what wages they were receiving. No information on the matter was available in Winnipeg until the Minister of Labour arrived there and the strike had made considerable headway. I have had to wait as long as a week for an answer with regard to an inquiry I made of the department. I think the department might well look to their laurels and answer inquiries more satisfactorily, not only when communications are addressed to them by the postmen, but also by hon, members.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have listened, Mr. Chairman, with a great deal of interest to the discussion in connection with the Post Office Service. There is perhaps no public service that comes home more closely to every individual than the service rendered by the Post Office Department; and accordingly the discussion that we had a few weeks ago on the question of whether the minister in charge of such a public service should sit in this House rather than in the Senate comes very much to the fore to-night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rowell) in charge of the Estimates to-night for the Postmaster General is a good lawyer of wide experience, and as such he knows that hearsay evidence is not evidence at all, and that no judge will listen to it. My hon. friend (Mr. Rowell) gathered this hearsay evidence very industriously and very cleverly as he was going along, but it would have saved a good deal of trouble if the deputy minister, or the other assistant who is here, were permitted to furnish information direct, rather than put it through the unnecessary machinery of being chewed out to us by the President of the Council. It strongly emphasizes my point, that such a popular institution as the Post Office—I say popular because it deals with everybody— should be represented in this House by its head, the Postmaster General. I sat for many years in this House with the distinguished senator who is now Postmaster General, and far be it from me to say anything about him except that he is a first class man in every sense. But he is not in this House and cannot get a proper impression of public sentiment—and every public man must be governed to a very great extent, if not altogether, by public opinion. I said a few days ago that in this democratic country the head of every department should be represented in this House as far as possible. Of course, the hon. gentleman who was giving us this second-hand evidence to-night was doing very well, and possibly no other member of this Union Government could do very much better. Nevertheless, we cannot help feeling when we see a minister, I care not what department he is representing, casting about for information to support his Estimates, that he is not seized of the matter himself, and really has no opinion of his own. I submit, therefore, that it is highly desirable, as I have already stated, that questions of this kind should be dealt with by ministers sitting in this House, and I trust that the day is not far distant when this very important department will be so represented.

The management of the department seems to me to be somewhat extravagant. The ordinary revenues, of course, go into the coffers of the department, and are supposed to be used to carry on the operations of the mail service. We find that in 1911 and for a few years thereafter there was a very substantial surplus, but according to the figures given to-night we then struck deficit upon deficit, and I venture to say that if the department was confined during the past year to its own legitimate revenue we would have rather a striking deficit as a result. On the operations last year, stamps which were sold, not for the purpose of carrying the mails, but for other purposes, had found their proper channel, there would be a deficit of something like $4,000,000. That does not speak well for the management of the department, in view of the fact that the war has brought a great deal of additional revenue to it on account of the hundreds of thousands of men overseas to whom their parents and relatives were sending letters and packages.

Possibly larger subsidies had to be paid for carrying these mails across the water, but I do not believe that the number of employees in the post offices have been materially increased, or that additional amounts have been made to mail couriers throughout the country on account of the war. I do know, however, from the experience in my own town, that an enormous amount of mail matter went through the post office which would not have been transmitted had there been no war. I reason, therefore, that had not the extraordinary revenue of the war, direct and indirect, gone to the credit of the post office, the showing of that department would not be satisfactory; indeed, the deficit would perhaps be the largest we ever had.

Occupying the position that I do, I should be careful in entering upon this discussion about newspapers—whether newspapers were bought or whether newspapers were sold. We have passed through a period of very deep agitation. There has been a strong and striking division among the people, intensified by a situation which we hope we shall never again meet or have to deal with. Our attitude should be, I think, that every man and every woman in this country was earnest and honest in the course that he or she pursued in connection with the war and that the division that took place among friends on the question of conscription was of the most honest kind. That is the only way, as I understand it, in which equity, fairness and justice will be extended to all. The war has been won; we Canadians are engaged in advancing the best interests of the country, and I see no good purpose in perpetuating the division that arose over this question. So far as I am concerned, I will be no party to any such feeling. But apart altogether from any such accusations as that against newspapers, before as well as since the war-election the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) made very strong insinuations—not insinuations, but statements—along the line of the observations made by the member for Maisonneuve. Hon. gentlemen sitting to your right, Sir, had equal provocation then to stand up in their places and deny those accusations. Whether a charge of corruption against a newspaper comes from your right or from your left, Mr. Chairman, makes no difference; but it is a striking fact that nothing was said about the matter by hon. gentlemen opposite when the member for Victoria made the statement that the press was "sweetened;" that the money of this country was being used to corrupt the press and to create a favourable public opinion for the Union Government. Sir, I hear no strenuous denials of that statement. I am not saying that I lost any sleep in pondering its truth or otherwise; but if it was necessary for hon. gentlemen opposite to make vehement, denunciatory denials to-night, it was equally proper and just that they should have made them then. All of us were children once, and we shall always have some more or less childish sentiments. If one child hears another accusing his fellow of something, and it is not denied, that child assumes that the accusation is true. An accusation was made by the member for Victoria, and there was no denial of it; it was allowed to pass as true. It is only the instinct of childhood, therefore, for us on this side, in our innocence, to believe that the accusation is true; and if we repeat it we are only repeating what was stated by an ex-minister and a very prominent member of the Conservative party.

I need not emphasize the importance of a clean and untrammelled press, a press which is faithful to its duty to the people. I was surprised to hear the President of the Council even suggest to-night that it was necessary to pay the press in order that the views of the Government might reach the people. What is the press for? Do I pay for a newspaper merely for the sake of getting a piece of paper with some print on it? I pay for a newspaper as I pay my preacher, or as I pay a teacher who instructs my children. I pay for that newspaper because it is its business to gather news, to gather opinions, and to publish them so that I may read them. Is it to be said that, apart from what I am paying for my newspaper, the man whose opinions are worth having must always pay for having them published in the paper? That is the doctrine that is preached here to-night. Over two millions of the money of the people—who had no two millions to throw away—had to be paid to the newspapers in order that views of the Government and of public men should find their way into the press. That is not my view of public service as it should be rendered by the press.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend certainly misunderstood what I said if he thinks I said anything like what he is attempting to answer. What I said was that the people were entitled to know of the activities and of the work of the Government, and that the principal money spent along this line was in connection with Victory Loans, in-

creased food production, and other campaigns of that kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: What my hon. friend said will appear in Hansard. I might go further and say that it will appear in print generally, whereas very little of what I say will appear. When a man on this side of the House tries to put his views before the people, a very meagre, indifferent and unsubstantial portion of what he says appears in the press, whereas the minutest details of the professions of hon. gentlemen who sit on the Government benches are lapped up with delight and glee. That is the striking difference. But we know that what we say will at least find its way into Hansard, and that we may, through some strenuous work, get it out here and there before the country.

We should like to reform the press so that it would convey to the people the views of everybody as expressed, without any painting of tainting, so far as may be worth while, and let the people judge for themselves. The people are the great jury in this country; let us put the evidence before them, and let them judge whether they shall serve Baal or whether they shall serve God. If they wish to serve Baal, that is their business, and the blood will be on their own heads. We have had a good deal of talk but, if the Chairman will excuse me, it has been quite germane to the subject under consideration. We are talking about a public service; we are rendering assistance by means of one public service to another public service. Newspapers may be private-owned, but they are a public service because their product goes through the public channels. You can buy your groceries from any store you like and nobody knows anything about it but yourself, but a newspaper is not confined to any individual; when it is published it is available to the whole country. It is therefore a public service, and it is important to us all that it should be conducted along proper lines, in a truthful manner, without any improper influence being brought to bear upon it, and without any contamination of the real fountains of truth. For these reasons it was quite proper for the hon. member for Maisonneuve to bring these matters to the notice of the House. An hon. member of this House is reproached if he says anything here that he would not say on the street. That should not be the case. It is possible for a man to go too far in that line, of course; the law does not always recognize the protection of this House. If a man says anything here that is malicious or slanderous or which cannot be justified, in the ordinary sense of the word, his shelter in this House does not protect him. The protection of this House is to afford an opportunity for fearless and open expression of opinions which if expressed outside, might possibly be slanderous in the eyes of the law. If a man makes use of that protection to bring before the public questions which he thinks are in the interest of the body politic, but which, if expressed outside, would drag him into court, he is simply making use of a protection which the British constitution has afforded to members of Parliament from time immemorial. If he uses that protection properly, for the purpose of getting the people to think of what is going on, I submit he should not be reproached or accused of taking improper advantages of the privileges which the law throws around a man sitting in this House.

As a last word, let me say that we were told by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) perhaps not more than twenty days ago in this House, that this Government was owned body and bones by a certain gentleman residing in the city of Toronto. I heard no denial of that statement; I hope it is not true. I only mention it to show that there is an opinion abroad that wealth cuts too much figure in this country, that corporations have too tight a hold on the Government and can influence the press, that big money has greater influence than the individuality of any single man. Those are the things that we are trying to bring to-night to the attention of the President of the Privy Council and the Government, so that they may guard against them. It is only a few days ago that I read in a newspaper that ordinary people in this country must not expect newspapers to be free from outside influence so long as they are not willing to pay for their newspapers. "You must expect," says that newspaper, "that the men who pay for the advertisements will have a certain influence on the editorial opinions of the paper." I was surprised to find that in a newspaper, but I suppose it is true. If it is the case that a newspaper is influenced, not by public opinion, but by the weight of advertising which comes into its business office, is it not time that we should receive with some degree of caution the expression of opinions as we find them in those newspapers? When a man becomes editor and launches into the newspaper business he must expect to be criticised and his conduct to be closely scrutinized as is the

case with all public men. For myself, and I am sure I am speaking for every hon. member of this House, when we put ourselves in the hands of the public we are quite willing to be properly and legitimately criticised. The same holds true of a newspaper. It is better that we should sometimes tread upon the corns and hurt the feelings of a newspaper man than that, through any laxity upon our part, the people of this country should suffer for lack of purity of opinions or honesty of publication upon the part of the organs which have the best opportunity of expressing public opinion.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend spoke of the extra cost of administering the Post Office Department having regard to the revenues, and I think it is only right to point out in what respect that increase arose out of the war. The Post Office Department has, I think, approximately 1,500 employees who have gone overseas to serve at the front and who are paid by the department. The department has had to engage other employees to do their work here. Hon. members have only to stop and think to realize what a very large sum of money that amounts to. The second factor is the war bonus to the employees of the department, and the third is the increased cost of supplies. The three together more than make up any possible deficit which would arise if you deducted the revenue derived from the sale of the war-tax stamps.

Lest my hon. friend should on some other occasion say that he suggested that a certain gentleman was the owner of this Administration and I did not deny it, may I say that he is no more the owner of this Administration than is my hon. friend or any of the others whose names have been coupled with it on different occasions.

Mr. COPP: With regard to the 1,500 employees who went overseas, is it the policy of the department to give them back their old positions?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Is it being done?

Mr. ROWELL: My information is that all permanent employees have been given back their positions. I know there are cases of hardship where there were temporary employees who retired from the service and went overseas and other temporary employees are now filling their positions, and the Civil Service Commission has been called upon to consider these cases. I know of cases of real hardship, and I hope the Civil Service Commission will find it possible to give to these temporary employees who enlisted and went overseas positions in the service.

Mr. COPP: I am very glad to know that consideration will be given to such cases, and when the acting minister said that positions were being given to these men I thought he was not well informed.

Mr. ROWELL: To the permanent employees. I understand they are getting their positions back, but the others I mentioned belong to the temporary class.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Some postmasters have small offices and their salaries are anywhere from $1,000 to $1,500 a year. They enlisted in the earliest stages of the war and other postal employees who had not offices enlisted at the same time. These employees received their full salaries as provided by Order in Council for civil servants who enlisted at the first of the war, but the postmasters who had these small offices were compelled to employ and pay postmasters to do their work. They gave up their positions and have lost their civil salary, which nearly all the other civil servants who enlisted at the same time receive. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Post Office Department to adjust the claims of these postmasters and have them reimbursed to the extent which they have paid out to others to perform their duties while they were overseas. This matter has been before the Post Office Department, the Militia Department and the Civil Service Commission, and yet these men have been unable to get any satisfaction.

Mr. ROWELL: I understand my hon. friend refers to men who are not in the Civil Service. The rural postmasters are not in the Civil Service in the sense that the regular city officials are. The rural postmasters are paid a percentage on their business plus whatever minimum they get. So far as I know the matter has not been before the Government for consideration. It has not come to my notice, and I am sure it has not come before the Post Office Department.

Mr. TWEEDIE: My informant advises me that it had been before the Post Office Department and had been taken up with the Deputy Postmaster General and had been referred to the Militia Department.

Mr. ROWELL: I will see that it is brought to the attention of the Government.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I want more than having it brought to the attention of the Gov-

ernment. I want to see some measure of justice given these men. These men technically may not be civil servants. Their yearly salary is determined on the past year's earnings, and I think it is an absolute injustice to let them leave these offices, enlist and go overseas, and tell them they will not get a cent, while employees in other branches of the Civil Service get their full salaries. They are equally good men, and it is unfair to crowd them through some hair-splitting technicality. The number in the whole of Canada is not very large, and it would be only fair on the part of the Government to reimburse these men.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend to give the House any information as to the reduction of the rate of postage? Is it not a favourable time to return to the two-cent stamp instead of the three-cent?

Mr. ROWELL: That question was asked in the absence of my hon. friend from the Committee. I said that it had been asked this session and that the answer was that any announcement affecting the revenue would be made in the Budget.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is now 11.40 o'clock, and we have had a good deal of discussion. I would suggest to the minister that we might let the first item go through and adjourn. We could let the second item stand.

Mr. ROWELL: I thought possibly we could let both go through because the Post Office comes up again under the Supplementaries. However, we will pass the first one.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to have this vote explained—Superintendent Mail Contracts, Controller Railway Service, Controller Postal Stores and Superintendent Staff Branch, $4,000 each. It seems to me before we let that vote pass we should have some discussion on the different items. What is the reason for these increases?

Mr. ROWELL: The increases have been given because it is felt that these public servants have earned them and should receive them. All Deputy Ministers are being increased from $5,000 to $6,000. Now in regard to these other men who are getting increases, not one of them has been in the service less than twenty-five years, and they run to thirty, and one over forty years of efficient public service. These public servants are simply receiving small increases having regard to the important positions that they fill.

Mr. PROULX: If all these officials deserve an increase, certainly, there is an army in the post office department in the country who also deserve increases.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I allowed a great deal of discussion on the Outside Service on the understanding that both items would be considered together. I see now that the second item concerning the Outside Service it to be considered as if it had never been discussed. I therefore must rule that the discussion concerning Outside Service salaries is absolutely out of order.

Mr. DUFF: I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the explanation given by the minister in regard to the reasons why the salaries of deputy ministers and others should be increased. I have no objection to that, but I notice that messengers, packers and sorters do not get any increase.

Mr. ROWELL: Messengers, packers and sorters get a special bonus or allowance, and there is a supplementary estimate before the House to continue to all those parties drawing the lower salaries the total bonus granted last year. The estimate continues the bonus to them to the first of July. In the meantime, we will have the re-classification of the Service before the House and it will give us the new salaries and new bonuses which will be dated back. All these are deserving of the fullest consideration, and that they will receive when we get the new classification before the House.

Mr. CANNON: I wish to call the attention of the minister to a circumstance that happened in Quebec some time ago. A mail clerk was killed in an accident on the Intercolonial.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, that has nothing to do with the Inside Service.

Mr. CANNON: Certainly it has to do with the post office.

The CHAIRMAN: That has to do with the Outside Service. All the clerks in the Quebec post office are in the Outside Service.

Mr. McKENZIE: That can be dealt with when that item is up?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: I think the discussion was very much wider than this item.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion was very wide on the understanding that the two items were to be discussed and passed

together. Objection has been taken to the passing of the second item, and therefore I must keep the Committee to the first.

Mr. CANNON: Then I will discuss the first. The minister mentioned, a moment ago, that fifteen hundred employees of his department had gone to the Front. The Postmaster-General went over to the Front also, and I would like the minister to tell me when he came back.

Mr. ROWELL: According to my recollection, he returned about the month of July or August, 1918.

Mr. CANNON: While the Postmaster-General was in France or England, was he drawing his salary as a minister?

Mr. ROWELL: So long as he was Postmaster-General, I assume he drew his salary, but I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. CANNON: Is the minister in a position to tell me if the Postmaster-General drew his pay as a Lieutenant-Colonel?

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot say.

Mr. CANNON: These are very important matters and the public ought to know the facts. The Hon. Mr. Blondin is a member of the Senate, he is not here to give us the information, and I think the item should stand. The next time it comes up before the Committee the minister may be better informed.

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot consent that the item should stand. It is already agreed that it is to be passed to-night. I understand that there was a question on the Order Paper, and the answer given was that Mr. Blondin only drew his salary as Postmaster-General.

Mr. PROULX: Did he not draw his salary as Colonel?

Mr. ROWELL: I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. CANNON: While Mr. Blondin was in France, England or Italy, which department paid his travelling expenses, the Post Office Department or the Department of Militia and Defence?

Mr. ROWELL: I would assume that it would be the Militia Department; the Post Office Department certainly did not pay them.

Mr. CANNON: That is only an assumption?

Mr. ROWELL: I say that the Post Office Department did not, so I assume that it must have been the Militia Department.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. CANNON: Will the minister say whether Mr. Blondin was accompanied by Mr. Laflamme, what Mr. Laflamme did, and who paid him?

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Laflamme accompanied the minister. I assume he drew his ordinary salary. I could give my hon. friend that information when we take up the next item.

Mr. CANNON: I shall not be able to discuss this with my hon. friend because the next item deals with the Outside Service.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend can put a question on the Order Paper and he can get an answer at once.

Mr. CANNON: I have a right to get an answer now. Now is the time for the minister to give me the information to which I am entitled. The minister has no right to tell me to put a question on the Order Paper. I will do that if I think proper, but if I wish to put a question verbally it is the minister's duty to give me that information, and if he cannot, I think the item should stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. McKENZIE: With the understanding that when we go into the Post Office Estimates again this information will be given by the minister.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Monday, May 5, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

ARMISTICE TERMS—LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): I beg to lay on the table of the House copy of a document received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, being the terms of the Armistice concluded between the Allied Governments and the Governments of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey; also copy of the revised draft of the League of Nations Covenant as approved by the Peace Conference in plenary session on April 28, 1919. In view of the importance of the League of Nations Covenant and the desirability that members of the House should have copies in their possession, I move, with the consent of the House:

That one thousand copies of the revised draft of the League of Nations Covenant, as adopted by the Peace Conference in plenary session, laid on the table of the House on May 5, be printed forthwith, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion requires unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

WAR TROPHIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Government whether it has seen a news item in to-day's Montreal Gazette which says that Canada's display of war trophies may be housed in a building to be erected at Nepean Point, Ottawa, by Lord Beaverbrook. Is this report correct, or is it the intention of the Government to build a national museum for these war trophies?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): A small committee was appointed consisting of Sir Byron Walker, General Cruikshank and Dr. Doughty of the Archives, to go into the whole matter of the collection of war trophies and war records, the idea being that a commission would probably be formed, representative of all the provinces, to consider the matter. Dr. Doughty has succeeded in collecting a very large number of war trophies from the battlefields of Europe, and these will be gradually sent out to Canada. A large collection of paintings and photographs was also procured under the direction of the Canadian War Records, which was under the control, I understand, not of the Government, but of Lord Beaverbrook.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was under control of the Government.

Major-General MEWBURN: It is the intention to present these paintings, which include some of the most valuable in the country, to Canada. It is hoped that some scheme will be worked out whereby a proper building will be erected wherein these paintings, and also the war photographs, may be displayed; and that a proper repository may be found for the war trophies. Moreover, a large number of trophies will be available for distribution throughout various parts of Canada. The committee to which I have referred has been getting data and receiving applications from various places in Canada so that when the trophies arrive here some systematic method of distribution throughout the Dominion may be adopted. Outside of that nothing definite has been worked out. The report of the committee will come in in due course.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN RE-ESTABLISHED COUNTRIES.

On the Orders of the Day.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I wish to bring to the attention of the Ministry the desirability of having the representative of Canada at the Peace Conference instructed to see that civil and religious liberty shall be accorded to those re-established countries in which it has not hitherto been recognized. Have any steps been taken to ensure that in the re-establishment of those nations where clerical oppression has been the rule, there shall be no more of that class of tyranny, but that the utmost freedom of worship shall be accorded to all?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not aware that the subject in question has been under consideration by the Peace Conference; possibly it has. I shall be very glad to take my hon. friend's suggestion into consideration.

DOUKHOBOR LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): In common with other members of the House, I have received a communication from Mr. James Mavor, 8 University Crescent, Toronto, transmitting a printed copy of an open letter addressed to Sir Thomas White, Acting Prime Minister of Canada. The subject matter of both communications will be placed briefly before the House for the purpose of asking a question if I read three short sentences in the transmitting letter:

May I draw your attention to a scandalous proceeding which is now going on in British Columbia, ostensibly under the auspices of the Dominion Government.

I am given to understand that at the present moment appraisers are at work in the Doukhobor settlement at Grand Forks, B.C., valuating the lands and other property in order that they may be expropriated and the settled community broken up.

The scheme is clearly a conspiracy on the part of land speculators, local politicians and rival fruit farmers who are exploiting the returned soldier and proposing to rob a group of peaceable and industrious, though peculiar people, of the fruits of their industry.

May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if he has received the communication referred to in this transmitting letter, and if so, what information he has to give the House on the subject?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I received a copy of the letter only this morning. It has not been drawn to my attention that the Dominion Government has in any way been connected with the transaction referred to. The question of ownership of land in British Columbia would seem to be under provincial jurisdiction. The Minister of the Interior, however, who has charge of the administration of the Soldiers' Land Settlement Act may reply to my hon. friend with more knowledge of the matter than I possess.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): I have read, at all events, most of the letter addressed to the Acting Prime Minister. The submissions of fact made in that letter are beyond what can be justified, so far as any information that has reached me goes. There is a committee of inquiry, headed by Mr. Paterson, investigating lands offered for sale in British Columbia, and amongst lands reported to be offered for sale were certain lands offered by the Doukhobor community. I do not know whether the committee have investigated those or not. Were they to do so, however, it would not be with the view to expropriate, because there are no expropriatory powers now vested in the Soldiers' Settlement Board and it is not purposed to vest the Board with power to expropriate lands now being reasonably used. At the time that the committee was at work, I received a telegram from Mr. Peter Verigin to the effect that he had made a certain offer to sell, but that the same was made under duress. I drew the attention of the Soldiers' Settlement Board to the telegram, and I advised Mr. Verigin that, if he had made any offer under duress, he should consult his solicitor in the matter.

PEACE TREATY—CONDITIONS OF LABOUR—THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. NEWTON WESLEY ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake) on Friday asked if the Government had any information as to whether provisions for an eight-hour day had been incorporated in the Peace Treaty, and I promised to give an answer to-day if possible. On Monday last, the 28th of April, on motion of the Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Robert Borden), the following clauses relating to labour were unanimously approved for incorporation in the Peace Treaty:

The high contracting parties, recognizing that the well-being, physical, moral and intellectual, of industrial wage-earners is of supreme international importance, have framed a permanent machinery asking that of the League of Nations to further this great end. They recognize that difference of climate, habits, and customs of economic opportunity and industrial tradition make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of attainment. But holding as they do that labour must not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for the ratification of labour conditions, which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply so far as their special circumstances will permit.

Among these methods and principles, the following seem to the high contracting parties to be of special and urgent importance:

First—The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

Second—The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

Third—The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable state of life as this is understood in their time and country.

Fourth—The adoption of an eight-hour day or a 48-hour week, as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been obtained.

Fifth—The adoption of a weekly rest day of at least 24 hours, which should include Sunday whenever practicable.

Sixth—The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh—The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth—The standard set by law in each country with respect to the condition of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth—Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part in order to insure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.

Without claiming that these methods and principles are either complete or final, the high contracting parties are of opinion that they are well fitted to guide the policy of the League of Nations and that if adopted by the industrial communities who are members of the League and safeguarded in practice by an adequate system of such inspection, they will confer lasting benefits upon the wage-earner of the world.

That, I think, succinctly answers the question of the hon. member for North Winnipeg, as it appears that not only an eight hour day, but a weekly day of rest, a living wage, the abolition of child labour, equal pay for men and women for equal work, the right of the association for all lawful purposes, are declared to be the standard for which all nations should work. It is a matter of gratification to the House and to the country that the Prime Minis-

ter of Canada was permitted to move the adoption of those clauses which will in the future be looked upon as the Magna Charta of labour.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I was out of the House when the first part of this statement was read, and after I came in I did not hear of any obligations on the part of labour. Are there any?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: This is a declaration of what labour is entitled to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 83 (from the Senate) for the relief of Albert Greensward.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate) for the relief of Mary Jane Lyons.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 85 (from the Senate) for the relief of Rose Kent Miller.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate) for the relief of Elizabeth Winters.—Mr. Mowat.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

CHAMBLY CANAL AND ROADWAY.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Does the Government intend to repair in a permanent manner, this year, the roadway extending between Pointe Cascades and Coteau Landing along the bank of the Soulanges canal?
2. If so, what is the amount of appropriation therefor?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. $75,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have sworn complaints relating to the construction of the Government highway along the Chambly canal been received by the Government since the beginning of the said construction three years ago?
2. If so, when, and by whom were said complaints made?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to investigate the matter?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Have sworn complaints relating to the administration of the Chambly canal, particularly that which is under the direction of Superintendent Robitaille, been received by the Government?
2. If so, when, and by whom were said complaints made?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to inquire into the complaints made?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. In 1918, by Alexander Champagne, Chs. Dupuis, Chs. Magavenny, Simeon Barsalou, L. H. Hebert, Stanislas Houle, E. S. Filiatrault, Arcade Bissonette, Joseph Aquin.
3. Yes.

PROVIDENT FUND ACT.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

1. Have the employees of the Government Railways asked the Government, since last session of Parliament, to amend the Provident Fund Act?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to have the said amendments passed by Parliament and become law during the present session?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Under consideration.

MESSRS. HENRY AND FERGUSON.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton):

1. Is the R. A. C. Henry, named in the Estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals, the young man referred to in the answer of the minister on April 7, as having been assigned to the Canadian Northern arbitration case?
2. If so, what is the amount of increase in salary given to him since December, 1917?
3. Is the Inspecting Engineer named in the same estimate, Mr. Ferguson, who was connected with the Canadian Northern arbitration? If so, how much has been added to his salary since 1917?
4. What were the salaries of these young men before they were assigned to the Canadian Northern case, and what will be their salaries when the Estimates now before the House have passed?
5. Were the increases of salary to these young men recommended by Mr. Graham A. Bell?
6. How long has Mr. Ferguson been in the service of the Department of Railways and Canals?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. $900.
3. Yes, $1,200.
4. Mr. Henry, $2,800-$3,300; Mr. Ferguson, $4,000-$4,500.
5. Recommended by the chief engineer and approved by the deputy minister.
6. 14 years.

FEDERAL HOTEL, OTTAWA.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is the Government leasing a building formerly known as the Federal Hotel, corner of Sussex and Besserer Streets, Ottawa?

2. If so, from what date was this building leased?

3. What was the annual rental paid each year by the Government?

4. Has the lease recently been renewed?

5. What is the annual rental being paid now by the Government?

6. From whom is this building being leased?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Negotiations are now in progress to lease this building for use of the Board of Pension Commissioners, but so far, no definite arrangement has been made.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No payments made.

4. No previous lease made.

5. Not established.

6. Stewart & Harris.

EMIGRATION FROM CANADA.

Mr. BALDWIN:

1. How many people have left Canada to settle in the United States within the last three years?

2. How many people have come from the United States to settle in Canada within the last three years?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. No information available.

2. 173,418.

RETURNING OFFICER OF NORTH BRUCE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Who was the Returning Officer for the Electoral District of North Bruce in the General Election, November 19, 1917, to December 17, 1917?

2. What instructions, if any, were sent him by the General Returning Officer or from the office of the General Returning Officer, Ottawa, with reference to the question of the right of Indian women to vote?

3. Did Rev. F. Parke, the enumerator at a poll in or near the town of Southampton, Ontario, receive instructions to place the names of squaws resident on the reserve near Southampton on the voters lists? If so, by whom were such instructions given and when?

4. Is Rev. F. Parke a brother-in-law of Hon. I. B. Lucas, Attorney General of the Province of Ontario?

5. In his report to the General Returning Officer did the Returning Officer for North Bruce report that about sixty squaws voted at or near Southampton, and that he had instructed the enumerator to place their names on the list in consequence of a telegram he or enumerator Parke had received from the office of the General Returning Officer, such instructions being contrary to the law?

6. Did the Returning Officer in his report to the General Returning Officer report at what hour on election day Rev. F. Parke gave certificates to the squaws to vote without notifying the Liberal candidate or his agent that he (Parke) was so acting?

7. Did the Returning Officer in his report to the General Returning Officer state what number of squaws voted at or near Southampton?

[Mr. Tobin.]

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. John Wesley Reany, Port Elgin, farmer.

2. By telegram dated December 10th, 1917, the returning officer of North Bruce enquired of the general returning officer at Ottawa whether mothers, wives and sisters of Indian soldiers overseas were entitled to vote. He was answered by wire on same day, not by the general returning officer in person but by an official of his office as follows: "Yes, mothers, wives, sisters and daughters of Indian soldiers have the vote." The general returning officer is of opinion that this advice was correct in Ontario only with respect to Indians not in receipt of treaty money and not living on a reserve, but that it would be correct without qualification in Quebec. Upon inquiry made, he finds that he directed the official who despatched the wire to the returning officer to answer in conformity with previous instructions given to returning officers, and that the official answered erroneously as the result of following instructions which had been issued to inquirers from Quebec province. The official so answered in good faith and the error was not discovered until after the election was over. This is the only known error which occurred within the office of the general returning officer throughout the elections.

3. No information.

4. No information.

5. No.

6 and 7. Answered by No. 5.

COMMERCIAL CABLE CO.—HAZEL HILL, N.S.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Who owns the Commercial Cable Company property at Hazel Hill, Guysboro County, N.S.

2. Is this a Canadian, a British or a United States Company?

3. Who is the superintendent or chief officer in Canada of this company?

4. Who employs and discharges the officers and operators of the company?

5. Were officers of this company refused permission to enlist for overseas service?

6. Is Mr. F. G. Burstall in the service of the company? If so, in what capacity?

7. Has the Canadian Government any control over the company or over its officers and operators?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. The Commercial Cable Company, head office, New York.

2. A United States Company.

3. F. G. Burstall, Hazel Hill, N.S.

4. General Manager, New York.

5. Not so far as the Government is aware. After the passing of the Military Service

Act, exemptions were applied for by the company on behalf of cable operators and granted by tribunal.

6. Yes. Superintendent, Hazel Hill station.

7. Governmental control over the cable station and the staff of the company is limited to censorship, and has not been extended to the relations between the company and its employees.

I.C.R.—EXPRESS PARCELS.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Is the Government aware that a large number of parcels, which are sent by express on the Intercolonial Railway, either become lost or are not delivered to the person to whom they are addressed?

2. If so, what steps are being taken to remedy this deplorable condition?

3. If not, does the Goverment intend to take such steps as will insure delivery of the parcels which are committed to the express companies on the Intercolonial Railway for transmission?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. No steps are being taken.

3. No steps can be taken except to call attention of the express companies to the complaints.

C.N.R.—LEGAL EXPENSES.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. How much money was paid by the Canadian National Railways or by the Canadian Government Railways, to the law firm of Bureau and Bigué, of Three Rivers, since the Canadian Northern Railway System has come under the control of the Canadian Government?

2. Is it to the knowledge of the Government that Mr. Jacques Bureau, M.P. for Three Rivers, is the head of the law firm of Bureau and Bigué?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to have Members of Parliament act as legal advisers for the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No money has been paid to Messrs. Bureau and Bigue by Canadian Northern Railway System since the Government acquired control of the company.

2. No.

3. Legal advisers of the Canadian National Railways will be appointed under instructions of the Directors of that company and it is presumed that they will avail themselves of the services of such legal firms as will best serve the purposes of the railway.

MESSRS. TASCHEREAU, ROY, CANNON AND PARENT.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

1. How much money was paid by the Canadian National Railways or by the Canadian Government Railways to the law firm of Taschereau, Roy, Cannon and Parent, of Quebec, since the Canadian Northern Railway System has come under the control of the Canadian Government?

2. Is it to the knowledge of the Government that Mr. Geo. Parent, M.P., is a member of the law firm of Taschereau, Roy, Cannon and Parent, of Quebec?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to have Members of Parliament act as legal advisers for the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Messrs. Taschereau, Roy, Cannon and Parent have been employed by the Canadian Northern Railway since 1903, and the annual fees are $2,000, and the amounts paid to them since September 30, 1917, are as follows: October 31, 1917, $1,000; April 30, 1918, $1,000; October 31, 1918, $1,000.

2. No.

3. Legal advisers of the Canadian National Railways will be appointed under instructions of the Directors of that company and it is presumed they will avail themselves of the services of such legal firms as will best serve the purposes of the railway.

DOMINION POLICE FORCE.

Mr. DECHENE:

1. How many men were employed in the special force of the Dominion during 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

2. What were their salaries?

3. What were their duties?

4. What was the amount of their expenses?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as the Dominion Police Force is referred to, the replies are as follows:

1. 1913, nil; 1914, 250 employees at a total expense of $80,449.27; 1915, 254 employees at a total expense of $154,225.24; 1916, 228 employees at a total expense of $161,260.47; 1917, 249 employees at a total expense of $205,018.13; 1918, 505 employees at a total expense of $293,433.06.

2. From $2 to $6.66 per day.

3. General police and secret service work.

4. The total amount of their expenses was $894,386.17.

VICTORY LOANS—$50 BONDS.

Sir HERBERT AMES:

1. How many $50 bonds were allotted to subscribers in connection with the fourth or first victory loan?

2. How many in connection with the fifth or second victory loan?

3. What proportion of these $50 bonds mature within five years?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. 699,451.

2. 612,744.

3. 1917 Victory Loan, 81.8 per cent; 1918 Victory Loan, 77.5 per cent.

IMPORTATION OF GASOLINE FARM ENGINES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. How many gasoline traction engines for farm purposes were imported into Canada between November 30, 1917, and February 9, 1919?

2. What were the various values placed upon tractors so imported?

3. Were those tractors subject to the usual customs duty?

4. Was a drawback paid to importers? If so, what was the gross amount paid in drawback?

5. Was permission given to any special firms or importers to import said tractors or any tractors free of customs duties?

6. If so, what are the names and post office addresses of the importers obtaining such permission?

7. Was the privilege of importing such farm tractors between the said dates open alike to all dealers or only to special dealers obtaining permission from the Minister of Customs?

8. What was the gross amount of the customs duty remitted on farm tractors imported between said dates?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The number of "Portable engines with boilers in combination and traction engines for farm purposes" entered at customs houses from November 30, 1917, to February 28, 1919, was 1,524. The number of "Traction engines for farm purposes, costing not more than $1,400 in the country of production" entered at customs houses from February 8, 1918, to February 28, 1919, was 15,121.

2. The total values of the foregoing were as follows: "Portable engines with boilers in combination, and traction engines for farm purposes," $2,541,613. "Traction engines for farm purposes, costing not more than $1,400 in the country of production," $14,640,609.

3. Traction engines, costing not more than $1,400 in the country of production, for farm purposes, were made free from 7th February, 1918, by Order in Council as per copy attached herewith. Traction engines costing more than $1,400 were subject to the usual customs duty.

4. Drawback was not paid to importers on traction engines.

5. No.

6. Answered by 5.

7. The privilege of importing farm tractors was open to all dealers alike.

8. $4,026,167.75.

EXPORT OF FEED.

Mr. REID (MacKenzie):

1. Was there an embargo against the export, except under license, from Fort Willian by the Fort William Grain Company, of a ground manufactured feed contained in cars N.Y.C. 216016; G.N. 20041; B. & O. 78872; G.N. 23408; M.P. 35687; G.N. 122391; N.Y.C. 241441; S.P. 21483; Southern 15081,, during December, 1918, and January, 1919?

2. Did the inspection certificates issued by the Government Grain Inspector at Fort William on these cars correctly describe their contents?

3. If not, in what respect were the contents incorrectly described?

4. Were false export entries declared by the exporters of these cars?

5. Was there any other firm or firms connected with these transactions?

6. Has the minister taken any steps to fine or prosecute those guilty of infractions of the law in these transactions? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The goods contained in these cars are stated to have been ground refuse screenings. There was an embargo during December, 1918, and January, 1919, against the export, except under license, of screenings produced in cleaning wheat and other grains, which was held to include refuse screenings and ground refuse screenings.

2 and 3. The exporters presented the certificates of the Dominion Grain Inspector at Fort William as correctly describing the goods as refuse screenings.

4. Export entries are certified, but not sworn to, by exporters. The exporters certified these goods to be refuse screenings—regarding ground refuse screenings as covered by the term "refuse screenings."

5. The Department of Customs has no information.

6. The exporters claim there were no infractions of the law and the Department of Customs concurs in this view.

VIOLATION OF M.S.A.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Was Harry Woodbury of Spa Springs, Annapolis county, N.S., apprehended during April, 1919, for violation of the regulations of the Military Service Act?

2. Was the said Harry Woodbury ever examined by a duly constituted medical board under the Military Service Act regulations?

3. If so, what report was made upon his medical or physical fitness for military service, and in what category was he placed?

4. Was the case of the said Woodbury ever dealt with by any member or members of a local exemption tribunal?

5. If so, what action was taken by the members of the said exemption tribunal?

6. Was the said Woodbury arrested for violation of the Military Service Act regulations? If so, where and when?

7. Where and before whom was he tried, and with what specific violation of the Act was he charged?

8. What penalty was imposed upon the said Woodbury?

9. Did he pay a fine or was he imprisoned? If the former, what was the amount? If the latter, what was the sentence?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Category "E." Nervous disability.
4. No, as said Woodbury failed to register under the Military Service Act.
5. Answered by 4.
6. Yes, at Middleton, April 17, 1919.
7. Tried before Stipendiary Magistrate McLeod at Halifax as a Group 1 defaulter.
8. Fined $15 and court costs, amounting to $8; or, in default of payment of fine, thirty days in county jail at Halifax.
9. Paid fine of $15 and costs.

INCOME WAR TAX—ASSESSMENT OF FARMERS.

Sir HERBERT AMES:

1. How many persons giving their vocation as farmers or stock raisers have paid income tax under the Income War Tax Act, 1917?
2. How are these divided as to provinces?
3. Is the business of farming and stock-raising specifically exempted from the operation of the Business Profits War Tax Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Number assessed, 5,885; amount assessed, $417,349.10. Number paid, 3,623; amount paid, $219,826.84.

2.

	Number Assessed.	Number Paid.
Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia	12	7
New Brunswick	4	3
Quebec	30	27
Ontario	396	342
Manitoba	1,454	1,281
Saskatchewan	1,084	564
Alberta	2,826	1,325
British Columbia	79	74
Total	5,885	3,623

3. Yes.

THE INCOME WAR TAX—TOTAL ASSESSMENT.

Sir HERBERT AMES:

1. What was the total amount assessed on incomes under clause 4 of the Income War Tax Act, 1917?
2. Of that amount, how much had been collected and paid prior to December 31, 1918?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Assessments approved by Department of Finance to 30th April, 1919: Number, 42,145; amount assessed, $10,031,094.28.

Payments received at Department of Finance to 30th April, 1919: Number, 32,715; amount paid, $6,865,047.10.

2. Assessments approved by Department of Finance to 31st December, 1918: Number, 22,293; amount assessed, $4,570,140.77.

Payments received at Department of Finance to 31st December, 1918: Number, 13,009; amount paid, $1,698,445.37.

Note.—Many firms which would otherwise be assessable for income under the Income War Tax Act are not liable to assessment by reason of their paying a larger amount under the Business Profits War Tax Act.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. McCURDY:

1. Is it the present practice of the Civil Service Commission in making appointments to the Civil Service to stipulate that all appointments shall be considered as temporary until the period of demobilization shall have passed?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to prevent further permanent appointments until demobilization has been completed?
3. If not, what steps has the Government taken to insure that men yet on active service shall enjoy an equal opportunity to compete for these positions?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No. All appointments of a permanent character are made from eligible lists of candidates who have passed prescribed examinations or have been successful in open competition after public advertisement. In both cases returned soldiers are required to possess only the minimum of qualifications when they take precedence over all civilians no matter how highly qualified. Permanent appointments are not made except on specific request from the departments.

2. Until demobilization has been completed, it is not the desire of the Government that permanent appointments to the Civil Service should be made except in those cases where it is necessary in the public interest.

3. Answered by No. 2.

ADVERTISING OF CIVIL SERVICE VACANCIES.

Mr. POWER:

1. By what means are vacancies in the Civil Service of Canada advertised?
2. Does the Civil Service Commission always advertise in the newspapers?
3. If not, under what circumstances are such advertisements published?
4. If so, what newspapers are authorized and paid by the department for such publications?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. The columns of the Canada Gazette, a mailing list of all persons known to the commission as likely to be interested, posters sent places of public resort, such as post offices, banks, libraries, colleges, universities, offices of the Great War Veterans' Association and its branches, and, in a few special cases, by newspapers.

2. No.

3. In the case of certain local positions, when a small advertisement in the local press seems to be the only means of bringing the notice of the vacancy to knowledge of persons interested, or when the other means of publicity have failed to secure a suitable applicant for a local position.

4. None. The paper, or papers, with the largest circulation in the particular centres where the vacancies occur are chosen in each case.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Has the Government purchased a marble bust of the Right Honourable Sir R. L. Borden? If so, what was the urgency or necessity of the expenditure therefor, during war time?

2. What has been done with the said bust, and how much did it cost?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Will the hon. member in whose name this question stands indicate any information that has come to him in regard to the purchase of this bust? We have made inquiry and have failed to find any basis for the question.

Mr. PAPINEAU: It is in the Auditor General's Report for the year 1915-16 under Public Works for repairs and furniture, Ottawa public buildings.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall note my hon. friend's statement in Hansard and make further inquiry.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Strathcona):

1. What rental per month does the Government pay for all branches of Government service in the city of Edmonton?

2. What several branches of Government ser vice are represented in Edmonton?

3. What building or buildings do they occupy and what is the monthly rental of each branch of the service?

Mr. DECHENE:

1. What was the value of farm implements exported during the years, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

2. To which countries were the said implements exported, and who were the exporters?

3. Were any tractors exported?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. McMASTER:

For a copy of all tenders submitted and contracts entered into, concerning the installation of wireless equipment in all steamers built or acquired by the Government since August, 1914, together with all correspondence relating thereto.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Government and the city of Quebec and other stockholders in Quebec, London, New York and elsewhere, with reference to the proposed purchase by the Government of the minority stock of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway and of the Great Northern Railway of Canada, now forming part of the mileage of the Canadian Northern Railway operated by the Government?

[Mr. Burrell.]

CONTROL OF AERONAUTICS—APPOINTMENT OF AIR BOARD.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean Bill No. 80 to authorize the appointment of an Air Board for the control of Aeronautics was read the second time and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Short title:

Mr. BELAND: Has the minister given a general explanation of this Bill?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I really cannot say anything more than is stated in the Bill which I explained briefly on its first reading. Obviously there must be some development in commercial aeronautics in the immediate future. During the war the development in aeronautics related almost entirely to military and naval affairs. Private and commercial aeronautics was prohibited altogether and consequently there was no development along these lines. It is necessary, in view of the probably development of aeronautics, that there should be some governmental control of such matters and it is proposed to establish a Board which shall have entire control of any Government or commercial service. If my hon. friend will look at section 3 he will see there set forth the duties of the Board which will cover fully, I think, all the probable activities in aeronautics. Section 4 is the other important clause and that empowers the Air Board to establish regulations for the control of aeronautics.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Air Board; chairman and vice-chairman; representatives of Militia and Defence and Naval Service Departments; term of office; salaries.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not proposed to establish another department to administer this Act. I would suppose that most of the members of the Board would be selected from established departments of the Government. The administration of the Act will be largely in the hands of the vice-chairman of the Board who will be the chief executive officer. It is necessary, of course, to have representatives of the Naval and Militia Departments upon the Board for the reason that heretofore they have been very much and practically in-

terested in aeronautics. Consequently it is proposed that they shall have direct representation on the Board. It might be urged that the Post Office Department, the Interior Department, the Dominion Police and some other departments should be represented on the Board. However, there was a reason at the moment existing for the representation of the two departments I have mentioned and it is not deemed advisable that other departments which may possibly be interested in aeronautics in the future should all be represented on the Board. But, it will be understood that this measure is of a temporary nature. I have no doubt that in the working of it during the coming year weaknesses will develop but experience will enable us to pass legislation which will be more satisfactory.

Mr. MORPHY: I have listened to the statement of the minister and I would judge from it that his intention is to set up a theoretical Board rather than a practical one. Otherwise, he would have stated the fact that we have a large number of the finest Canadians who have ever done service for their country many of whom have returned to Canada after real practical service on the battlefields of Europe. While there may be men who have been employed with the military and naval services in Canada this is a very opportune time of recognizing the boys who have been fighting for their country, and doing good practical work, and of calling to the service of the country some of these young men who fought for it. I will leave that with the minister. I think that there should be some recognition given to these boys who have done their duty overseas.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Doubtless the class to which my hon. friend refers will be represented on the Board.

Mr. COPP: Has there been any consideration given to the question as to the salaries that will be paid as to those who serve on this Board?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No consideration so far has been given to the matter. It is impossible to give any information to my hon. friend which will be at all reliable at the moment. Possibly the chief executive of the Board will be one who is now employed in some department of the Government. The other members may possibly serve without pay. The development will be largely commercial and perhaps it will not be very extensive for a time. I am hopeful that all the members of the Board will not be paid.

Mr. COPP: Is any provision being made in the Estimates this year for this service?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will be in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. COPP: You could give us some idea from that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Committee will have some idea of the probable expense when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister kindly state if it is in the mind of the Government that this Board shall at an early date undertake the commercial development of aeronautics, not with the idea that it is to be merely an adjunct of military and naval development but with the idea of taking up definitely the commercial development?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If my hon. friend is inquiring whether the Government intends entering into the field of commercial aeronautics, I am bound to reply that it has not yet considered the matter from that aspect. The operations under the Act will, of course, largely relate to commercial activities; I would expect that for the next few years, at least naval and military activities in aeronautics will be very limited, indeed.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think the minister has given the Committee very much information as to the functions which this board is to perform. I have not got any clear idea as to whether it is simply to manage aeronautics in connection with private enterprise, or whether it is to embark upon some large scheme of its own.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. member will be in order when we take up the next clause.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Government any idea with respect to its future policy on the subject of aeronautics?

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. member will be more in order when we take up clause 3.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before we pass this clause I would like to ask if the operations of the board to be created under this Bill are to be centered at Ottawa?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: It will be an organized body under the supervision and control of some department of the Government?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it intended, in connection with the operations of this board, to establish an institution or school where practical and theoretical instruction in aeronautics will be imparted so as to render a man thoroughly competent to take charge of an aeroplane?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Up to the present moment it is not the fixed or settled policy of the Government to establish a school for the purpose indicated. Speaking generally, the Government has no settled policy in respect to aeronautics. The Militia and Naval Departments, during the period of the war, carried out a programme, but it has now practically ceased. It was necessary to first enact legislation before any fixed policy could be adopted by the Government in respect of any form of aeronautical activity. Many applications have been received from commercial companies for the establishment of aeronautical routes throughout Canada; and, as I said a moment ago, it is open to the Government to embark upon various forms of aerial activities, such as the conveyance of the mails, the survey of forest, fire protection, patrols by the mounted police, and so forth, but at the present time, the Government has reached no definite policy in respect of any of these matters.

Mr. McKENZIE: What will be the real function of this board after it has been organized? What will it start out to do?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The immediate purpose of this legislation is chiefly to control aeronautics in Canada, established by any Government department or by private corporation. For example, it is not within the right of any individual to fly in the air with aeroplanes or hydroplanes, or any other machine of the kind, although there is no statutory law which directly prohibits it.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is entirely unknown to the common law.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is unknown to both the common law and the statute law. Consequently, nobody can legally engage in flying to-day, and in none of the provinces, nor in Canada, is there any statutory authority for any body to grant licenses for the purpose. This board must establish aerial routes, or to put it in another way: If a commercial company desires to carry on an aerial service between, say, Montreal and Toronto, their route should be first established and that would be one of the functions of the board. The machines used should be licensed and inspected just as a steamer is. The pilots and the crews must also be licensed, and that will be another function of the board. Furthermore, regulations must be enacted, compelling flying machines to use telephonic or wireless apparatus, and in relation to many other matters which do not occur to my mind at the present moment. I think a very close parallel to the control of aerial navigation is the control which we exercise over shipping, with, of course, the very notable difference that one operates on water and the other in the air. Generally speaking, the object of the legislation is to put ourselves in a position to control aeronautics, chiefly commercial, as that is the form we shall likely have in the immediate future in Canada.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: By this Bill, according to the minister, Parliament is establishing its authority over aerial routes and all matters concerning air craft. But does my hon. friend think that if a company, for instance, established a line between Montreal and Quebec, to operate exclusively within the limits of that province, it would be a provincial matter, and that the company in question should not come under the authority of this Parliament unless its undertaking is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada? My hon. friend classifies aerial navigation with marine navigation, but article 92 of the British North America Act declares that a provincial legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the matters coming within the class of subjects "hereinafter enumerated," and article 10 of section 92 sets forth:

> Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes:—
> Lines of Steam or other Ships, Railways, Canals, Telegraphs and other Works and Undertakings, connecting the Province with any other or others of the Provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the Province.

Therefore if such a company were operating exclusively within the limits of one province it would be a provincial matter, and I do not think this air board could fix the route, or control the license to pilots, and other matters in connection with it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The constitutional question, of course, arises in connection with this matter, and had it been pointed out to the Fathers of Confederation that we might possibly have this aerial development in later years, it would be difficult now to say whether it would have been placed in clause 91 or 92 of the British North America Act.

Clearly, the legislation, if enacted, would cover interprovincial aeronautics, and con-

sequently to that extent the Federal Government would have control. Whether it has control over purely provincial aeronautics is a question open to very much doubt, and possibly it will have to be settled ultimately by the courts. There is a clause in the British North America Act which in effect states that subjects not assigned to the provinces fall within Federal jurisdiction. Aeronautics were not placed in the list of subjects assigned to provincial jurisdiction, and therefore it is arguable that the subject falls within Federal jurisdiction. However, any doubt we may entertain on the point does not affect the competency of Parliament to pass this legislation, although later it may be held by the courts that it is only intra vires in so far as it affects interprovincial aeronautics.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not know if this development of transportation was known before Confederation, but two of the greatest poets of the 19th century, Lamartine and Tennyson, predicted that some day we would see argosies floating in the fair blue sky.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And Jules Verne also.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. I think the objection of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was well taken. It seems to me that as the Government is so anxious to have Government ownership of all kinds of transportation, it should not lose this favourable opportunity of furthering that project. There is no incubus attached to aerial as there is to railway transportation, and the Government should take control of this new industry, which no doubt will develop to a very great extent in the near future. The British Government have already organized an aerial postal service and have mapped out three routes, one for freight, another for passengers, and a third for some public service, I think the postal service. The United States also have organized a postal service between Philadelphia, Washington and Baltimore.

Mr. ROWELL: And New York.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This may be only a tentative service—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is experimental.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what I mean. But it seems to me that the Government should take into serious consideration the propriety of experimenting in this matter. Perhaps we would save enormous railway subsidies by organizing an aerial postal service.

I regret sincerely that the Government did not take over the magnificent plant which the Imperial Munitions Board erected at Camp Borden during the war. Unfortunately the whole plant was sold to an enterprising Yankee, and Canada lost thereby an excellent opportunity. If it is not too late, I would urge upon the Government the necessity of taking over that plant and giving Canada the benefit of it. We do not lack enterprise in aeronautics. During the war our young men showed that they were equal to the best among the Allies in that particular sphere. I need name only one of them who is world famous—Bishop. We have not only the men, but we have all the elements that constitute the material part of the industry itself. During the war the Imperial Munitions Board found in British Columbia the timber which was best suited for the construction of aeroplanes, and I understand they went even as far as to subsidize very heavily a branch line several miles in length in order to tap the district where that special timber was obtainable in large quantities. It seems to me that the Government should be extremely careful in its legislation,—more careful than it appears to have been in the present instance,—so as to start this industry in the right way.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I permit any more speeches on the principle of the Bill, I must ask whether it is the unanimous consent of the Committee that the principle of the Bill be discussed at this time. If not, I shall have to call the Committee to order. I called an hon. member to order a moment ago on this ground. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) but the rules of the Committee are not being followed, and this accounts in great measure for the length of the session. Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the principle of the Bill be now discussed?

Some. hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CAHILL: Will this board be empowered to grant licenses to any persons who wish to establish lines between Ottawa and Toronto, or between other points?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: If a company which established a line between Ottawa and Toronto wanted to establish a line also be-

tween Ottawa and Montreal they might ignore the specified landing places around Ottawa and lease for a trifling sum landing rights on any field within a reasonable distance of the city. Would it be within the power of this board to say that no company should have exclusive right to own territory for landing purposes? Airmen are now ready to leave Newfoundland for England; they have all decided to start at about the same place. It is possible that Prince Edward Island would be a very satisfactory landing place—perhaps more satisfactory, on account of the absence of fog, than any other part of the eastern coast. Some company, if you gave them a franchise, might go in there and blanket the whole island for a trifling sum, obtaining exclusive right to land there. Is it intended to give these companies any such exclusive franchise as was given to the Bell Telephone Company in the early days, when it was thought that no one else would be in a position to compete with them? Before this board is established, before they take power to tie the country up to anything, it would be well for the Government to have a well-defined policy in this matter; it would be well for them not to go too fast until they know what the outcome is likely to be.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The only thing I can say in reply to my hon. friend is that the Government have not in mind the granting of exclusive privileges in respect of certain routes to any individual or company which may be organized. But we must be guided largely by experience in this matter. While at the moment it may seem undesirable to grant exclusive privileges to any person or persons, still a limitation of licenses granted to individuals along certain routes may be necessary. It might, for instance, be perfectly proper to grant a license to twelve or twenty-four persons to fly between Ottawa and Toronto, but, in the light of experience, it might be considered improper, possibly dangerous, to grant licenses to several hundreds or several thousands. As I have already indicated, the policy of the Government in this matter is not yet fully considered or matured. We shall be guided very largely by efforts which are made to develop aeronautics commercially by individuals or corporations. My hon. friend might suggest the propriety of our establishing a mail service between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. That might strike one as a very desirable place to experiment in aerial mail service. I should not like to speak for the Government at the moment and say that they propose establishing such a mail service, but naturally, in the course of time, the Government must develop a policy in respect to these matters. If there is great activity on the part of private interests and private capital, it might be well to allow such interests to do a great deal of experimenting.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—duties of Air Board:

Major-General MEWBURN: I was glad to hear the remarks of the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to our taking over some of the property at Camp Borden. The Imperial Munitions Board spent a large amount of money in Canada in connection with the Royal Air Force. They had a school of aerial gunnery at Beamsville, on lake Ontario, which we did not consider it advisable to touch. They also had large buildings at Deseronto and large aerodromes and plant at Camp Borden where they spent millions of dollars. When the armistice was signed I immediately took the matter up with the Imperial Munitions Board and all that plant and machinery was transferred to the Militia Department.

It was difficult for us to determine from a military standpoint what should be done as regards the air force. I realize what wonderful work the Canadians did in the Royal Air Force, and while it seemed to me that we could not utilize that force in Canada for training purposes, I thought it my duty to protect, as well as possible, their property and equipment. Therefore, the buildings and all the equipment there were handed over to the Government for a mere song, and they are on our own training ground, Camp Borden, which is recognized as one of the best training grounds on the North American continent and which has been used for training American fliers. We also had handed over to us, free of cost, a large number of airships and also a quantity of maps and so forth, and we have retained a very small staff there to protect them. Some of the buildings we expect to utilize as hospitals, thus saving the erection of hospitals. At Long Branch, on lake Ontario, where the rifle ranges are, the Imperial Munitions Board erected a number of buildings which have been handed over to us, but other properties which were on leased ground were scrapped. All the property I have mentioned is intact, and we have the facilities for continuing training and developing an air force in the

future. When my Estimates were being discussed the other night, I was discussing the reorganization of the militia, and if we have to reorganize the militia for defence and other purposes, no doubt an air force will form part of it. That, however, was one of the subjects that we decided the commission would deal with, and as regards the Air Board, I sincerely trust the magnificent men who have made such a name for Canada in the air will have the first opportunity of being recognized in this. Many of them are coming back and are now talking of the commercial side of the industry which is being developed in England. We have a large quantity of information both from France and England as regards air forces, and I sincerely trust that our men who have made good in the air from a military standpoint will be able to make a success in the air from a commercial standpoint.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were there any Canadians associated with the American who bought the whole of the aerial property in Toronto?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not know that there were. Col. Bishop told me that he expected to be interested in some British machines for which he was offered the agency, and while he had not worked out just what he was going to do, he hoped to be able to develop in this country some commercial enterprise, possibly in conjunction with the postal service. This Air Board is only a temporary one to study the question, and the Department of the Naval Service is represented on it merely to keep in touch with a view of developing something in the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I cannot agree with Shakespeare's lines: What's in a name? I would suggest that the minister have Col. Bishop on the first aerial board in Canada.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I should like very strongly to second the suggestion of the hon. member. Col. Bishop is a native of my town and is a son of my former legal partner. I have known him from the day he was born to the present time, and he is to-day the world's champion living airman, having brought down seventy-two aeroplanes. He is a boy of whom any country might be proud, apart altogether from his ability and record as an airman. I would respectfully suggest that anything that can be done by the minister to secure his services on this Air Board would be one of the best moves the Minister of Militia could make. I understand he served for a time on the Administration Board in connection with the air service in London, England, and would be admirably qualified for the position, though I do not know if he would accept it at the present time.

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think any salary the Militia Department could offer Col. Bishop would induce him to take such a position. I have had many consultations with him, but at the present time he is making something like $30,000 a month under contract in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am sorry, because I would like to see a "bishop" associated with the present Government.

Mr. COPP: Under subclause (b) of section 3 this Air Board can travel throughout the whole country studying this question, without let or hindrance on the part of any one. They may go even into other countries, as they see fit. Under subclause (c), they have power to construct and maintain all Government aerodromes and air stations, including all plants, machinery and buildings necessary for their efficient equipment and upkeep. In these two clauses, the approval of the Governor in Council is apparently not necessary, and I should like to know whether or not it is the intention of the Government to give such wide powers to this Aerial Board.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purport of subclause (b) of section 3 is merely a direction to the Air Board to take cognizance of and to study aeronautical development in all countries of the world. It does not imply that the board is to travel as a body to do research work in connection with this matter. It might conceivably at some time be desirable for a member of the board to visit some countries to study the development there taking place, but I do not anticipate that much in the way of travelling will be done by members of the board for a considerable time. I think, however, it is a very proper provision that members of the board be directed to study the development of aeronautics in all countries in the world. Section 7 says that all the moneys proposed to be expended under this Bill must be voted by Parliament, so that Parliament will have control over the matter.

The purport of subclause (c) is to place in the hands of the Air Board the absolute control of the construction and operation of any air service owned by the Government. If the Post Office Department should de-

cide to establish a service between Halifax and Newfoundland, or Halifax and Charlottetown or Halifax and St. John the control of the service would be in the hands of this Board. The Board will also control any services which originate in either the Naval Department or the Militia Department, and this clause places in the hands of one body all matters relating to aeronautics. I trust that this will commend itself to the judgment of my hon. friend. For the time being it seems the best thing to do. D and E are similar in character to C: it simply gives the Board the control and management of all aircraft and equipment necessary for the conduct of any of His Majesty's services. Possibly the Government may establish other services of its own, but in any event, such services when once established, and so long as this legislation stands upon the statute books, will be under the control of the Air Board.

Mr. COPP: I would not like my hon. friend to think that I am raising any objection to the passage of the Bill. My only object is to get some information in regard to it. The minister suggested that the possibility in the near future of a postal air service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Suppose a private individual started such a service, would this Board have the right to designate the landing places on the island and on the mainland and undertake the expenditure of public money in regard thereto?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If it were a Government service, yes; and if it were a private service, still in some respects the Air Board would have control. For instance, it might very properly designate the route to be followed by the service, and should certainly have the right of licensing machines and naming the landing places. In the case of a private concern, the Government, of course, would not expend any money in securing the landing places; that would be done by the companies. There is in contemplation the organization of private corporations which will shortly approach the Government for subsidies for the carrying on of a mail service between different points in Canada. It was necessary that we should have this legislation in order that private companies might be in a position to approach the Government for assistance to carry on public services or to conduct any form of commercial aeronautics themselves.

Mr. COPP: I quite agree with the minister that such legislation should be passed at this session. Aeronautics are only in the experimental stage and it is but right that opportunities should be given to develop this service if it becomes of commercial value to the country. I would suggest, however, that we surround it with adequate safeguards, particularly in connection with the expenditure of moneys. I fear that if money is expended without the approval of the Governor in Council a very much larger expenditure will be incurred than the Government or this Committee foresees at this moment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Governor in Council will exercise a very critical control of expenditures. Clause 7 of the Bill reads:

> All salaries mentioned herein and all expenses incurred under the provisions of this Act shall be paid out of such money as may be appropriated by Parliament therefor.

The authority of Parliament must therefore be obtained before any money can be expended.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If it is good in this case, why not in the railway case? My hon. friend says that companies are already petitioning the Government to establish aerial mail services, and he gives us a gentle hint that the Government may favourably consider the request made by these companies. He has mentioned possible routes —Halifax and Sydney—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Magdalen Islands.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has struck the nail on the head. The Magdalen Islands are the only group of islands inaccessible during several months of the year. Navigation closes at the beginning of January and is hardly open on the first of May, and it would be highly beneficial if a mail service could be carried on during the winter months between, say, Pictou and Prince Edward Island, and the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have no doubt that matter will receive the attention of the Air Board. They would have to study very carefully the atmospheric conditions, the affect of altitudes, etc., before it could be definitely decided how practical these questions are. But when one is thinking of the practical uses to which aeronautics may be applied in Canada in public services, one immediately thinks of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, the Magdalen Islands, the Yukon Territory, across lake Superior, James Bay and many other routes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the cruising of our forests.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, the cruising of our forests.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Conservation Commission is very anxious that such a service should be established, and I note with pleasure that the province of Quebec has secured two aeroplanes to cruise the forests there.

Major-General MEWBURN: They can also be used for photographic purposes in the making of surveys.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes. The great enemy at present is fire, and according to statistics published lately the losses are colossal. I see in the establishment of an aerial service a great boon for Canada not only in the matter of defence but commercially and industrially.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I see in the American papers that the United States Government have been experimenting in the locating of schools of mackerel by aeroplane. Possibly aeroplanes might be useful in that direction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have seen that in the papers but I do not think that any experiments in that direction have been really made. I know of something analogous to that, though. The seal fishermen in Newfoundland were endeavouring some months ago to secure the services of an aviator—I do not know whether they succeeded or not—to fly out over the ice floes to ascertain the location of the seals and the openings for sealing vessels and steamers. That is easy of accomplishment if atmospheric conditions permit.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: You can see deeper into the water from above, and schools of mackerel can be located in that way. By this section the Departments of Militia and Naval Affairs are associated with this Board. Which department will it come under?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Both.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What minister will be responsible for the administration of this board?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is not settled. There will be a representative of the Militia Department on the board.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: Is the minister in a position to make a statement as to what development has occurred in regard to coastal patrol by seaplanes which will operate under this board? Some time ago I took the opportunity of expressing some ideas I had in regard to the development of the hinterland of Canada by the use of aeroplanes, and I am delighted now that the minister has brought in this Bill. I feel, with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that we are on the eve of great events in so far as aerial transport is concerned. On another occasion when I was addressing the House, I pointed out that we had a tract of land 1,600 miles long and 1,000 miles deep just north from here where aeroplanes could be used for exploration purposes and for the carrying of scientists, geologists, naturalists, topographers and photographers, in order that the country might be properly mapped and explored. I also pointed out that the geologists have told us that the Cobalt and Porcupine formations in Northern Ontario extend northward. There is a great field for the use of aeroplanes in a scientific way. But, what I particularly desired to bring to the attention of the Committee was an accident that occurred on the west coast of this continent last fall when a steamer was on the rocks of the Lynn canal, and when 343 people were drowned, not one person being saved. A great work could be done on the coast in aiding shipping in bad weather by the use of aeroplanes, and I would be glad if the minister could say as to whether the plans of the Government contemplate a service of that kind more particularly on the Pacific coast and in British Columbia.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The service to which my hon. friend (Mr. A. Thompson) refers is one of the many that it is intended shall come within the purview of the board. Just how practical a service the aeroplane might render on the coast is one which, of course, will have to be determined by experience. But at least I can inform my hon. friend that that is one of the subjects which will have the attention of the board when it is established.

Mr. MOWAT: With regard to clause 3, which with clause 4 is the chief operating clause of the Act, I would say that the draughtsman has done his work well, but there is one thing that he has not had present in his mind in connection with the matter and that is as to the question how aeronautics is going to interfere with the property rights of the public. I would suggest to the minister that he consider that point before the Bill goes through. According to the law, as it has stood for many hundreds of years, the right of the property owner extends usque ad caelum ab inferno,

that is up to the heavens and down beneath the earth. That is his property. It may be that we have arrived at a stage in the world's history in which a machine has come which will suddenly be launched across his property. While a flier may be far up in the air and could not be said to do very much harm to a man's property, sometimes aeroplanes come very near to a man's house and they do make a great deal of noise. You may have claims made by certain property owners who do not want these things coming over their houses or property. There is nothing in the Act which enables the Government to say that aeroplanes shall have the right to pass over a man's property or to define the conditions under which that right shall be exercised. I do not share with the minister the doubt that he seems to have as to his power to enact this legislation as having reference to the point raised by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe).

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As to provincial service only.

Mr. MOWAT: Quite so. Property rights will be provincial. You have the right to legislate with regard to that because you have the exhaustive clause of the British North America Act which says that anything which is not provincial is Dominion. You have besides that, the Post Office service, the naval service, and the military service, and, last, but not least, the service suggested by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. A. Thompson)—the geological service. That brings it into the Interior Department. With all these uses in the different departments of the Government to which the aeroplane might be put, there seems to me to be a preponderating case in support of the contention that these are Dominion matters and would naturally come under the control of the Dominion authorities. How could an air man know where the exact position of the provincial boundary was? When he starts out on his journey he must have some rule or regulation which will carry him to the end of it in Canada without regard to what particular province in Canada he may be in. I doubt if any one will raise the point that this is a matter for exclusive provincial jurisdiction. If any one does, it behooves the Dominion Government to fight for Dominion rights with all the power they have. I agree that it is a good general purpose Bill. It is impossible to foresee all the things that will come under it but its provisions are expressed in general terms and if the minister will consider the addition of a clause which will give the right to go over properly either with or without compensation—I do not care which—he will be making a Bill which will do for the time being and until we know more about the subject. It seems to me that the Bill should pass at this session even if it is not wholly adequate to provide for all cases so that the world may know that Canada, is, as usual, in the van in regard to improvements in science.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: As my hon. friend (Mr. Mowat) in closing, referred to the necessity of legislation at this session, I would like to emphasize the statement a little farther and say that I am very anxious to have the Bill become law at once and that I shall probably ask His Excellency's assent to this Bill long before the closing of Parliament. I do not desire to amend the Bill with a view of abrogating any of the common law doctrines in respect to property rights in the air. In view of recent developments, the point is one for the courts to determine but I doubt very much if that doctrine would be held to have much validity under the circumstances. I would refer my hon. friend to paragraph (i) of section 4 which reads as follows:

(i) the institution and enforcement of such laws, rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the safe and proper navigation of aircraft in Canada or within the limits of the territorial waters of Canada;

The subsection 3 immediately below reads as follows:

(3) All regulations enacted under the provisions of this Act shall be published in the Canada Gazette, and, upon being so published, shall have the same force in law as if they formed part of this Act.

The important thing to have in mind in aerial navigation is the protection of life and property, and I have no doubt the board will provide by regulation that no flying machine shall approach the ground, or approach a building, within a certain number of feet. I have heard the story frequently, and I assume it is a fact, of somebody when flying in the city of Vancouver entering a bedroom where a patient was being attended by a doctor; the machine and pilot landing in the bedroom. We will seek to avoid the repetition of such a discourteous act as that by providing a regulation that the flight of the airplane shall be of a certain height in order to safeguard, so far as is possible, the safety of property and person. I submitted the Bill to the Justice Department before introducing it, and was told that the measure

was perfectly constitutional and about the best that could be done to meet the situation for the time being.

Mr. CRONYN: I rise to support the suggestion of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that this is a good opportunity to really consider Government ownership in connection with aeronautics, and I bring the point up under subsection (11) of the clause under discussion. I would urge upon the minister, when preparing the regulations considered necessary for the control or operation of aeronautics in Canada, to make those regulations so drastic for the time being that the Government will be able to keep that control within its own hands. I think one of the tests to be brought to bear on the question of public ownership is whether the particular business under consideration has become, or is likely to become, a natural monopoly; and while it is impossible for us to foresee, as was instanced in the case of the Bell Telephone Company, to what extent aeronautics may become a monopoly, there is some danger of it. Some months ago I overheard a discussion in New York about the formation of a wealthy syndicate to acquire the landing places around the great cities in the United States, and thus to completely control aeronautic operations, or aviation between those points. It is evident that unless an aeroplane can come close to the heart of a city to make a landing its speed avails little, because the time consumed after the landing is made to reach that centre, takes so much off the time gained between cities that the aeroplane comes then into competition with the railway. I might also be permitted to point out to the minister that Mr. Rudyard Kipling, many years ago, drafted a code of aeronautics. Following his wonderful tale which, I think, is called "The Night Mail," he as a matter of tour de force of the imagination, prepared a series of rules. I have not read them for many years, but in those rules Mr. Kipling covers some of the very points we have been considering this afternoon.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is only fair when we are dealing with so practical a phase of the development of aeronautics as the present, that I should suggest to the minister that he would—in connection with this board and in connection with any legislation on this subject—enlist the sympathy and help of the father of aeronautics in this country, I refer to Dr. Bell, who has a home at Baddeck, N.S., although he sometimes resides in Washington. I had the pleasure in September 1896 of being present in the machine shop experimenting office of Dr. Bell in the town of Baddeck, when it was considered a great achievement in aeronautics that he could cause a certain machine that he had in his laboratory to rise three or four inches from the ground. It is gratifying to know that we have today reached such an advanced stage of development in aeronautical science. Dr. Bell is a Canadian, born in Brantford in the great province of Ontario and is well known, and he spends about ninety per cent of his time at his beautiful home in the neighbourhood of Baddeck in the county which I have the honour to represent, and I think it would be only fair on the part of the Government to recognize his great services, the great research he has displayed, and what he has done for this science. The first airship that was ever built in Canada was constructed at his workshops at Baddeck, and did considerable flying. It was operated by a Baddeck boy, young McCurdy, who was famous afterwards as a flier and who was in charge of some of the works at Toronto or Camp Borden in the early stages of the war. I do not know where young McCurdy is now.

Major-General MEWBURN: Long Branch.

Mr. McKENZIE: He is the young man who took charge of the first flying machine that was built in Canada, if not on the continent of America, under the direction of Dr. Bell. He was assisted by another young Canadian, also well-known to fame—or at least his progenitors were, young Baldwin, the grandson of the famous Canadian statesman of that name. Mr. Baldwin is in charge of Dr. Bell's works at Baddeck, where not only flying machines, but machinery of the most advanced type in connection with transportation, are turned out. I therefore suggest to the minister that it would be a proper and well-deserved compliment, and a mark of recognition on the part of the Canadian people and Canadian Government, to Dr. Bell to enlist his sympathy and utilize as much as possible his great knowledge in connection with the enterprise in which Dominion authorities are now about to engage. As to landing places, if it is desired to take advantage of possibly the greatest site in the world, let me point out to the minister that his own native town of North Sydney is the place that was selected by both the United States and Canadian Governments while the war was on, and when they were

looking for the very best location for the starting of an aerial service. At that time North Sydney was chosen as the best place on the east coast of America for the purpose. A large amount of money has been expended on the station there, and very extensive buildings erected which are now owned by the Government. Large areas of land were also acquired for the purpose of carrying on experiments, and I would suggest to the minister that the board to be appointed under this Bill are the proper persons to take charge of that property and see that it is not lightly thrown away. There is an idea that a portion of this land is to revert back to some of its original owners, and if that should turn out to be the case the Government may not again acquire it as cheaply as they did in the first instance. Those works were constructed, at the nearest point to Newfoundland, and there at least forty or fifty machines were built and put in operation last summer. We got so used to flying machines last summer in North Sydney that it was no more a novelty to see an aeroplane in the air than an automobile on the street. I am bringing these matters to the attention of the minister so that he may not forget to make use of the knowledge and experience of those great men who are to all intents and purposes Canadians, and of the development that has already taken place in connection with the use of aeroplanes and hydroplanes for commercial purposes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The property at Sydney will, of course, under this Bill, come within the control of the board, and it is not the intention of the Government, so far as I know, to part with it. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) that it is a very desirable property, particularly in connection with trans-Atlantic operations. I am also grateful to him for calling the attention of the Government to the pioneer work of Prof. Graham Bell. His very valuable services in the science of aeronautics ought to receive proper recognition, and I shall be very glad to submit to my colleagues the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The clause now before the Committee affords a good deal of scope for the imagination of hon. members in defining the duties of the Air Board. When we contemplate the great strides that have been made in the science of aeronautics during the last five years and the possibilities of the future, I think we may well realize that this is likely to become a very important service. I do not feel very much concerned about the danger of not having sufficient landing places. If there is one thing we may claim to have in abundance it is sufficient room for that purpose.

The question raised by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) and other hon. members is, I suppose, a constitutional one, but to the ordinary layman it seems inconceivable that any province should claim a monopoly of the air. This is a case where provincialism should not creep in, and certainly it ought to be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It seems to me that the Government have shown good judgment in promptly bringing a measure of this kind before Parliament. No doubt the Air Board will keep in touch with changing conditions and report to the Government from time to time, and I think this section should be made as broad as possible in order to give the Board the fullest control of the air service. But with regard to the disposal of certain machines which were in service during the war, those machines might be all right for training purposes, but a very different type of machine will be needed for commercial purposes.

I do not altogether agree with the view that the Government should exercise too rigid a control over the service. I think something should be left to the ingenuity or individual initiative if this service is to develop as we would like to see it develop. Our Canadian boys made an enviable record in the air at the front, and the Government would certainly be lacking in their duty if they failed to retain in our air service as many as possible of those splendid men who made such brilliant records overseas. When we consider the immense undeveloped resources of this country, and what can be accomplished through such an air service I think it is very important that instead of restricting the powers of this board we should extend them as far as possible. Practically the whole northern part of Canada is unexplored, and we have as yet no idea as to the value of our resources in that vast territory. This service can render very valuable work in the way of exploration and fire protection.

5 p.m.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think the Government is to be congratulated on taking this progressive movement and in recognizing the splendid work done by our air men at the front. In a country like British Columbia this service can be very usefully developed in connection with the handling of forest fires, and also in exploration work. But I

hope one of the first things to be taken up by this Board will be to thoroughly investigate the possibilities of using the service for rescuing shipwrecked people. We have had many serious wrecks on the Pacific coast, some of them almost within a stone's throw of shore, such as the Princess Sophia recently, and the Valencia wreck on the coast of Vancouver Island a few years ago. The latter boat was within a few hundred yards of the shore, but owing to the shallow water and the steep cliffs it was an utter impossibility to rescue the passengers, and they dropped off the rigging one by one and only a few were saved. In such cases an aeroplane could render valuable help by carrying a cable to the ship by means of which those on board might be brought safely to shore. I trust this will be one of the first things investigated by the Air Board.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—powers of Air Board to make regulations with approval of Governor in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: In the matter of penalizing a person who violates the rules, has the minister given attention to the question of jurisdiction? Where will the offender be tried and the penalty be imposed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Such a case would be comparable, I suppose, to a case against an offender engaged upon a ship; he would first be served by a process of the court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How about the customs laws?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Section 5 provides that the board shall have power to control the places in Canada where a landing may be made from a foreign country.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—officers and men:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of this clause is to provide for the control and discipline of those employed in connection with the Government service. For instance, if it was an air service in connection with national defence, the Air Board would acquire these powers, which are somewhat similar to the powers enjoyed by the Naval Department and the Militia Department. If the service had something to do with policing the unorganized territories of Canada, it would probably be necessary to house and clothe our men. The powers are very general, but important and necessary.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—payment of expenses, etc., under Act.

Mr. BELAND: Is it contemplated to have a certain number of aeroplanes reserved for the exclusive use of ministers of the Crown? It would mean a great saving in time—and time is precious just now, as is evidenced by the fact that we are interfering with the ordinary course of the sun to gain some of it. To have some aeroplanes reserved for ministers would afford them an opportunity, when they travel in that way, to see very much more of the country which they govern. Further, it would avoid the repetition of the fearful plight in which my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) found himself at the station in Toronto the other day, when he was unable to get a sleeper because of the fact that three private cars were attached to the Ottawa train.

Major-General MEWBURN: You would not want to see the ministers any more up in the air than they are now, would you?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

LIVE STOCK AND LIVE STOCK PRODUCTS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. T. A. Crerar (Minister of Agriculture), Bill No. 75, to amend The Live Stock and Live Stock Products Act, 1917, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—selling and buying rights of other persons preserved:

Mr. ROBB: This clause makes some slight changes in the Act which was passed in 1917. I notice that it gives the farmer, drover, or other person the right to "buy his live stock at any stockyard". Why is the word "his" there?

Mr. CRERAR: The clause as it formerly stood, read:

> Nothing in this Act, or in any regulation made hereunder, shall take away, or in any manner limit, the right of any farmer or drover to sell his live stock at any stock yard.

The main change in the amendment is to provide that any farmer may buy as well as sell in any stockyard. My hon. friend directs attention to the fact that the term "other persons" is included, and he desires to know what is meant by that. It merely broadens the scope of the amendment.

Mr. ROBB: I was not objecting to that. I was drawing attention to the last line:

Or other person to buy his live stock at any stock yard.

Why is the word "his" in there? Why would a man want to buy his own stock?

Mr. CRERAR: I think there is an error in the printing of the Bill. The word "his" is not in the amendment as I have it on my notes here. And I would move that the word "his" should be struck out.

Mr. MORPHY: Why not also strike out the word "his" where it occurs before? A man might want to sell his neighbour's live stock as well as his own.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes. I would move that the word "his" in the tenth line, and also in the twelfth line of subsection (2) of section 1 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the ordinary construction that lawyers put upon matters of this kind is applied to the term "other persons" in this section, it will not have the effect that the minister says; it will not widen the scope of the section. It means simply "other persons" of the classes already mentioned. The minister should be under no misapprehension, and if he intends that anybody at all can go there, that should be made clear.

Mr. CRERAR: "Any person of the classes mentioned" is what is intended.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—manner of inspection may be prescribed by regulation, also size of packages of wool.

Mr. CRERAR: I can, perhaps, make this clear by reading the clause as it stands in the existing Act:

The manner in which live stock, meat, poultry, eggs and wool shall be graded and branded or marked, and what shall be the size of packages containing meat, eggs and poultry, the kind of package that may be used, and how such packages shall be branded, marked or labelled.

The amendment provides that regulations may be made as to the manner in which these shall be inspected, and it adds wool to the other articles mentioned that are subject to regulation as to size of package. The request for this has come from probably 90 per cent of the wool growers in Canada who desire to have their commodity standardized and subjected to regulations the same as the other articles.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Crerar.]

On section 3—requirements for shipping.

Mr. ROBB: The minister should explain where the inspection will take place. Must farmers have their stock inspected before it is shipped? Very wide powers are given to the inspectors as to the regulations they may prescribe, and I should like to know what the minister's policy is.

Mr. CRERAR: This provision is not intended to be applied in the manner suggested by the hon. member. It is rather for the purpose of giving shipping companies power to refuse shipments if they think the Act has not been complied with in respect to inspection and grading. A similar provision exists in the Meat and Canned Foods Act. It is not intended that a farmer shall have his stock graded before he ships it from the farm. This is not intended to apply to live stock at all, but rather to live stock products such as hides, wool and similar commodities.

Mr. McKENZIE: In connection with stockyards, could the minister give us some information about the proposition to build a cold storage plant at Montreal to some extent under the guidance and supervision of his department, and is it the policy of the Government to build cold storage plants in other parts of Canada. In the Maritime Provinces there are no cold storage plants for chilled meats, and very strong pressure is being brought to bear upon the department to extend to those provinces the same privileges as are being given to Montreal in the way of cold storage plants.

Mr. CRERAR: The cold storage warehouse to be erected at Montreal will be under the control of the Board of Harbour Commissioners for that port. The purpose is to erect a plant on the water front, to provide facilities for transhipment of perishable commodities. At present, the existing cold storage warehouses in Montreal are located at some distance from the water front, and it has frequently happened that deterioration has occurred in moving foodstuffs from the cold storage warehouse to the vessels for shipment. I know on some occasions last year, for instance, in the shipment of frozen beef, carloads of beef had to be sent back from Montreal to Toronto to be refrozen and put in proper condition for loading on the vessel to be carried in its refrigerated space across to Europe.

The development of cold storage and refrigeration in the shipping of perishable commodities, has been very remarkable in

recent years. I urged on the Government the necessity of having such an equipment at the port of Montreal in order that we might have all the facilities for developing an overseas trade in this respect. For example Great Britain, I am informed, imports annually two hundred million dozens of eggs, of which large quantity Canada, I believe, supplies two or three million dozens. If we are going to take advantage of that market we must provide proper facilities for reaching it, and to that end it is essential that there should be proper cold storage facilities at the point of shipment, so that a carload of eggs, or beef, butter, or cheese, as the case may be, which comes into the port of Montreal and has to wait for a week or ten days or possibly two weeks for a vessel will have proper storage and be readily transferred to the vessel on its arrival. As to the policy of the Government, I am not in a position to speak, but I can express my personal opinion that this aid to the development of trade in these commodities is one that should be encouraged by the Government. That is only my personal opinion. I think that other ports such as Halifax should, as soon as opportunity offers, and it is possible, be provided with such facilities.

Mr. LOGGIE: Will the proposed cold storage plant have railway trackage so that cars can be run into the building or alongside of it in order to preclude depreciation in unloading? In what part of the city will the construction take place? I understand that a new cold storage plant is proposed, a short distance west of Mile End on the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks. It is intended to unload western frozen commodities there, and when they are ready for shipment overseas they will have to be reloaded in cars and sent to the dock to the steamer. I think it is important that the cold storage plant should have railway trackage to enable the cars to run either into the building or alongside. This would greatly facilitate loading on the steamer.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Government is assuming to itself all the virtues in connection with government ownership of all the great utilities of the country, and I might suggest that this is a field into which the hon. minister might extend his jurisdiction and his usefulness by announcing a policy of ownership of cold storage plants in Canada. If you will permit me some latitude, Mr. Chairman, I will point out to the minister what is regarded as a great curse to the ordinary people in the private ownership of cold storage concerns. It is said that five or six million pounds of butter is being held to-day in cold storage waiting for higher prices than the extraordinary prices we are now paying. If these facilities were held by the Government and foodstuffs such as butter, etc., could be put into cold storage and controlled, and only a fair profit allowed, we would not have the condition that exists to-day of butter which was bought for about 40 or 45 cents a pound, as I am informed, being held for higher prices which in some places have reached 75 and 80 cents a pound. Such a condition should not be permitted, when such a useful article of food as butter can be allowed to remain in storage in immensely large quantities until the price soars from 45 to 80 cents and over. In some parts of Canada butter is selling at one dollar a pound. I have read that Dr. McFaul, the representative of the Labour Department, who has been inquiring into this matter, has suggested to the Government that some immediate action should be taken in regard to these large quantities of butter now in cold storage. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to consider this matter and to see if anything can be done to relieve the situation. The Government should release this food so that people may have it at reasonable prices.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It puzzles me to know why Canadian butter is cheaper in London to-day than it is in Canada, and my hon. friend will be doing a great service if he can reduce the cost of living by giving us at least as cheap butter in Canada as in London. We are taking very necessary precautions against Bolshevism, and it is right that we should do all in our power to prevent any revolutionary wave from sweeping over Canada. But I would remind the Committee that revolutions are primarily caused by empty stomachs. The French revolution began at the bakeries, and when the French—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. I hope the Committee will not impose upon the indulgence of the Chair.

Mr. ROBB: I understand that the cold storage warehouse which the minister says will be erected on the property of the Harbour Commission of Montreal will be controlled by the Harbour Commission. If the Government are going to subsidize the Harbour Commission, they should be careful to make such regulations as will

compel the Commission tc handle these products on a fair basis, and not such as will create the same arbitrary conditions as now exist in the grain trade. Grain that is sold locally pays more than grain for export. It is unfair to the people of Canada who are putting up the money that they should be taxed a higher rate than when grain is exported. The minister should be careful to see that the regulations will provide that on products for domestic distribution people will not be charged more than is charged on goods going for export.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall gladly keep the suggestion of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) in mind when the regulations are being prepared. I want to make it clear to the Committee, however, that the main purpose of the plant to be erected in the harbour of Montreal is to facilitate the export of perishable agricultural commodities. As to the points that the leader of the Opposition has raised, of course they are very important, but they are not intimately related to the clause under discussion. The cause, mainly, of the high prices of butter at the present time is the great demand and the shortage of supply. The dairy herds of Europe have been depleted enormously by the war. Recently the dairy commissioner of the Department of Agriculture had an inquiry from Denmark to purchase Canadian butter. It is a well known fact that Denmark has, in the past, been one of the largest exporters of butter in Europe. The demand is so great and the supply so limited that the inevitable result is higher prices. To what extent the farmers of Canada should be controlled in the prices they are getting for their dairy products is another question. I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that, if cold storage warehouses and butter speculators are cornering supplies of butter with a view of reaping a golden harvest, through the sale of it, there should be some method of formulating regulations which will reach such people. But from all the information I have been able to get, I really believe that in the main—practically altogether—the excessively high prices are due to the reasons I have stated. The tendency in the last few weeks has been for butter prices to come down. I believe that in Ottawa to-day first class butter can be secured for fifty cents a pound, and the dairy commissioner tells me that the Montreal price had dropped ten cents a pound during the last two weeks.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not like to let the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition, as to the prices of butter being so exorbitantly high, to pass without being challenged. The papers to-day say that on the Montreal market on Saturday choice creamery butter is quoted at 51 cents per pound. I do not know of any other foodstuffs that are quoted at any more reasonable price than butter at 51 cents a pound, and when you talk of butter at a dollar a pound——

Mr. ROBB: If the hon. member would allow me to interrupt him; the only fault that can be found with his argument is that you cannot buy butter at 51 cents a pound.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am speaking about what the producer has to sell it for, and if it cannot be bought for that price I am unable to understand why. There must be some medium between the producer and the consumer, and there is room for complaint if, as the leader of the Opposition says, butter is now selling for from 70 cents to 80 cents and a dollar a pound. But you will see from the market reports that butter is not unreasonably high considering the cost and everything bearing on the production of butter.

Mr. McKENZIE: Let me say to the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) that I have a right to believe the records as they come to us from the Labour Department. If he will look at the last Labour Gazette which gives the prices he will see that the price of butter at Sydney and Halifax was 75 cents a pound, and at St. John 80 cents. There are some other places where it went as high as $1 a pound. I am sure that my hon. friend, who is always very anxious to make a point against the leader of the Opposition, sometimes perhaps justly, but often wrongly, is wrong again to-day. I did not find fault with the price that the farmer was getting for his butter. I did not find fault about the farmer getting 45 cents a pound for his butter, but I do hold that the Government which my hon. friend supports ought to take steps to see that the coal miner, the lumberman, and every man who is a non-producer in so far as butter is concerned, is protected against the middlemen who are getting this difference between the price that the farmer is receiving, and the consumer is paying. That is the position of the leader of the Opposition, and if the hon. member for South Oxford gets any consolation out of it he is entirely welcome.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am sorry if the leader of the Opposition should think that I would be so unkind as to try and put him in wrong on any question. I was merely referring to the market reports as to the price of butter. I am one of those who feel that it is not the province of the Government to do for the people what they should do for themselves. If butter is sold wholesale on the market, as it has been recently for 51 cents a pound, and if it is going down, I do not anticipate that there is any great difficulty in the people getting it at a reasonable price if they exercise the ingenuity which they usually do in business. I can hardly imagine that the people expect to be spoon-fed by the Government, and that they are not to put forth any effort in order to do the things that they would naturally be expected to do. I do not say but that there are things that the Government might be able to do. If butter is being held in cold storage for speculative purposes, for instance, which I very much doubt, then I do think it is the duty of the Government to step in and see that it is not permitted.

Mr. ROSS: Provision is made in section 9 for inspection, and my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) asked the minister certain questions as to where that inspection was to take place. I imagine his idea was to find out what trouble producers were going to be put to in regard to their food products. I have in my town one of the largest dealers in eggs. He tells me that when eggs are shipped out of the province, to the province of Quebec, or possibly out of Canada, they have to be inspected. He says that when he ships two carloads of eggs to Hull they have to be inspected, whereas, if they are shipped to Ottawa, they do not need to be inspected. On account of the restrictions imposed by the regulations, and the difficulty of getting inspectors to inspect the eggs when they are ready for shipment, great inconvenience and loss to the shipper, as well as loss to the purchaser results. I would like to know if there is any real justification for that restriction being placed upon a shipper of eggs in this country, how many inspectors the minister proposes to have and if sufficient inspectors are going to be provided to see that delays shall not occur.

Mr. CRERAR: If regulations are passed governing matters of this kind it is necessary that sufficient inspectors be appointed to carry out the regulations with reasonable convenience to the people who are working under them. The shipment of eggs to which the hon. gentleman alluded comes under regulations that are already in effect. As I understand, it is not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to lay down regulations governing the shipment of eggs from one point to another in the same province. But the Federal Government has power to make regulations governing interprovincial shipments and shipments for export, and the present regulation with respect to eggs is this: If a merchant in Canada has a shipment of eggs for export covering more than twenty-five cases of thirty dozen each, that shipment has to be inspected. In the case of an interprovincial shipment the merchant is allowed up to one hundred cases, but if the shipment exceeds that maximum he must have it inspected. The underlying purpose of this legislation and these regulations is to guard the public, as far as possible, against fraud in the shipment of commodities, and to establish reliability and reputation for the articles that are being traded in. It can be readily seen what the effect on our Canadian produce would be, for example, if some dealer in Canada sent a shipment of eggs to the London or the Liverpool market and when it arrived at its destination half the eggs were out of condition; or if hides, wool, or any other commodity were exported and did not reach the market over there in proper condition. The fact is that the producers of these articles are the ones that are mainly asking for the establishment of these regulations.

Mr. ROSS: I can appreciate the necessity in the case of national trade, but not in regard to interprovincial trade.

Mr. CRERAR: Of course, the consumers in Montreal, or any other Canadian city, are just as much entitled to protection against fraudulent shipments as in the case of such shipments to the London or Liverpool market.

Mr. ROSS: There is not the same danger.

Mr. CRERAR: The same danger exists on the part of unscrupulous dealers.

Mr. ROSS: But Canadian dealers are not unscrupulous.

Mr. CRERAR: I would not say that Canadian dealers are unscrupulous, but some of them might be, and the provision is there in order to protect the public. In that connection I might say that there has been a very notable development of the egg and poultry industry in the province of Prince Ed-

ward Island in the last few years. That is due, I am informed, almost altogether to the reputation and reliability which the producers in that province have been able to establish for their products, and by this legislation we aim simply to provide the machinery that will aid in bringing that about. If the regulations are working hardship to any interest in Canada it is the duty of the Government to take the matter under consideration, and if necessary modify, or change the regulations in such a way as to make them reasonable in their operation.

Mr. ROSS: I presume the Prince Edward Island trade to which the minister has alluded is overseas trade?

Mr. CRERAR: And interprovincial trade as well.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—penalty increased from $100 to $500.

Mr. BOYCE: What change does this clause make?

Mr. CRERAR: The clause in the Act as it now stands provides that the maximum fine shall be $100. We are increasing the maximum for violation of the Act or any regulation to $500.

Mr. BOYCE: Does the minister mean that the penalty applies to any violation of any part of the Bill we are now considering?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, the fine is not to exceed that sum, but the amount imposed will be within the jurisdiction of the magistrate who happens to try the case.

Mr. ROSS: What fines have been imposed under this particular section, and what is the reason for increasing the penalty from $100 to $500?

Mr. CRERAR: I cannot at present state the amount of money that has been collected from fines imposed, but I will be very happy to obtain the information and supply it to the hon. gentleman privately. The purpose of raising the penalty is to impress upon dealers that they cannot violate the regulations without having to face the possibility of a severe penalty.

Mr. ROSS: Have there been many infringements of this clause of the Act?

Mr. CRERAR: There have been a few, but in the main the law has been pretty well lived up to. I regret that I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the precise number of infringements.

Mr. ROBB: In connection with this matter, a few days ago, when the Acting Minister of Justice was putting a Bill through the House and objection was made to the excessive amount of the penalty, the minister stated that these fines were generally imposed correlatively with the period of imprisonment. In this case the Minister of Agriculture has jumped the fine from $100 to $500, but has not increased the term of imprisonment. It is apparent therefore that the law officers of the Government have not the same basis for calculating fines in all the departments.

Mr. CRERAR: Probably in the case to which the hon. gentleman alludes the object was to place the fine and imprisonment more on a parity than it had previously been.

Mr. ROBB: The situation was exactly the opposite. There was a fine of $1,000 or ten years' imprisonment.

Mr. CRERAR: What does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. ROBB: I am referring to legislation that we were considering a few days ago. Now we are dropping from that high level to $500, or three months' imprisonment.

Mr. PETER R. McGIBBON: I would urge the Minister of Agriculture to reconsider this clause, and make the punishment a little milder.

Mr. CRERAR: As I have already stated the object of placing the maximum fine at $500 is to hold before the person who consciously violates the Act or the regulations, the possibility of a stiff penalty. However, I am quite willing to reduce the amount to $400 if it would suit hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McKENZIE: How will this section read as compared with the provisions of the old Act?

Mr. CRERAR: The section reads:

> Any person violating any provision of this Act, or of any regulation, shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

In the existing Act the penalty is $100, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding

three months, or both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. McKENZIE: The period of imprisonment is the same as it was before, is that right?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. PETER R. McGIBBON: I would ask the minister to make the fine $300.

Mr. CRERAR: I am willing to make a fair compromise, and place the fine at $400. I move that the clause be amended in that way.

Mr. BOYCE: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGibbon) expect many evil doers in his neighbourhood, that he wants to make the maximum fine so low?

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. CRERAR. With the consent of the Committee I beg to move:

That section 9 of the Act be further amended by adding the following, which shall be subsection (d) thereto: The manner in which live stock products imported into Canada shall be inspected, graded, branded or marked.

This is merely to provide for the application of the same regulations to these goods coming into Canada that we are applying to similar goods produced here.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CRERAR: In respect to the information desired by the hon. member for Northumberland on the cold storage plant to be erected in Montreal, the request came from the Harbour Board and was strongly supported by them. I understand that it is their intention to have the plant built on the wharf with full trackage facilities to it.

Bill reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

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

Miscellaneaus—amount required to meet expenses of the Lake of the Woods Technical Board and the Lake of the Woods Control Boards, $6,000.

Mr. COPP: What is this for?

Mr. ROWELL: When this item was before the Committee last week I explained that the International Joint Commission had considered, and made certain recommendations with regard to, the levels of the Lake of the Woods. The Lake of the Woods Technical Board was composed of officers of the different departments of the Dominion Government and certain representatives of the Ontario Government having to deal with technical matters of that kind. Its function was to collect the data necessary to enable Canada to present her case fully to the International Joint Commission. The board collected that data, and the case was presented to the International Joint Commission, which has made certain recommendations. These have not so far been acted upon by either Government in the sense of framing a convention to carry them out. The International Joint Commission, however, recommended that the water of the Lake of the Woods should be maintained between certain maximum and minimum levels. The Lake of the Woods Control Board is composed of two officers of the Dominion Government and two officers of the Ontario Government, whose duty it is to regulate the level of the Lake of the Woods in order to keep it within the limit fixed by the International Joint Commission. The amount of $6,000 is to cover the expense of these two commissions. The members of the commissions get no salary for their work in this connection. But they have to employ officers to assist in carrying on the work, and the amount voted is to cover the salaries of those officers and incidental travelling and other expenses of the board. The officers consist of one engineer at a salary of $2,600, and one technical clerk at a salary of $1,200. The same officers work for the two boards, and the two boards work in co-operation.

Mr. CAHILL: Is this commission to be perpetual, or will there be an end to it some time?

Mr. ROWELL: The Lake of the Woods Control Board will be a continuous matter, because the levels must be maintained to protect the interests of navigation as well as of the riparian owners on both sides of this international water.

Mr. COPP: How long has this board been in operation?

Mr. ROWELL: The Lake of the Woods Technical Board was established in 1914.

Mr. CAHILL: Under what department?

Mr. ROWELL: The Minister of Marine is chairman of the board. The Lake of the Woods Control Board, which was appointed in January of this year, is under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I wish to bring to the attention of the Committee the need of some control over ocean-going vessels as regards rates and tolls and tariff agreements. This matter is of vital interest to the shippers of this country, and should be dealt with at the earliest possible date. When the armistice was signed, some two hundred representatives of manufacturing establishments in our country went overseas to solicit orders. Orders were sent back, and the manufacturers found that in order to fill them they were compelled to pay an extortionate rate——

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to be captious, but I do not see that this has to do with the item under discussion. Perhaps the hon. member is coming to it.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: We are dealing with external affairs, and surely I have the right to deal with the subject which I am trying to put before the Committee.

Mr. McMASTER: If the hon. gentleman asks for the consent of the Committee, I have no doubt they would be glad to grant it.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member (Mr. McMaster) insists upon the point of order, it is well taken. Clause 5 of rule 13 states very clearly that speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. But, with the unanimous consent of the Committee, the hon. gentleman may be allowed to proceed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: I am sure that when I have finished what I have to say the Committee will agree that this matter is of urgent public importance and should be dealt with at the earliest possible day.

I was calling attention to the fact that these orders were sent overseas; that they were sent back; that when the manufacturers began to carry out their part of the contract they found that since the signing of the armistice ocean rates had increased from fifty to one hundred per cent and in many cases more. The result has been that not only have the manufacturers' profits been wiped out, but a great deal of additional expense has been incurred, and unless conditions are very materially changed we are liable to have a very serious interference with the development of our trade with other countries. In 1913, Sir Henry Drayton was appointed by this Government to go overseas and interview the Imperial Government on the question of joint control of ocean rates. He went, and on his return made a report in which he favoured joint control. In 1916, he made a further report in which he emphasized his position in that regard. His report was a very full one, and I wish to read only a paragraph or two of his summing up:

> The whole discussion is predicated upon conditions and practices existing before the war, and I am firmly convinced that, with a situation such as we have had it—with agreements between the carriers—with the absence of competition, a proper measure of sane and constructive Government control is necessary. That of itself, however, will be insufficient to cope with the situation arising on the proclamation of peace.
>
> On the one hand, there has been a large destruction of mercantile tonnage, made up in part, doubtless, by new construction, but resulting in the whole in all probability in a largely decreased tonnage. On the other hand, there will exist producing centres glutted with commodities they produce and oversea markets most urgently requiring these commodities.

He shows that he is definitely in favour of government control of ocean freight rates. In 1912, the British Government appointed a commission on natural resources, trade and legislation in certain portions of His Majesty's Dominions. This commission travelled throughout the different dominions of the Empire and made their final report in 1917. Their report, presented by command of His Majesty to both Houses of Parliament, includes the following as part of its summing up:

> Our investigations have satisfied us that in normal times the combination of shipowners is strong enough to limit the freedom of shippers, whose varied and detached interests make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to combine in any effective opposition, and that, therefore, in principle, it is not desirable that the operations of the steamship companies should remain longer without some measure of Government supervision.

Following this, the commissioners state:

> We are, however, unanimous in thinking, as we have indicated in the preceding paragraphs, that some measures of supervision are needed. In our opinion, the line which should be taken is as follows:—

And they give a number of pages of suggestions as to the lines along which they would advise joint control between the

Dominions beyond the seas and the Imperial Government. I respectfully urge upon the Government the necessity of bringing about a permanent joint control of ocean freight rates. I need not tell the Committee how urgent it is that this matter should be dealt with at the earliest possible time.

Mr. McKENZIE: I suppose, the door being open to this discussion to all, it is necessary to give a little further attention to it. The subject brought to the notice of the Committee by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is very important and one that was brought to the notice of the Government on several occasions. But the reasonings and warnings that were uttered, fell as the old saying has it, like water on a duck's back—there was nothing done. The question of shipping has been before the House for quite a number of years, more especially in 1910, when the naval policy of the Laurier Government was announced in this House and heartily supported by the Opposition of that day, led by Sir Robert Borden, as it was going to bring about the happy condition that we in Canada would own our own shipping and be able to handle our own goods and control, to a very large extent, our transportation freight rates. It is unnecessary for me to point out how that scheme failed by reason of the fact that some plan other than what was agreed upon at that time was devised, for political purposes, by my hon. friends opposite, thus defeating the scheme.

I wish to bring to the notice of the Committee, and incidentally to that of the hon. member for East Lambton, the fact that this Government, about the time of the signing of the armistice, took no steps whatever to secure shipping for Canadian business. A great many ships from Nova Scotia were commandeered by the British Government. The ships that carried our coal to Montreal and our other goods to many parts of the world were taken from us and used in connection with the war, and we had no complaint to make. But immediately after the signing of the armistice every Government in the world, every business agent in the land, was trying to get hold of shipping as rapidly as possible. One would naturally have expected that the great army of representatives that we had in Great Britain, ministers and missionaries in the shape of trade missions, as they are called, would waken up and look after Canadian interests. Such, however, was not the case. Canadian vessels were sent to Australia, and when shipowners in Nova Scotia looked for their ships, they found them chartered by the British Government, practically after the war was over, to concerns shipping wheat and other commodities from Australia to England and other parts of the world. Our Government were evidently absolutely indifferent about the business, and we have no ships at all. To-day, the hon. member who speaks about the trade that we are trying to create with Belgium and Roumania, will find, when the time comes for the delivery of the goods, that we have no ships. He will find that this Government started, as an eleventh hour matter, a death-bed repentance matter, to build ships at a time when they will be absolutely useless. The Government will find their ships coming in at a time when ships are plentiful and not in great demand. They are building ships at a time when they are costing 400 per cent more than they should cost, and are 400 per cent less useful than they would be if they had been built at the proper time.

That is the kind of action the Government is taking in connection with the building of ships and looking after the general interests of the country. I am pleased that there is some one behind the Government who has been enterprising enough to bring up this question, and I trust we shall have from the Government some constructive policy in connection with shipping. Yet, indeed, I cannot hope so; it is impossible now. The day is past when something could be done. But I hope that the hon. member for East Lambton will be able to infuse some life into this inertia that is passing itself off as a government.

Mr. ROWELL: The speech to which we have just listened is a good illustration of the unwisdom of departing from the rule that requires one to confine oneself to the subject under discussion. However, out of respect for my hon. friend I will say a word or two on the matter he has mentioned, and then suggest that the proper time for discussing the question will be when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has his Estimates before the House. Then my hon. friend can discuss the matter at any length he desires. In reference to the question raised by the hon. member for East Lambton, he is in error if he assumes that the Government has not taken any action in this matter. The question he has brought up is an important and urgent one, and the Government has been active in regard to it. So long as the war was on all the shipping was controlled directly by the Controller

of Shipping in London, and it was essential that the shipping of the Allies should be mobilized and used to the greatest possible advantage in the carrying of troops overseas or to the various theatres of war, and in the transportation of necessary food and war supplies to the centres where they were needed. Under these conditions, the bulk of the ocean-going shipping of Canada was commandeered, and as long as the attention of the British authorities was centred on the problem of transportation in the interests of the war, it was difficult to get them to consider the question of controlling ocean rates in times of peace. Notwithstanding that fact, however, the matter was brought up at the last Imperial Conference held in July, 1918, when this resolution was passed:

That, in order to maintain satisfactorily the connections, and at the same time encourage commercial and industrial relations, between the different countries of the British Empire, this Conference is of opinion that shipping on the principal routes, especially between the heart of the Empire and the Oversea Dominions, including India, should be brought under review by an Inter-Imperial Board, on which the United Kingdom and the British Dominions and Dependencies should be represented.

2. That for this purpose an Imperial Investigation Board, representing the various parts of the Empire, be appointed, with power to inquire into and report on all matters connected with ocean freights and facilities,—

The very question my hon. friend has mentioned.

—and on all matters connected with the development and improvement of the sea communications between the different parts of the Empire, with special reference to the size and type of ships, and the capacities of harbours; the board to include, in addition to representatives of the Governments concerned, persons with expert knowledge of the problems involved, including representatives of the shipping and trading interests.

The Government has recently been in communication with the Prime Minister and his colleagues overseas, as well as with the Canadian High Commissioner, to get into touch with the British Government in order to work out this very problem. Hon. members will realize that no one Government can deal with this problem of shipping, as it affects international communication; it can be done only by joint action of the Governments affected. This Government is not unmindful of the importance of the question, and is using its best endeavours to see that satisfactory action shall be taken. At the present time it is pressing the matter upon the attention of the British Government. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) said the Government had not taken any action to get ships for Canadian shipping. Just so soon as the armistice was concluded and the urgent necessity for the mobilization of shipping for war purposes ceased, the Government did take up with the Imperial authorities—as did also the Canadian Pacific Railway and other companies controlling ocean transport—the matter of the release of these vessels, to have them restored to Canadian trade. Everything that the Government could do has been done in that respect, and having regard to the difficulties of the situation and the very great demands upon the world's shipping, I think the Imperial Government on the whole have met us in a fairly reasonable manner. They certainly had every desire to do so, and it has only been the difficulty of the shipping situation the world over that has prevented us from getting a larger use of our own tonnage. I hope that if there is further discussion it will be confined to the subject matter of the item before the Committee.

Canadian War Mission and Representation at Washington, $50,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. ROWELL: When this item was called some three or four weeks ago an hon. member—I think it was the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau)—asked for a statement as to the work of the Canadian War Mission and as to what was proposed in this representation. The reason for the establishment of the Canadian War Mission was briefly this: When the United States entered the war the whole situation was changed so far as it related to trade between the United States and Canada. The Committee are well aware of the enormous development in the trade between the United States and Canada in recent years. To-day our volume of business with the United States, imports and exports, is more than 50 per cent of the external trade of Canada. For the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1919, Canada's total trade in merchandise was $2,124,057,238. Of that trade no less sum than $1,201,860,679 was with the United States. The Committee will therefore realize how important a part our import and export trade with the United States plays in the whole industrial life of Canada. When the United States entered the war and commenced to produce munitions and war supplies on a large scale she found that she had not sufficient of the materials which are the bases for that manufacture to supply her war industries and carry on domestic manufacturing enterprises at the same

time. Canada was largely dependent upon the American market for the maintenance of many of its industries, in the supply of raw materials or partially manufactured materials basic to those industries. To meet the situation the United States established a license system for export trade, and to regulate and control this licensing of exports, they created what was known as the War Trade Board. Not a single article could be imported from the United States into Canada without first obtaining a license from the War Trade Board in Washington. Not only that, but the United States realized that if they were to get their war supplies produced within the time required it was essential that war materials should have priority in manufacture. They therefore established a scale of priorities whereby certain classes of contract were to have priority in point of manufacture over others. One could not expect to get a contract filled by a plant in the United States for the manufacture of any supplies unless he had a priority order from what they called the War Industries Board.

Then the question of transportation in the United States became exceedingly urgent, the railways were congested, they could not transport upon their railways all the war supplies required and at the same time maintain their domestic system of transportation. The United States railway administration therefore imposed an embargo on all freight traffic except under permits authorized and issued by the car service section of the Railway Administration. This embargo was imposed on the 24th January, 1918. If a Canadian manufacturer required to get speedy delivery of the articles that he had purchased in the United States he had to get a permit to transport them over the American railways. So this was the position—the Canadian importer had to get a license to export from the War Trade Board in the United States, he had to get a priority order from the War Industries Board, and then he had to get a shipping permit from the Railway Administration. One could readily see that, under such conditions, with American institutions, strong and powerful themselves, pressing for priority orders and shipping facilities, it became necessary for the Government of Canada to step in and protect Canadian industries and the development and maintenance of our industrial life. In order to do that it created the War Trade Mission at Washington and the Canadian War Trade Board here at Ottawa, the two working together to meet the situation. That was the reason why the mission was created. It was created under an Order in Council—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: I would ask my hon. friend how else he would expect it to be created?

Mr. CAHILL: By this Government?

Mr. ROWELL: By any Government. If my hon. friend could tell me any way by which it could be created except by Order in Council I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. CAHILL: By Parliament.

Mr. ROWELL: If my hon. friend will refer to Orders in Council a little later I will be glad to give him all information upon them. I do not wish to break the continuity of what I am saying in reference to the Canadian War Mission by discussing Orders in Council. I say that by Order in Council the War Trade Mission was created, and Mr. Lloyd Harris became chairman of the mission. Subsequently three or four other members were added and they carried on their work in Washington so long as the war lasted.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who were the other members with Mr. Harris?

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Frank A. Rolph, Toronto; Mr. Ross H. McMaster, Montreal; Mr. Arthur H. Scott, Montreal, and Mr. J. Allan Ross, Montreal. Mr. Young of Montreal was appointed secretary of the mission and he filled that position until Mr. Harris went to England. He accompanied Mr. Harris to England. In addition to the work I have mentioned, and which constituted a very important part of the Canadian War Mission work, an opportunity opened up for Canadian manufacturers to secure munition contracts from the American Government. In the latter part of 1917 the demand by the Imperial Government for munitions fell off. The Imperial Government had been steadily enlarging their own facilities in Great Britain for the production of munitions, and as these facilities were enlarged and as they were producing what they themselves needed, they desired to discontinue to a substantial extent the production of munitions in Canada. Our industries were faced either with the question of largely curtailing their operations and throwing a large number of men out of employment or of getting contracts elsewhere. The Imperial Munitions Board, being then in touch with the con-

ditions, thought there was an opportunity of securing contracts in the United States. To that end they opened negotiations with the Ordnance Department of the United States. Mr. Harris had already gone to Washington. He went in January, 1918, I think, as the representative of the Imperial Munitions Board to endeavour to secure contracts from the Ordnance Department of the American Government in order to keep our munition industries in operation. Therefore when the Canadian War Mission was constituted, it acted not only on behalf of the Imperial Munitions Board in Washington to secure contracts for Canadian industries but also in connection with the other matters that I have mentioned in association with the War Trade Board in Canada.

I am sure the House and the country will be interested in knowing—and so far it has never been made public—the extent of the business that the Canadian War Mission secured from the American Government. From the time it was constituted in February, 1918, up to the date the armistice was signed, the Canadian War Mission secured for Canadian industries contracts to no less a sum than $231,045,544—a magnificent contribution to the industries of Canada, to work for the workmen, and at the same time a splendid contribution to the prosecution of the war by providing the American Government with munitions and supplies. I think it is only fair to say that so successful were the manufacturers and working men of Canada in producing the munitions required, and so excellent was the quality of the product, that the American Government was glad to avail itself of the facilities our plants offered to have munitions turned out and turned out satisfactorily. There was a certain period during the summer of 1918 when more shells of an important class, used by the American army at the front, were being turned out for the American ordnance department in Canada than were being turned out in the plants in the United States. Canada made a splendid record in the production of munitions and in the ramifications of industrial war work. When the history of this war comes to be written there will be no finer page than the record of the splendid achievements of the manufacturers and workmen in the production of munitions, to the success of which work the Imperial Munitions Board so largely contributed.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has referred to the magnificent record of the Canadian manufacturers of munitions, and the dire necessity existing in the United States for these munitions. Why was it necessary to create this commission and expend public moneys getting these orders?

Mr. ROWELL: I did not say there was dire necessity in the United States, but I believe there was real need. My hon. friend, I am sure, is quite well enough acquainted with the business men of any country to know that they are not anxious to have business go to another nation if they think they can get it themselves. The only way Canadians were able to get the business, and it is one of the evidences that the Union Government was on the job, and the country is getting the benefit of it—was by going after the business. They knew that we had the plant and the working men who could turn out the munitions, and they knew it was a good thing for the American Government to get the work done here, and so we secured the orders. It so happens that peace came earlier than was anticipated, and necessarily many of these orders were not filled, but were cancelled. I think possibly one-half of the total amount consisted of orders that were cancelled, and settlements have been made from time to time with those manufacturers whose orders were cancelled.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister stated a moment ago that there was $1,200,000,000 worth of trade between United States and Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Of that amount what part consisted of imports to Canada, and what part of exports to the United States?

Mr. ROWELL: Our imports from the United States were $746,937,511, and our exports were $454,923,170.

Mr. CAHILL: In view of the figures showing that we were importing to such an extent over our exports, would it not be advisable for us to retain the commission in the United States that sold us the goods instead of the commission that sold our goods to the Americans?

Mr. ROWELL: I am afraid my hon. friend does not understand business. I assume we only buy goods in the United States that we need. In view of the tariff against them, those goods would not be brought into Canada unless they were needed here.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister says that Canada was buying goods that she needed. Does he wish to imply that the United

States were buying goods from us that they did not need?

Mr. ROWELL: I did not say so. I said the United States needed these goods for the war. The war is now over but the United States still needs certain of our goods. She requires our nickel and many other commodities. We are selling those to her, but we cannot now sell munitions to the United States or the particular goods that were being sold to that country during the war. I have pointed out the success of the commission in securing this large number of orders. Then allusion must be made to the success achieved in securing licenses for export.

Mr. COPP: Before the minister leaves that point. I understood him to say that this board had secured contracts amounting to about two hundred and thirty odd million dollars on munitions. Was that correct?

Mr. ROWELL: Two hundred and thirty millions for all purposes. The munitions consisted of $188,000,000.

Mr. COPP: Then do I understand the minister to say that about one-half of those contracts were cancelled when the armistice was signed?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, I should say that one-half, or a little more than one-half, were cancelled when the armistice was signed. Practically all the orders that were not filled, or were on the way to being filled, were cancelled, and the American Government made such compensation as they considered right, or as was agreed upon.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: While the minister is on that point, will he state just what the duties of the board will be in times of peace? We all understand it was very useful to have the War Trade Board in Washington because there were many things there which they had to attend to. Could the minister now tell us how they have succeeded since November 11th in securing orders for Canada, or has anything been done in that direction?

Mr. ROWELL: The War Trade Board is winding up the business; there are no orders which can be secured at the present time. That matter has been carefully canvassed, and so far as business between the United States and Canada is concerned, it is now back to its normal channel. Canadian business men must obtain orders from the United States if they can, and American business men must secure business in Canada if they can.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to wind up the board altogether?

Mr. ROWELL: It is intended to wind up the board, but the item provides for representation at Washington because the Government intends to continue representation there. It is not necessary that I should elaborate this matter, it is obvious from the statement I have made how essential the work of the board was. In order to illustrate the character of that work, let me state that they had ten thousand applications for export, and in the case of each separate application, the War Trade Board had to be seen and a permit obtained. There were no less than 2,765 applications for priority, and we know how pressing the American manufacturers were in that regard. The Board had to take up and meet these applications and I think the country is indebted to them for rendering an exceptionally fine piece of public service. The board had to employ a staff who were paid, but the members of the board themselves served without compensation. I wish to say that not only in connection with the work of the Imperial Munitions Board in dealing with the question of munitions for Great Britain, but also in connection with their work in assisting in securing munition contracts for Canada from the United States, the country is deeply indebted to them for the services they have rendered. The American Government chose the Imperial Munition Board as the medium through which they distributed their orders in Canada, and the board acted in that capacity.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister kindly give the names of the members of the War Trade Board?

Mr. ROWELL: The Minister of Trade and Commerce was chairman, and the other members were Messrs. Frank P. Jones, J. W. McConnell, Montreal; J. H. Gundy, Charles B. McKnight, and Joseph Gibbons, Toronto; Mr. C. A. Magrath, fuel controller, and Sir N. H. Laporte, chairman of the War Purchasing Commission were ex-officio members of the board. I was going on to say that not only are we indebted to the Imperial Munitions Board for the work they did in that respect, but for the splendid contribution—

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister give us the names of the Imperial Munitions Board?

Mr. ROWELL: The chairman was Sir Joseph Flavelle.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friends say, "hear, hear." I want to say to the Committee that when the history of this war is written, and Canada's contribution is summed up, it will be seen that no single man in the industrial life of Canada, no man outside the military forces, has rendered more conspicuous service to this country in the successful prosecution of the war, and in assisting the Imperial Government, than did Sir Joseph Flavelle by his work on the Imperial Munitions Board.

That what I have stated is true I will give my hon. friend the proof, because I anticipated that some of my hon. friends would say "hear, hear." At a gathering held in Ottawa in November last, when the heads of the different branches of the Imperial Munitions Board met to say goodbye before the work of the Board was dissolved, the following cable from Mr. Lloyd George was read. I would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Imperial Munitions Board was constituted by Mr. Lloyd George himself while Minister of Munitions:

> Now that hostilities have ceased, I am anxious to send you, on behalf of myself and my colleagues in the War Cabinet, our congratulations on the great work of the Imperial Munitions Board for three years, which has been of such signal assistance to the British Empire and to the Allied Cause.
>
> It is a great and varied achievement for your Board, not only to have produced so great an output of munitions, representing no small proportion of the shells used by the British armies, but also to have built over three hundred and fifty thousand tons of shipping for the Ministry of Shipping, to have assisted to so great a degree the Royal Air Force in Canada, and to have developed the great output of Aeroplane timber which has been essential for our Air Service.
>
> As the Board was appointed by me when I was Minister of Munitions, it is particularly pleasurable to me to recognize the success, efficiency and value of its work and to thank you, and through you, your staff, the Canadian manufacturers and the great army of workers who have so splendidly assisted you, for the great services so rendered.

Mr. Lloyd George would not pay that tribute if he did not know that it was deserved, and undoubtedly he knew the value of the work done by the Imperial Munitions Board.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: May I ask the minister the date of that cable?

Mr. ROWELL: November 22, 1918.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was Sir Clifford Sifton in England at the time?

Mr. ROWELL: I do not know. My hon. friend knows very well that Sir Clifford Sifton had nothing whatever to do with the message. Mr. Lloyd George does not move at the behest of any particular man; he gives praise where he believes it to be deserved.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not always.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, possibly my hon. friends would prefer to hear what the then Minister of Munitions, Mr. Churchill, had to say. He cabled:

> As the Armistice with Germany has now been concluded I wish, as Minister of Munitions, to congratulate you and, through you, your staff on the splendid work of the Imperial Munitions Board during the last three years.
>
> You have carried through a work of the greatest magnitude with uniform success and efficiency and I wish to pay my personal tribute to the great ability, energy and organizing power you, as Chairman, have shown.
>
> Canada's remarkable output of munitions has played a large part in the munitioning of the British armies and will remain a testimony to the high value in that great struggle of the work of the Board and of all those, whether manufacturers or work people, who have shared the burden with you.

With these statements of Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill I am in most hearty accord.

When I was in England in 1918 I heard from the Minister of Munitions and from Lord Weir of the Air Service nothing but words of the highest commendation for the character of the output of Canadian manufacturers and working men and of the fine work of the Imperial Munitions Board. In connection with aeroplanes Lord Weir told me that in his opinion there had not been a finer aeroplane factory anywhere in the world or one that had done better service than the factory operated by the Imperial Munitions Board and situated in Toronto. Our manufacturers and working men made as creditable a record in their sphere as did our gallant soldiers in their particular sphere; they all did magnificently.

Mr. MORPHY: What was the output of munitions under the auspices of the Imperial Munitions Board?

Mr. ROWELL: The Imperial Munitions Board expended in Canada something over $1,100,000,000. The principal materials entering into the production of shells were steel, copper, lead and zinc, of which the following amounts were used:

Steel	2,058,000	gross tons
Copper	47,000	net "
Lead	139,000	net "
Zinc	25,000	net "

Of these amounts approximately 1,720,500 tons of steel, 7,000 tons of copper, 70,000 tons of lead and 22,000 tons of zinc were produced in Canada. Prior to the war the steel capacity of Canada was approximately 1,000,000 tons of ingots annually. By the enlargement of the existing plants and the creation of new ones this capacity was increased, until at the time the armistice was signed the production was equivalent to 2,250,000 tons of ingots per annum.

We had more than doubled our productive capacity. I might go on giving figures of the remarkable development of the copper, zinc, lead, ferro-alloy, pig-iron and explosives industry during the war, to say nothing of the remarkable development in the supply of aeroplane timber. In fact, Canada has the finest timber in the world for aeroplane construction.

9 p.m.

The following quantities of munitions were manufactured and exported:

Shells	65,343,647
Fuses	29,638,126
Fuse parts	16,174,073
Cartridge cases	48,627,673
Percussion primers	35,386,488
Exploder containers	13,285,000
Shell and adapter forgings	6,412,115
Explosives and Chemicals—	Lbs.
T. N. T.	41,754,950
Cordite	28,542,157
Other (more than	41,000,000
Metals and Compounds—	
Steel bars	43,077,923
Zinc	35,412,413
Nickel	1,792,000
Other (more than)	27,000,000
Lumber for Aeroplanes—	Feet
Spruce	16,289,227
Fir	6,801,324
Other Lumber—	
Douglas fir	11,530,315
Pine, various kinds and qualities.	10,360,566
Spruce	8,345,675
Workers engaged in war contracts	200,000 to 300,000
Persons handling and transporting stores, about	50,000
Contractors in Canada for munitions, about	1,000

Mr. TRAHAN: The President of the Privy Council gave the name of the President of the Imperial Munitions Board, but he omitted to mention the other members.

Mr. ROWELL: Those members were Mr. Brand, Mr. Perry, Colonel Carnegie——

An hon. MEMBER: Sir Charles Gordon.

Mr. ROWELL: He was vice-chairman for some time then he went down to Washington to become chairman of——

An hon. MEMBER: Mr. Vaillancourt.

Mr. ROWELL: Yes. All the members of the board worked together harmoniously and very effectively.

As to the future, while the several British ambassadors at Washington have rendered admirable service to Canada, our business with the United States is now on so large a scale that the Government is convinced that our interests can only be adequately protected by a Canadian representative resident in Washington. While ordinarily the Government would wind up the affairs of the War Commission—and they are being rapidly wound up—yet in view of the decision to have permaneent representation at Washington, it does not deem it desirable to have an interregnum between the closing up of the War Mission, and the opening of the office of our permanent representative. Therefore it has been decided to continue the War Mission until permanent representation is arranged for.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How will it be arranged?

Mr. ROWELL: That is being taken up with the Imperial Government. It is one of the matters the Prime Minister has under consideration.

Mr. McMASTER: Would the minister point out what proportion of this $50,000 is required to wind up the present situation, if I may so term it, and what amount is proposed to be spent on the continuation of the mission for the next year?

Mr. ROWELL: The present expenditure in connection with the mission is between $4,000 and $4,500 a month. We do not anticipate that the expenditure in connection with the permanent representation will exceed that amount. It is impossible to figure the exact amount; the estimate is the best the Government could make of the probable expenditure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am pleased to learn that Canada is to have a permanent representative at Washington. If it is right that Canada should be represented in London, Paris and other large centres, surely the interests of Canada demand that we should also have a representative at Washington. Previously, matters arising between Canada and the United States were so managed as sometimes to cause heartburnings on the part of Canadians. For instance, if anything happened to a Canadian in business on the other side of the line which resulted in international complication, the negotiations had to be carried on via London; the Canadian Government could not,

according to international law, go directly to the British Embassy at Washington. The Canadian Government, through the Governor General, would first address himself to the Colonial Office; the Colonial Office, through the Foreign Office in London, would address itself to the British Embassy in Washington; and matters which were the subject of correspondence or discussion might not be settled before many months. Some years ago, thanks to the common sense of the then Governor General, Lord Grey, a series of conversations began between the Canadian Government and the British Embassy at Washington, and the roundabout method of dealing with such matters was avoided. But this is all against international law. Subject always to British control, it is better to have, as far as possible, direct communication through our agent in Washington. During the war the Government took Sir Charles Gordon from the Imperial Munitions Board and sent him to Washington. I have the honour, as has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) of being very well acquainted with Sir Charles Gordon. He is a Montrealer; he is one of the most progressive Canadians of the day; he is a credit not only to his native city, but to Canada as well. With his knowledge of business methods and his keen intellect, Sir Charles Gordon has been able to render very valuable service to Canada and to the Mother Country as well. About the year 1898 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, had almost decided to appoint a very distinguished Canadian to the high position of representative of Canada at Washington. I am not free to disclose the name; perhaps I will some day. At all events, the appointment by the present Government will be a welcome innovation. Most of our business, except that which we engage in with Great Britain, is with the United States; and now that we have been allies in the great war our trade relations and our other relations should become closer every year. The appointment of a prominent Canadian, well versed in business, who will be in a position to build friendships for Canada in that great country, is an excellent departure. It is an indication of Canada's growth. Besides, it will tend to remove old prejudices which since the time of the United Empire Loyalists have prevailed in our country. The United States and Canada are bound to be close allies in future, and I hail with satisfaction the announcement

that Canada will be represented in the great capital of United States.

Mr. McMASTER: Will this representative at Washington deal merely with trade matters or will he have a diplomatic mission as well?

Mr. ROWELL: I heartily agree with all that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has said with regard to the importance of this appointment and the close character of the relations that must exist between Canada and the United States. If this representative is to be truly a Canadian representative, his functions must have a wider scope than that of merely dealing with matters of trade. The condition creates the need; the need undoubtedly will be met when the arrangements are completed. Moreover, Canada has a unique opportunity of being the means of keeping more closely together than they have been in the past the Mother Country and our sister nation to the south. We understand the Americans better than the Old Country people do, and we understand the Old Country people better than the Americans do; we may be interpreter between the two. I am sure, therefore, that the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington is in the interests of the Empire as a whole as well as of Canada.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the appointment be made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I think that will be beyond the scope of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CAHILL: How will this representative be useful to the farmers of Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: Any man who is useful to Canada as a whole is useful to the farmers of Canada. I am not one of those who believe that the interests of any one class are best served by ignoring all other classes. The greatest progress and success will be made in Canada when each recognizes that the other has a part to play and we seek to unite rather than to divide along any lines.

Mr. CAHILL: Doubtless this man will be useful to all parties in Canada, but he will be more useful, under existing conditions, to the manufacturer than to the farmer. The minister has told us that in the last year there is a balance of trade against Canada of something like $300,000,000, and that condition could, to a large

extent, be relieved by the Canadian Government adopting the reciprocity agreement and reducing the tariff on certain goods that are imported into the United States. That would be much more useful to the people of Canada as a whole than the appointment of a trade commissioner at Washington. Has the minister in view the early adoption of the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister refuse to answer the question?

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member knows that the question of the reciprocity agreement is a fiscal matter and could be dealt with only in the Budget. He knows, even if we were considering it, I could not make an announcement on it to-night.

Mr. CAHILL: I understood that, by Order in Council, the duty was taken off wheat some time ago, and also off farm tractors and potatoes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman is wandering far from the item under discussion.

Mr. CAHILL: We are discussing the subject of trade between the United States and Canada, the appointment of a trade commissioner. The minister has so stated, and I think the question is perfectly legitimate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CAHILL: The minister was, I think, getting up to answer the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that the question is out of order. If the hon. member does not wish to abide by my ruling he will have to appeal to the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The name of Sir Charles Gordon was mentioned a moment ago in connection with the Canadian representation at Washington. Can the minister say, without revealing any Cabinet secrets, if the offer has been formally made to Sir Charles Gordon, and if there is any hope that he will accept the nomination? Sir Charles Gordon is a distinguished gentleman who would fill the position to the satisfaction of every one.

Mr. ROWELL: I agree with all my hon. friend has said as regards the ability and service of Sir Charles Gordon, and I am glad to say that he is now Acting Chairman of the Canadian War Mission at Washington. Canada would, indeed, be fortunate if he would continue to act as her permanent representative. That, however, is a matter for the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has any offer been made?

Mr. ROWELL: I am not in a position to say.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: What business is the Canadian War Mission doing now at Washington?

Mr. ROWELL: Contracts have to be adjusted and details settled, and the commission is, from time to time, taking up, on behalf of the Government, various matters with the Washington Government, but its principal duty has been closing up its own business.

Mr. McMASTER: None of the members are at Washington now?

Mr. ROWELL: No. Sir Charles Gordon was there in the spring, but he is overseas at present.

Mr. PEDLOW: As the balance of the orders have been cancelled and no orders are in hand at present, what business remains to be closed up?

Mr. ROWELL: All the contracts have to be adjusted and settlements made. Questions are coming up which have to be taken up with the American Government, and the members of the staff who are there are kept busy with the work they have in hand. As a matter of fact, they are exceedingly anxious to get back to Canada, especially the secretary, but we have kept him there on account of the necessity of the work he is doing.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has the Government brought down any legislation as regards this representation at Washington? I suppose the Order in Council business is going to be closed up.

Mr. ROWELL: The voting of the Estimate by the House would be all that would be necessary to appoint a representative at Washington. Next session, when the matter is more fully understood, and we know exactly the relations, it may be considered desirable to introduce legislation.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Have we as a nation the right to appoint a diplomatic agent at Washington?

Mr. ROWELL: We have no right, except with the concurrence of the Imperial Gov-

ernment, to appoint a diplomatic agent, but the question of the status of this representative is now a matter of conference between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We should not pass this Estimate before having power from the Imperial Government.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend need not worry. We shall have an understanding with the Imperial Government, and we shall have a Canadian representative at Washington.

Mr. McMASTER: In other words, the minister thinks it wise to appoint a representative first and to consider the getting of power afterwards?

Mr. ROWELL: No. We shall, I am sure, carry the judgment of the Imperial Government on this. As a matter of fact, they do not dissent from it. The only question is exactly what his status will be, and that is a matter of conference; and until that is settled, we continue the War Mission with Sir Charles Gordon as acting chairman. When we reach that agreement with the Imperial Government, we shall appoint a permanent representative, but in one case as in the other, we have continuous representation at Washington.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Have the Imperial authorities agreed to that?

Mr. ROWELL: They are agreed that we should have representation at Washington.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is there any correspondence to that effect?

Mr. ROWELL: There are certain confidential communications between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Imperial Government. The negotiations are not yet closed. As soon as they are closed, I am sure the Prime Minister will lay the whole matter before the House, but he is conducting negotiations personally in Great Britain.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the establishment of new relations between this country and a foreign country, although that foreign country is a neighbour, not of such importance that it should be dealt with by Parliament, and that the will of the people as represented by Parliament should be ascertained upon such a question? Is it to be said that a government of this country, without any mandate or authority from the people, are going to open negotiations of this kind and establish a new institution, entirely foreign to our former relations with the United States, without bringing down legislation with a view to establishing that position and defining what the powers and functions of the plenipotentiary shall be? We are already represented in the United States as a part of the British Empire by a British plenipotentiary. We are going to depart from that position and have a representative of our own.

It cannot be said that the appointment of a new man will not in any way influence the old status. It must necessarily do so. These are serious matters upon which there should be no doubt, and the relations between the British ambassador and the official whom we are going to appoint should be of such a character as to make any clash or misunderstanding impossible. Our representative might conceivably make certain representations to the United States Government, while the proper representative of the whole nation and of the British Empire might make others. It is not such a simple matter that a mere Order in Council, by which the Government appointed a Trade Commission whose duty was to secure contracts for munitions factories in Canada and to provide for rapid transportation over the railways of the United States, should be extended to create an institution to conduct the diplomatic relations between two countries. These relations are of such an important character that the whole policy of the Government should be embodied in concrete legislation and thoroughly threshed out before being put into force. I am not opposed to the idea involved. The closer the relations that exist between ourselves and our great neighbours to the south, the better pleased I am. I am in favour of the freest relations between the eight millions of people in Canada and the one hundred and twenty millions of our kinsmen across the way, and I only hope that this step will be taken in such a way as to ensure that the will of the people will be constitutionally carried out, and that there will be no rule-of-thumb arrangement that may afterwards be found to be inoperative and not based upon broad and well founded constitutional principles.

Mr. McMASTER: In his diplomatic functions, will this representative deal directly with the American Government or through the British ambassador?

Mr. ROWELL: I should think that matter would largely depend upon an understanding arrived at with the Imperial Government, and also upon the nature of the question involved. On a purely Canadian question, I should think he would

deal direct, and on a question affecting the Imperial Government as well as Canada, he would co-operate with the British ambassador.

POST OFFICE—OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Salaries and Allowances.. ..	$10,428,354.75
Mail Service..	8,234,337.50
Miscellaneous..	843,838.00
Yukon Territory..	195,000.00
	$19,701,530.25

Mr. McKENZIE: When we were on Mail Service and Mail Contracts last year the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who is now absent, was Acting Postmaster General. The question of mail contracts was fully discussed, particularly contracts which were made before the war. The phase of it which we specially discussed was the cost of living for horses, if I might use that expression, and the cost of vehicles and everything else, which had gone up about 400 per cent. It was contended that those who took contracts under normal conditions were losing money and could not reasonably be expected to carry out their undertakings. At that time the Acting Postmaster General said that he would look into the matter, and we hoped for some relief for these people. I am told that nothing was done to relieve the situation, and I would suggest to the minister now that if it is not intended to supplement these contracts or pay a little more money to those who were obliged under security to perform the contracts, new contracts should be called for, so that the work might be performed under conditions as they exist now. The war came on suddenly and everything doubled and trebled in price, and it is entirely unfair that these poor men should be compelled to carry out the mail contracts under such circumstances. As a lawyer my honourable friend knows that when parties enter into a contract they are supposed to be cognizant of every consideration that affects the contract, but they are not supposed to make provision for extraordinary circumstances that they cannot possibly foresee. At the commencement of the war when men were entering into contracts for the carrying of mail for four years they could not know what effect war conditions would have upon the different elements that enter into the performance of that contract, and the Canadian people have no right to expect, nor do I think they do expect, to receive their mails in the regular course at the expense of suffering mail contractors. The Acting Minister last year thought he could deal with the subject, but probably found it impossible to do so. I admit it is a difficult thing to revise these contracts and add anything to them. But if nothing else can be done, I think that such a percentage might be added to these contracts as would bring them into proportion with increased costs at the present time. But if that cannot be done I would certainly expect that people who are suffering by reason of being bound by these contracts should be relieved and new tenders called. I have not heard of anything being done by the department to meet the situation, nor have I heard whether the promise which was given by the Postmaster General last year has been implemented. But if not I think the earliest opportunity will have to be taken to relieve these people from the distressing situation in which they find themselves by reason of the conditions which exist now as compared with those which existed at the time they entered into these contracts.

Mr. ROWELL: The matter which the leader of the Opposition has raised is one of very great interest and importance not only to the mail carriers themselves but to the service which they render. I presume there is not a member of the House who has not amongst his constituents people who are concerned in this matter. Last session the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) moved the following resolution:

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

That expresses in another form the idea which the leader of the Opposition has been expressing to-night, and it undoubtedly represents a condition which exists throughout the country. There is no doubt that contracts which were let before the war were let on a basis of prices and conditions radically different from those which existed during the war and particularly in more recent years. I have turned up the statement of the Acting Postmaster General to which my hon. friend has referred and I find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty), in speaking to this motion, made this statement:

> It is not impossible—it is, in fact, highly probable—that there are cases (quite a few have been brought to the attention of the department) where it is contended, and in many

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

Members of the Committee will see that the policy outlined by the Acting Postmaster General a year ago was that where complaint was made by a rural mail contractor that the price at which he had taken the contract was such that he could not carry it out except at a loss, the contract should be cancelled and new tenders called for. He then would have an opportunity of securing the contract at a higher price in open competition with others. The policy thus outlined has been carried out by the department during the year. When application for an increase in salary, or relief from a contract, is made to the department, if the contractor can establish to the satisfaction of the department that to insist on the performance of his contract will cause him serious loss, tenders are called for with a view to making other arrangements. If a reasonable offer is forthcoming, a new contract is entered into and the contractor is released. The old contractor submits a tender and competes on equal basis with the others. That principle has been applied to all contracts entered into prior to the first of January, 1918. In reference to contracts entered into since that date, the view of the department has been that any man who made a contract after that date made it in view of the existing conditions and that conditions had not so radically changed since 1918 as to justify the cancellation of the contract.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certain people who have contracts have written that their routes have been put up as many as three times since they have had the contracts and that the department found the tenders too high and continued the poor victims under the old contract, continuing them in harness and making them do the work. If I am put to the test I can produce written evidence to the effect that it is true. One man says: My route was put up for the third time, and each time the Government refused to make a new contract saying the price is too high, and I am compelled to continue the work.

Mr. ROWELL: I am only expressing my own opinion as a member of the Government but I would think that in a case like that there should be some method of relief. I would think that some additions should be made to the contract. If the Government cannot get anybody else to take the contract at a figure which they are willing to accept, there should be some measure of relief to the existing contractor. I will take the matter up with the Postmaster General and make representations to him in connection with it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see a good deal of force in what the Acting Postmaster General says about contracts that were entered into in 1918. Of course, conditions have not changed so very much. The people had notice as to the conditions. But I am advocating relief for people who had before that time entered into contracts. There must be a great many of them. I have only mentioned a few.

But there are a great many who have had contracts for quite a period prior to 1918. I know personally that around the island of Cape Breton tenders have several times been called to replace contracts now existing, but they were not accepted because the department regarded them as too high. Of course, the department could call upon the man who already had taken the contract, and given securities, to continue, and in some cases that has been done. That may be regarded as economy, but it is economy at the expense of the poor man and economy that the Canadian people do not want, if I judge them aright.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have a distinct recollection that about a year ago certain of the city mail carriers were brought under the Civil Service Commission, but the rural mail couriers were not. Could the

minister give us any figures showing the average stipend paid to rural mail couriers as compared with the wages paid to the carriers or postmen in the cities and towns? It was only a short time after the House prorogued last year that the postmen in the city of Toronto went on strike. They demanded higher wages than they were then getting, and their deman was acceded to. As to the rural mail couriers, some of them, who had taken contracts several years ago, have carried on, but others have bitterly complained that they were not able to do so by reason of the increase in the cost of living. It must be remembered that the rural mail couriers have to furnish a horse and rig in order to carry out their contract, whereas the postmen in the cities and towns are relieved from any such expense, and in addition are furnished with uniforms. I think that such a comparison of cost as I have asked for will be very useful to the House and to the country at the present time.

Mr. ROWELL: I do not quite understand what my hon. friend refers to when he speaks of mail carriers having recently been taken under the Civil Service Commission. If he means the city postmen or letter-carriers, they have been under the Civil Service Commission for several years. I do not see how it is possible to make a comparison between the wages paid to postmen in cities and towns and the amount paid to a rural mail contractor. In some cases the contractor works all day, and in other cases his working day is short, depending entirely upon the nature of the route. The conditions are so entirely different between the two classes of employees that I have no figures upon which to base a comparison such as the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) has asked for.

In answer to the leader of the Opposition, I intimated my own view that if a rural mail contractor took a contract before the war at pre-war prices, and if new tenders have been called for and the department cannot get one at a price it is willing to accept, the existing contract should be readjusted so that the contractor should not be compelled to carry out his duties at the old figure. If, however, the department, in calling for new tenders, should receive a tender at what it considered a fair price, I believe it would be its duty in the public interest to accept it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not see why it is not possible to make some reasonable comparison between the wages paid to the postmen and the amount paid to contractors in the rural mail service. The average route for a mail courier is from twenty to twenty-five miles, which surely involves a day's work, now that the country is getting down to an eight-hour day basis. The rural mail courier has to provide a horse and rig, as I have already explained, and if a comparison such as I have suggested were made, I think it would be found he receives much less than is paid to the postman in the towns and cities, who is not obliged to make any such outlay, and is supplied with a uniform.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: Comparing 1919 with 1915, I would like to ask the minister what he considers should be a fair increase in the remuneration now paid to a rural mail contractor?

Mr. ROWELL: I confess that I cannot answer the question, because there are so many conditions involved that would have to be considered. One would have to know what the actual contract was, and the conditions under which it was entered into in 1915 as compared with 1919. That, I think, would be a matter for the expert advisers of the Post Office Department.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: We are told by the acting minister who had the affairs of the Post Office Department in charge last year, that he considered fifteen per cent a very fair increase, and that both the rural mail courier and the country should be satisfied with it. I think it would be a good business policy to cancel the existing contracts and call for new tenders, in view of the inadequacy of the present remuneration. I have in mind a case where a rural mail courier received $1,000 for the work which he performed. It was suggested to him that he should relinquish this contract and put in a fresh tender. He did so and re-tendered at what he thought was a fair price, viz: $1,250. He was the only tenderer, and months passed without the contract being renewed with him. Then there appeared upon the scene a representative of the Post Office Department who made a canvass from house to house, and eventually succeeded in getting a retired farmer to accept the contract for $950. The departmental official described to this retired farmer what a delightful occupation mail carrying was, describing that he was out in the early morning listening to the birds singing, but he did not enlighten him about the snowdrifts through which he would have to drive in winter, or anything of that nature. Now the repre-

sentative of the constituency in question is being urged by this man to secure for him an increase of at least $400, so that he can meet expenses. I consider the tactics of the department were decidedly unfair in the case I have mentioned.

Mr. ROWELL: In the case the hon. gentleman has alluded to the official was perhaps over-zealous in the public interest is his desire to keep down expenses. If the increase was only what my hon. friend mentions I would have given the man the contract.

Mr. H. J. MACKIE: Then I wish the minister would bring the facts to the at- of the Postmaster-General, who has not the honour of a seat in this House, and that he would see that this man receives a proper increase in his remuneration.

Mr. HOCKEN: Am I at liberty, Mr. Chairman, to refer to the salary items for the Post Office Department under the heading "Civil Government," and to ask the minister a question with respect to them?

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: We will have to come back to this item, I suppose, because I have something to say about it also.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): The hon. gentleman will be quite in order in referring to the salaries of the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister, which items have not yet been passed.

Mr. HOCKEN: That will afford me the opportunity I want.

The CHAIRMAN: The officers mentioned have control over the Outside Service, and therefore the hon. gentleman would be quite in order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have nothing to say with respect to the deputy minister, but I wanted to ask the minister if the increase being voted to Mr. Verret is in recognition of the services that he rendered in connection with the stealing of the examination papers from the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps the minister is not aware of the circumstances, and I will state them if he so desires. It will be remembered that a man named Petticlerc was caught with examination papers in his possession, and subsequently a Mr. Robert, of the Post Office Department, was arrested. Thereupon Mr. Foran, the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, telephoned to the inspector of police and asked him to take the prisoner to Mr. Verret's office. When he was—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): Anything which this assistant had to do with the outside service of the Post Office Department would be quite in order for discussion, but it would be scarcely in order to bring this particular matter up on this item.

Mr. HOCKEN: I just wanted to show how by reason of the steps taken the whole case went by the board.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) has referred to a particular case in his own constituency, and I have a similar case to bring to the attention of the minister. Last spring before I left for home I interviewed one of the officers of the department and submitted a concrete case to him. I gave him the facts as well as I knew them and so convinced him that I got a promise that he would open up the contract and ask for tenders. He did so, and sometime in June he received offers which he considered so high that he proceeded to ask for further tenders, and he did that a third time. Then he communicated with those who had tendered to coax them to take the service at a lower figure. I have not the slightest complaint against the officer I have in mind, because I know him to be one of the best officers in the department—the Superintendent of Mail Contracts. He, however, kept this thing dangling until last April, when he finally agreed to give the contract to another man. The difference between the old contract and the new is so great that it must have been apparent to the department that the first contractor was not properly treated. He had had the contract for four years—it was made before the war—and he received under it $1,600 for his services. The lowest offer that the superintendent could get was $3,600, and he was finally forced to give the contract to the tenderer at that figure. I submit that by the manipulation of the department they succeeded in ruining the original contractor. He was an honourable man and sacrificed everything he had rather than throw responsibility upon his sureties, and he is now without house or home. In such a case it seems to me that the department should come to the rescue and compen-

10 p.m. sate this man to some extent for the services he rendered during those months while the departmeent scurried all over the country in their efforts to get another man to take the contract at any-

thing less than $3,600. That was not the lowest tender anyway.

Mr. EDWARDS: How long a time elapsed?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Nine months.

Mr. ROWELL: What is the name of the route?

Mr. CHISHOLM: From Margaree to Inverness.

Mr. ROWELL: From those facts the department will be able to look the matter up.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I have been after the department since then, but have not succeeded in getting any consideration for the man.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I have a request to present on behalf of a very large population in the district along the Transcontinental between the city of Quebec and Edmundston, N.B. The Canadian Government Railways are running two trains daily, one in each direction. There is a mail car attached to the train leaving Quebec in the afternoon, but that car goes only so far as Monk in the county of L'Islet, about a hundred miles from the city of Quebec, and then it is attached to the return train. The population between Monk and Edmundston is asking that the car be retained on the train to deliver the mail on the whole section of the line. Petitions were sent to the department last fall and winter asking for this improvement. It is a very important section and a large business is transacted by lumber companies. There are among others the important settlements of Pohenagamooke, Blue River, River Ulanie, Lake Long, St. Eleuthère, Escourt, and Baker Lake.

The district is in the counties of Temiscouata, Kamouraska and L'Islet for the most part, with a portion in New Brunswick. I do not understand why the department is not operating this mail car on the whole route instead of only as far as Monk.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend's question involves two considerations: the public to be served and the cost of the service. One of the reasons why, up to date, full postal facilities have not been provided on certain sections of the line is because of the cost of the service. Generally speaking, railway service depends on the volume of business, and the service is increased as the volume of business increases. With reference to the particular section that my hon. friend mentions, and certain other sections of the National railways, the whole matter, as I mentioned on Friday night, is under consideration by the Post Office Department. A number of requests have come in for increased postal service, and the department is now reviewing them to see what can be done to meet local needs, at the same time conserving public interests and not imposing too great a tax on the exchequer.

Mr. McKENZIE: Going back to the subject of contracts, I have a letter here from a place called Boundary Creek, in the province of Alberta. It is from a contractor who is an old servant of this department, his contract dating from 1911. He writes me that he has been making desperate efforts to be relieved from his contract, but the only relief he can get from the department is in the form of threatening letters to himself and his sureties that unless he carries out the terms of his contract the law will be enforced upon the bond. For the last three years, I understand, they have had hay and oat crops failures in the part of the country where this man lives, and he has to haul his hay and oats from a long distance in order to perform his contract. The man's name is Stuart Selby. He is an entire stranger to me, and I suppose he wrote me because I am leader of the Opposition and in the hope that I would bring this matter to the attention of the department.

His route is from a place called Carston to Boundary Creek and back; it is a thirty-mile route. This man appears to be in desperate straits. According to a letter he writes me, the amount which he gets from the department does not begin to pay for the upkeep of his horses; but he is bound under a bond, and can do nothing in the matter.

In my part of the country there is a mail route from a railway station at a place called Christmas Island to the head of East Bay, a distance of about twenty-five miles each way. The mail contractor, a man named McIntyre, has had the contract for a good many years. He has applied for some relief, but so far has received no consideration, and he is still performing the service faithfully and well. There is another contractor in the northern part of Victoria county on the mail route between Englishtown and Path End, or Ingonish Ferry, at the foot of Cape Smoky, a distance of thirty-five miles each way. This man, whose name is McInnis, is in the same position as the others who are claiming that they cannot perform the contract on the allowance that they are getting—though, if they get no relief, they will have to perform it whether they are ruined or not.

Mr. EDWARDS: Were all these contracts entered into prior to January 1, 1918?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes. The McIntyre contract is much older than that, as also is the McInnis contract. There is a mail service from Christmas Island to East Bay three times a week. At the head of East Bay the courier connects with the Sydney route which runs from the city of Sydney to East Bay, and letters for the north side of East Bay were formerly carried by the Sydney courier and delivered to the East Bay-Christmas Island courier at the head of East Bay. The East Bay-Christmas Island courier would take this Sydney mail back to Christmas Island on his return trip and distribute it, so that the people along that route got mail every day, alternately from Christmas Island and from Sydney. But about a year ago the lady who kept the post office at the head of East Bay refused any longer to distribute this mail on the ground that she was not paid enough for doing so; consequently the people on the Christmas Island-East Bay route are deprived of the service that they had for thirty years. The amount of money that this lady asks for distributing the mail cannot be very much, but rather than pay it the department has thought fit to drop the service and deprive these people of a daily mail. I have taken the matter up by correspondence several times with the minister and with the inspector, but the only answer I get is that this woman refused to do the work. I was never asked to find out how much she wanted, but I am sure that a woman living in a country house would not be unreasonable in her demands. She should be paid a reasonable amount so that the people of that community may be served as they were for thirty years; the expenditure of a trifling sum should not stand in the way of giving them a good service.

Mr. ROWELL: I will have all the cases mentioned by my hon. friend looked into carefully and will report to him with regard to them. If the member for North Renfrew (Mr. H. J. Mackie) will give me the particulars of the case which he has mentioned, I will have it looked into.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) appeared to be anxious to know what was the reason for the increase in Mr. Verret's salary. I hold no brief for Mr. Verret, but my hon. friend will be interested to learn that Mr. Verret is one of the bravest, the most distinguished and most efficient officers who went overseas with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. He went as a captain and returned as a major, having been twenty-seven months in the trenches and wounded seven times. He bears the badge of D.S.O.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have heard all that before. I wanted to explain Colonel Verret's part in the Robert case, but you would not permit me, Mr. Chairman, to do so. I submit that after what has been said by the hon. member (Mr. Beland) I should be allowed to go on.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): The hon. gentleman may deal only with the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General in his connection with the outside post office service.

Mr. HOCKEN: This was a case where evidence was pretty nearly available and the man was going to "cough up," but after spending three minutes with Mr. Verret he closed up tight.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: On Friday the minister promised to give certain information asked for by the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon).

Mr. ROWELL: I shall be glad to give it. The expenses of Mr. Laflamme, private secretary to the Postmaster General, on the occasion referred to, were paid by the Post Office Department, and the expenses of the Postmaster General himself by the Department of Militia. Mr. Laflamme's expenses amounted to $1,970.61.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That is for his travelling expenses?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes, and living expenses.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Was he drawing a salary apart from that?

Mr. ROWELL: Those are his travelling expenses. He would have his salary in addition.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: The minister knows about the letter carriers' strike which occurred last summer and which caused a great deal of trouble and considerable loss in the city which I represent. A war bonus was granted and the delay in its allocation caused a strike. That bonus expired with the last fiscal year. Has it been renewed, and is their remuneration satisfactory to the men—because we wish to avoid another strike this year?

Mr. ROWELL: All the bonuses to which the hon. member referred continued until the 31st March of this year. The Government have now a Supplementary Estimate

before the House continuing the bonus for three months more, that is, up to the first of July, and the men are being paid the bonus now just as they were during last year. Much before the first of July, the Government anticipate the re-classification of the Civil Service will be brought down, upon which re-classification there will be submitted to the House for approval a new salary schedule and a new system of bonuses which will take the place of the old salary and the old bonus entirely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What salaries are the letter carriers receiving now?

Mr. ROWELL: The salary, apart from the bonus, is a minimum of $2 and a maximum of $3 per day, with an increase of 25 cents a day per annum. In addition to that, there is a series of bonuses and allowances totalling $350 for the East and $300 for the West, which has to be added to the salary in each case, and in addition there was $180 extra living allowance in the West.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What would the maximum salary be?

Mr. ROWELL: It is $939 for salary and $350 for bonus, or a total of $1,289.

Mr. EDWARDS: As regards the renewal of contracts of mail carriers, the Government has adopted a very wise and just policy in allowing those who made their contracts previously to the first of January, 1918, to be, if they so desire, released from those contracts. But in cases where, after advertising, it is found impossible to get any one else to put in a tender for carrying the mail on a route, the Government should take the impossibility of getting tenders as evidence of the fact that the price paid has been too small; and while the Government must allow the service to go on and hold the original carrier to his contract, he should be held only for a reasonable time after the Government has exhausted its efforts to get tenders, and some consideration should be given to that man on his contract. He should not be compelled to carry it on because it is found impossible to get any one else to tender for the same kind of work.

There is another matter that I want to call to the attention of the Acting Postmaster General (Mr. Rowell), and I hope it will receive more consideration from the department than it has received in the past. The Government has seen fit to fix the salaries of postmen, and the acting minister has just told us that with the bonus their maximum salary amounted last year to $1,289. In the rural parts of this country, in fair-sized villages, we have a class of postmasters who are receiving practically no consideration and who never have received any consideration or any fair play from the Government. I refer to the country or village postmaster whose whole time is required for the work of his office. I took up with the Deputy Postmaster General the case of the postmaster at Sydenham, the largest village in my constituency, and asked if something could not be done to give that man fair play in the way of salary. His whole time is required for the duties of his office; he must be at his office by seven o'clock in the morning in order to prepare the mails for the outgoing stage, and he has to be there until eight or nine o'clock at night. Although those are pretty long hours, he has been receiving a salary of $800 or $900 a year, which is entirely unfair. That man is just as much a public servant as any postman or other civil servant in Ottawa whose salary is much higher. The majority of postmasters in the country districts carry on their work in connection with a store or some other business, the post office being a sort of side line, and in those cases, there is no great hardship. But I wish most earnestly to direct the attention of the department to those few cases in country villages where the whole time of the postmaster is required for the work. Such men should be placed in a separate class from the ordinary country or village postmaster, and their salaries should be fixed just as the salary of a postman or other civil servant in Ottawa is fixed. We are getting their services and they are not being paid for them. In a large village such as I have mentioned, the post office not only serves the village, but is the distributing point for several rural routes, so that the work of the postmaster is enormously increased. Civil servants in the Post Office Department in Ottawa have to work eight or nine hours a day, and not one of them but is receiving a much higher remuneration than that man. In my constituency, there would be perhaps only one other similar case, or possibly two. I hope the department will seriously consider placing those postmasters in a class by themselves, and not have their remuneration fixed as it is at present.

Mr. BOYCE: I do not think there is a more faithful body of men than the mail

carriers, who are doing splendid work for from $750 to $900 a year, out of which they have to supply their horses, every carrier having one and sometimes two. It matters not how bad the roads may be, they carry on their work in every condition of weather, and at the end of the year they find that they have not been able to make ends meet. The mail carriers in the cities get from $1,000 to $1,500, and any civil servant who receives less than $1,800 gets a bonus of $250 or $300. Why should not the Government be generous to these people in the country? Are they not as well entitled to consideration as those in the cities? The Postmasters, too, get about $40 a year, but no consideration seems to be given to their extremely deserving case. The attitude seems to be that they can take what they get and need say nothing about it. I can mention a man who carries the mails six miles every day back and forth for the munificent sum of $300, and yet hon. gentlenmen seem to consider those men are getting enough. I do not intend to use any threats, but in the county I represent there will be a strike before two months pass if these men do not receive more generous treatment, and one can hardly blame them. I trust that something will be done to remedy this state of affairs, because if there is a strike there you may depend upon it there will be strikes all over Canada. These men are not demanding anything extravagant but they want to be treated honestly and decently and given a fair remuneration for the excellent service they render.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think we have before us an example why the people are inclined to move from the country to the cities. When you witness the ragged and bedraggled rural mail carriers driving in from the country through all sorts of weather, furnishing their own horses and rigs and travelling over a twenty-five mile route for something like $800, while a postman in the city receives about $1,300 and two uniforms without any outlay such as the other has to incur, I think the injustice that is being done to these people will be apparent, and the manner in which the postmen can hold the Government up and compel them to meet their demands is an evidence that the rural mail carrier is suffering an injustice. He has also to furnish bonds. I am not sure whether the men delivering mails in the cities do the same, but do not think so. I have known several instances in which the rural mail carriers had to quit and lost what little money they had put into their outfit, and went back labouring for day's wages wherever they could obtain work. In regard to the closing of small offices throughout rural districts, I shall have something to say. The establishment of rural mail delivery was, I think, the greatest boon to the people in the rural districts ever experienced, but the policy of the Government apparently now is to close up as many of these offices as they can regardless of the effect it will have on the community. Many of these offices are located, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said, in general stores, at points where there may be small hamlets of thirty or forty houses, and the postmasters receive a mere bagatelle for their services and the rent for the offices is very small. During the past summer a couple of offices were closed in the riding which I have the honour to represent, offices which I thought were serving a useful purpose. I felt an injustice was done, not only to the people living in the immediate vicinity, but to the farmers in the surrounding district who were accustomed to assemble at these places after their day's work and who were doing business through these post offices in the way of purchasing money orders, etc. In thickly settled districts these general stores are rendezvous where the people from the surrounding districts often gather at night to do their business. Consequently they serve a useful purpose. One of these offices to which I refer was about five miles and the other about eight miles from a town in a part of the country that was well served by rural mail delivery. The revenue in each case was over $100 above the cost to the country in maintaining them. The Postmaster General's report does not now contain the information which it previously gave, and I have not the figures for the last few years, but in 1916 the revenue of one of these offices was $182.13, salary, $68; and the postmaster got $6 rent for keeping His Majesty's mail in his store. The department derived a revenue of $118 from that office over and above expenses. The other office, which was about four miles distant, showed a surplus of about $94 over cost to the department. Both of these offices have been closed and the department will suffer a loss of revenue. The express companies deemed it of sufficient importance to open offices there and pick up some of the business which had formerly been carried on by the Post Office Department. I do not like to refer to cases of this kind, and these were the only two instances in

the constituency which I represent in which I took exception to the closing of the offices. The two previous Postmaster Generals, acting on the advice of the inspector for that district, suggested the closing of these offices, and when the matter was placed before them they saw the wisdom of continuing them. However, the present Postmaster General thought it advisable to close them, with the result I have pointed out. But another objection is that the people will have to pay $4.50 for a box to be stuck up on the side of the road, and two beautiful country hamlets will be greatly disfigured as a result.

The manner in which these places have been disfigured by having these boxes stuck up at corners is a serious matter. This policy is not being carried out uniformly throughout the country. I have asked for information in regard to it with reference to adjoining ridings, and I understand that in these ridings where the revenues were not as great as they were in the offices to which I refer the offices are still being maintained. It is very unfair on the part of the department to show discrimination as between different ridings. If, as the minister has informed me, this is the policy that they have laid down, and that they are closing up these offices by the hundred regardless of financial loss to the country by reason of having given the rural mail delivery, let them apply the same rule in all constituencies. I know that in the constituency immediately to the north of me that policy is not being carried out and that offices are being maintained for the closing of which there would be much more justification than there was in the case of the two offices I am referring to. The names of these offices are Verschoyle and Culloden and they are offices which have been in existence for years. The express companies have deemed them to be of sufficient importance to open offices there to take care of the business which has been discarded by the Post Office Department.

Mr. ROWELL: I will ask the officers of the department to look into the particular case to which my hon. friend has referred. I am sure he will appreciate the difficulty that the Post Office Department faces growing out of the extension of rural mail delivery. I quite agree with him as to the great practical benefits that result to the people of the country from the extension of the service. If you can get your mail regularly without the necessity of going to the post office it is a very great boon. But this can only be done at very considerable cost to the country; the extension of the rural mail service has involved a very heavy financial outlay. The Government is extending the service from time to time as the conditions appear to warrant. During last year 266 post offices were opened and 366 closed. These offices were closed for the reason which my hon. friend has mentioned as applying to the two offices in his own riding—largely due to the extension of the rural mail delivery service and because it was not believed essential that they should be continued, as the mail was being distributed by rural mail delivery. The number of rural mail delivery routes in operation to March 31st was 2,674, and the number of boxes served 173,150. That great extension accounts for a certain number of offices being closed. The rural mail routes have taken their places.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I see by the Postmaster General's report that the revenue for the 1918 from the Verschoyle office was $243.34 and not $182 as it was for the year 1916. It shows that there was a material increase in the revenue from that office. At Culloden the revenue was $268.97 for 1918. It may be the policy of the department to close up these offices by reason of the rural mail delivery that has been inaugurated, but if you are going to allow revenue to go into the hands of the express companies it is a very poor business method on the part of the department.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion regarding the rural mail service, and I endorse most heartily all that has been said with reference to the superintendent of that service. He is a most efficient, capable and energetic administrator. He has a most difficult department to administer, and I feel confident that if he had more latitude from the Postmaster General he would straighten out a great many of the complaints that have been voiced here to-night.

I have another matter of greater importance, in the interest of the country, than the rural mail service to deal with in connection with these Estimates. I think the Committee will be well advised to delay the passing of this Estimate for further consideration. I refer to the cost of the railway mail service. The entire cost as shown in the Auditor General's Report, page S-48, is $3,487,590.37, of which the Canadian Pacific Railway secured the magnificent sum of $1,735,644.44. I think that if a little attention were given to this feature

of the expenditure, and if some of the carriage were transferred to the Government railways, it would tend to reduce the deficits that obtain from year to year on the Government roads. If the surplus mail that goes by express, instead of in the railway mail cars, were shipped over the Government railways rather than over the Canadian Pacific, the cost of this carriage would be added to the revenue of the Government railways and not to the revenue of the Canadian Pacific. This is a matter that I think deserves the sincere and earnest attention of the Postmaster General and I would be glad if the President of the Privy Council would call his attention to it.

There is another matter that I think supports my demand for delay in the passing of these Estimates and that has reference to the item of salaries and allowances. I do not see how the Committee can deal with this subject intelligently until the new classification has been brought before the House. I claim that it is not possible for the House to pass this Estimate to-night or to arrive at an intelligent decision on the subject. I do not know whether it is germane to the subject under discussion to go into the question of increases of salaries or not. Possibly it will not be until such time as the Supplementary Estimate has been brought down but I would point out one anomaly likely in connection with this matter. Take chief clerks in the Post Office classified as grade 1A. Now supposing a clerk is promoted from the Railway Mail Service to the position of chief clerk, Grade I A. At the present time the maximum salary for that position is $1,800, and the minimum $1,600. Under the re-classification which has been recently carried out the maximum and minimum salaries attached to that position may be increased to $2,600 and $2,400 respectively. The point that will be up for debate in the House is whether the employee in question —having been in the Service perhaps for a period of thirty years and having attained a maximum of $1,800 a year—should be advanced to the minimum or the maximum of the new classification. I think it will be admitted by all that a man who has given thirty years service to the country should in all fairness receive the maximum instead of the minimum under that classification. This at the first glance might appear to be unreasonable, but such an advance would be simple fairness to a man in such a position. For the two reasons I have given the minister will be well-advised in allowing this item to stand over for further discussion until the new classification has been brought down or until we have had time to look into the facts regarding the amounts paid to the railways for the carriage of the mails.

Mr. STEELE: I wish to join with a number of honourable gentlemen who have spoken to-night in urging the Government to give more generous consideration to the mail carriers. I hesitate to offer any criticism respecting a department that is generally so efficiently run as the Post Office Department, but, I presume, no department of the Government has ever attained absolute perfection. I believe that the minister and the officials of the department at the present time are most anxious that it should be managed as perfectly as possible, and knowing this I venture with a good deal of confidence to advance one or two suggestions which, perhaps, have not been brought to their attention, and which, in their desire to administer the department as efficiently as can be I know they will take under consideration. First, regarding the rural mail carriers, I can see great difficulty in connection with the matter. There is no doubt at all that many of those carriers are working to-day for a remuneration which is notoriously inadequate—in fact, I have told many of the carriers in my constituency that they were very foolish to undertake the work at all when they are losing money every day on account of carrying His Majesty's mails. However, I cannot forget that these men entered into the contract voluntarily, they are not under compulsion at all, and when they do that naturally the department expects them to carry out their obligations. I think, however, that contractors who took contracts three years or so ago, and are to-day carrying out those contracts on the same terms, should be considered, even if they do not put up a plea to the department and endeavour to show they are losing money. I think it would be better for the department to take up all these cases and deal with them on a uniform basis; it would certainly be greater satisfaction to the mail carriers. Another thing of which the carriers complain, and which I wish to bring to the attention of the department, is in connection with the sale of stamps and money orders to the people along their routes, especially stamps. There is but little trouble in the summer time when the weather conditions are favourable, but on stormy days in winter, when the carrier is going along muffled up in his fur coat,

and wearing a big pair of mitts or gloves, and parties come running out to their gate to purchase two or three stamps, it is altogether different. The carrier has to stop, remove his mitts, unfasten his wallet to get out the stamps, and if it is a damp day the stamps are apt to get moist in the process. That seems only a little matter, but it requires perhaps three, four, or five minutes, and if he has to do that at ten, twelve, or twenty places a day it will be seen how much time he loses. I would suggest that the department supply the carrier with envelopes made of waterproof paper in one of which he might place twenty-five cents' worth of stamps, in another ten cents' worth, and so on. When the people come out for stamps he can hand them an envelope containing the amount of stamps they want and there is very little danger of the stamps getting moist and being spoiled.

There is another thing I wish to bring forward, which I know results in considerable loss to a number of postmasters. In the portion of the country I represent the trains leave very early and the mail is received very early, necessitating postmasters having their offices open at six a.m. Mails are also received very late at night. In both the towns in my riding mails arrive at eleven o'clock at night, necessitating the post office being kept open at that hour in order to take care of registered mail and so on. The postmaster of one of these offices writes me to say that he pays an extra allowance of $5 a month to a man to take in the mail at night, and dispose of the registered mail carefully. He has also to pay an extra allowance of $7 a month to a man to be there in the morning to open the office at six o'clock in order to get the mail ready to be despatched on the seven o'clock train. He says that for these two services he pays extra men $144 a year, and notwithstanding the fact that he has brought it to the attention of the department, all that it allows him for this purpose is $75 a year. Any of us who thinks of a man being up three hundred nights in the year till eleven o'clock to receive mail and for that is paid the magnificent sum of $5 a month will duly appreciate the fact that the Post Office Department, in that respect at least, is not extravagant. I do think the department might well recognize the services which these men are compelled to perform, and remunerate them according to the work they are doing. I do not think it is economy to have any man doing such work as this for the department and feeling that he is being paid such an unreasonable amount. We know that the salary of the country posmaster to-day is very inadequate, and that if he has to pay out of his own stipend for these extra services considerably more than the department will allow him he is probably filling the office of postmaster at considerable loss to himself. I hope the department will look into these matters and endeavour to be more generous to the postmaster in the small town as well as to the country postmaster.

Mr. PEDLOW: I wish to add one statement to my previous observations. Whereas the Canadian Pacific received $1,735,644 for carrying mail last year, the Government Railways received only $849,879 for the same service.

Mr. ARTHURS: I think that every hon. member who has had any experience with the Post Office Department will agree with me that the Post Office Department is managed very economically and with due regard to the public service. As a whole I have absolutely no fault to find in that regard, and I must say that during my experience with the present and the preceding Governments I have received nothing but courtesy. But while I believe that economy is desirable I agree absolutely with the previous speaker that both in the rural and other mail services the remuneration is very inadequate. Unfortunately, the practice followed by the department is to call for tenders for these various services, and after the tenders have been received the department, in their wisdom—or lack of wisdom in many cases—if a tender is too high immediately start to peddle the job round the country, or get the post office inspector to call round and interview certain men and say: " we will not award this contract for $100, we are going to get new bids".

The net result is that they induce some individual to take the contract at about half a living wage. We have in the same department demands for increases on behalf of the mail carriers in the cities. Those demands have been granted in many cases, and yet where a new route is being established—and I have in mind now particularly rural mail routes—the department adheres to the principle of a maximum sum per mile. A sum was fixed previous to war conditions, and if the sum asked by tenderers is greater than that maximum, the rural mail delivery is set

back until somebody is foolish enough to accept the terms of the department. When these contracts are renewed the department inevitably find that they cannot get the work done for the same money. My experience has been that where a rural mail delivery has once been established, and new tenders have been called for on the old contract, the Government has in every case had to pay from 40 to 60 per cent more than the original sum allotted for that service. These men are entitled to a fair wage, and when the Government advertise for tenders they should abide by the tenders received or advertise for new tenders. I cannot see any reason why this practice should be continued of peddling these contracts around and ultimately inducing some poor fellow to take on a twenty mile route at $2.25 a day. As I said before, the general service of the Post Office Department has been entirely satisfactory to the public, but as far as the mail carriers are concerned, there is no question in my mind that they have a grievance. As previous speakers have said, these men took contracts under pre-war conditions, or during the first year of the war when prices were low, and they are continuing loyally to carry out those contracts. We had a promise from the minister last session or the session before that in any case where cancellation of such contracts was asked for it would be granted, but I find many cases in which cancellation has been refused. This is a very serious matter to the men concerned and is deserving of careful consideration on the part of the department.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have several times heard hon. members call attention to the revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department, and if they can show that the expenditure has exceeded the revenue they think they have scored a point. In my judgment the Post Office Department is the one department of the Government where we should not look for a surplus. If a deficit is shown, that is not necessarily a point against the administration. Every dollar of revenue of the department comes out of the pockets of the people, and in my estimation every dollar should go back to the people in mail service of some kind or other. With demands for rural delivery over our very extensive Dominion I do not see how it is possible for the department to show a surplus if they give the people of the country districts the service to which they are entitled. The people in the country districts are contributing to the up-building of this country just as much as their friends in the urban districts, and practically the only thing that the Government can do for them is to give them an up-to-date mail service. There are many places in the rural districts where there are no public works, no money is ever expended by the department in building post offices, or wharfs where there is no water, and that sort of thing, and it is but right that the rural population should have an up-to-date mail service, even if it results in the expenditure of the department exceeding the revenue.

11 p.m.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: In my judgment the Post Office Department have not done nearly as much as they might have done for the rural districts. I am not now urging a large expenditure, but for a number of years I have drawn the attention of the department to the desirability of putting automobiles on the long routes instead of horses, but I have had no attention paid to my suggestion. Where the routes are short, and the population is dense, rural mail delivery by team is all right, but on the long routes automobiles are necessary. In my constituency there is one route sixty miles in length from Heatherton to Canso, one of the largest towns in my county. It would be impossible to apply the usual rural delivery to that route, because the postman could not get to Canso for a couple of days. I know of other routes forty miles long. If the department would introduce delivery by automobile it would be a great accommodation on those long routes. Some of the contractors have adopted automobiles and they find they are able to do their work most satisfactorily, but the department have taken no interest in the matter as far as I know, and have not figured on the difference between automobile and horse delivery.

Mr. EDWARDS: How about the winter season?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Of course it would not be practicable during part of the winter season; but these long routes are generally handled by men who have livery stables, and in the winter season they have very little work for their horses, whereas in the summer season there is a great demand for them. I rather expected the minister would explain to the Committee the very large increase that has taken place in the Estimates of the department compared with the service the people are receiving. In look-

ing over the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, I find on page 77, the expenditure of the Post Office Department for a long period of years. The last occupant of the position of Postmaster General under the late Laurier Administration was the member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) and I suppose we must make him responsible for the year 1912. In that year the administration of the Post Office Department cost the country $9,172,035.47. In 1913 the amount, in round figures, was $10,000,000; in 1914, $12,000,000; in 1915, $15,000,000; in 1916, $16,000,000; in 1918, $18,000,000. The expense has doubled since the Borden Administration came into power.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would it not be advisable to go back to the years 1909 and 1910, and to give the number of rural routes in existence in those years?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That would only make the comparison more striking, because the cost of administering the department in 1910 was $7,000,000, and in 1911 about the same. There was a large surplus at that time, which was paid into the general revenue of the country. The cost of the rural mail service does not explain the large increase. Of course, we must make allowance for the rural mail delivery. It is a progressive move; it serves the people, and we must pay for it. It is said that $5 a box would be a fair basis upon which to estimate the increased cost resulting from the establishing of rural mail delivery; the officers of the department are here and can say whether or not I am right in that. The post office returns for the present year show that there are 173,150 boxes, which would give $865,750 as the total increase of cost in connection with the rural mail delivery. Even if we allow a million for the increase on this account, the general increase is still very large and the greater part of it is not accounted for. The population of the country has not increased very much. The number of offices opened in 1918 was 216 and the number closed was 366; so we had 160 less post offices at the end of the last fiscal year than at the beginning. Nor is the increase due to the increased efficiency in the department, so far as I can see. I feel that it is largely due to the large and unnecessary increase in the staff in some of the cities, and that patronage has a great deal to do with it. I may be wrong in that, but I would like the minister to explain the enormous increase in the expenditure during the last seven or eight years.

Mr. ROWELL: Last Friday evening I gave the Committee some of the reasons for the increased expenditure. A good deal of the criticism, or comment, or suggestion, that has been offered to-night has been with the idea that the Post Office Department should be more generous in its payments; that the expenditure should be on a larger scale. I should judge that the general opinion of the Committee is that whatever may be the mistakes of the Post Office Department, it does not err on the side of spending too much money in carrying out the postal service of the country. My hon. friend suggests that one cause of the increased expenditure may be unnecessary appointments in some of the city post offices, and that that is one of the evils of the patronage system. My hon. friend must be very glad indeed, as we are, that the patronage system has been abolished and that the Civil Service Commission now has charge of all appointments. If such a condition exists as my hon. friend suggests, it will be disclosed when we have the report on the re-classification of the Civil Service. I should think that that report would show the number of men required in the various branches of the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was promised for the beginning of May.

Mr. ROWELL: The first week in May—the first week has not yet passed. The Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who is in charge of that matter, is not here; he will have to speak for himself. The extension of the rural mail service has cost many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and there has been a substantial increase of salaries in the various branches of the service. But the largest increase is due to three chief causes. First, some fifteen hundred employees of the department served overseas and in the meantime received their civil pay. The department had to employ and to pay temporary clerks to take their places.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Only until an Order in Council was passed cancelling the first Order in Council.

Mr. ROWELL: No, that has been continued. Those who enlisted after the Military Service Act was passed were not entitled to their civil pay, but those who enlisted prior to that were entitled to it.

Mr. PEDLOW: About how much did that cost during the past year?

Mr. ROWELL: The average salary of these fifteen hundred employees would be over a thousand dollars; my hon. friend can estimate what the figure would be. Another very important item in the expense is the bonuses that have been paid during the last two or three years. In 1917 a bonus of $100 was paid; there was another $150 last year; then there was the war bonus last summer of $50 in the West and $100 in the East, making $350 in bonuses to the East and $300 to the West. In addition the western employees had their regular special living allowance of $180, making a total bonus of $480 for the West. My hon. friend has only to apply these figures to the vast number of employees who received the bonus to see what a large amount that involves. The third was the increased cost, due to the increased price, particularly during the last two or three years, of supplies which the Post Office Department must buy and use. The items I have mentioned amount to some millions of dollars.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that the Empress of Britain has, for the first time since the beginning of the war, reached Quebec. Were the mails conveyed by that vessel to Quebec?

Mr. ROWELL: They were.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope we shall have no more mails conveyed to Halifax, but that they will be landed in New York.

Mr. ROWELL: The Post Office Department have made representations to the Post Office Department in Great Britain which despatches the mails, pointing out what happened before and urging that that should be done. They have promised co-operation, so we anticipate that will be the result.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What population must a town have before it is entitled to have delivery of the mails?

Mr. ROWELL: The general rule is 12,000 people and $20,000 revenue.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If the revenue were larger and the population smaller, would there be a chance of getting the accommodation?

Mr. ROWELL: If the revenue were very large, I think the Post Office Department would take the matter into very sympathic consideration.

[Mr. Rowell.]

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: According to a return that I have on my desk, the revenue last year of New Glasgow, the town in which I live, was $39,138, and the revenue of the town of Shawenegan Falls was $15,158.80. I do not know what the population of Shawenegan Falls is, but I do not think it is as large as that of New Glasgow, and yet Shawenegan Falls has a letter carrier service. Three Rivers, revenue $32,171.49; St. Hyacinthe, revenue $24,032.84; Strathcona, revenue $24,001.65, all have a letter carrier service. New Glasgow has not, and although I do not think the population of New Glasgow is 12,000, still, as the revenue is so large, it is perhaps entitled to this service.

Mr. ROWELL: The town will have to increase its population. The other figures would seem to indicate how carefully the Government is looking after the interests of Quebec.

Mr. DUFF: How much did it cost the Post Office Department last year for advertising throughout Canada?

Mr. ROWELL: I have not the figures here, but I can give the information to my hon. friend later.

Mr. McKENZIE: On several occasions I have brought before the House the question of the carriage of the mails from Halifax to St. Pierre-Miquelon. How were the mails carried last summer during open navigation, and how are they being carried now? The mails used to be put aboard the trains at Halifax and taken by rail to North Sydney, then taken out of the train and put into the post office at North Sydney, and afterwards taken aboard the Pro Patria or the St. Pierre-Miquelon boat at North Sydney. The Pro Patria every time she comes to North Sydney goes to Halifax, and I could never understand why those mails are not put aboard the boat at Halifax, because there is nothing done with them anywhere between Halifax and North Sydney. I have been bringing this matter up for years, and I can never get any satisfaction as to why the mails are not put on board the boat at Halifax.

Mr. ROWELL: The reason given to me is that the mails can be despatched at a later hour to reach the boat than if they were put on the steamship at Halifax.

Mr. McKENZIE: That reason is simply absurd, because while North Sydney is not such a small town, there is very little space in the post office and for days at a time it is

filled up with St. Pierre-Miquelon mail waiting for the boat to come, so that the men cannot do their work. There must be some arrangement by which somebody is making a little money; the thing is not clean; it cannot possibly be. There is a contract for hauling the mail from Halifax to North Sydney; there is a contract for hauling it from the post office to the railway station, and all that business is carried on to no purpose in the world when the boat goes right into the wharf at Halifax, where the mails could be put on board and taken to St. Pierre-Miquelon. I have had this matter up a dozen times before, and the reason given by the Postmaster General is absolutely no reason at all.

Mr. ROWELL: I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but I will look into it and will give the hon. member the best reason the department has.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope the minister, when we next come to his Estimates, will bring the figures of what advertising has cost during the last two or three years. I am quite satisfied that a very large amount of money is being sunk in those advertisements for mail contracts. The department itself is not responsible, because those notices are published under the direction of the Secretary of State, or at least, that was the custom under my regime. Last year, I brought to the notice of the House a concrete case which struck me as being a case of pure jobbery. A contract for mail service in British Columbia was advertised in a small weekly paper in the county of Drummond-Arthabaska in the province of Quebec.

Mr. ROWELL: There is no excuse for that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly not, and I think if advertisements have to be published, they should be confined to the county or district in which the mail service is to be carried on.

Another matter I wish to call attention to. The boxes for the rural mail delivery service were changed some years ago, but I do not know whether they were changed all over Canada. The reason given for the change was that we were going to adopt the parcel delivery system. I would like to know the extension of this service and if the minister has any figures to give the House in connection with it. What was the revenue derived from it and what number of boxes were specially adapted for that service? The old box was too small to contain the ordinary parcel and larger boxes were secured by the department. Were those boxes distributed all over the mail routes, and does that account for the increase in the expenditure of the department? I would like to know if the rates are sufficiently low to justify the use of the parcel delivery to any reasonable extent.

Mr. ROWELL: When the Supplementary Estimates of the Post Office come in I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the information so far as it is available. Some of it is not available, because no revenue stamps are attached in the case of parcel post. I believe the service is efficient and is carried on, on the whole, under satisfactory conditions. But I shall take a note of the information my hon. friend has asked for and shall be glad to give it to him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are there special arrangements with large firms, such as Eaton and Simpson, Morgan in Montreal, and Dupuis and Paquet? The department store has practically put out of business the country store, and from the remotest places in my constituency mail orders are sent, and it is a great service to the people when they can order and receive their goods by mail. Are there special features of that service?

Mr. ROWELL: No, they come under the same terms as anybody else.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does not the Post Office Department provide a specially allotted space in the mail car for that service? I have been under the impression of late that these large firms had obtained through the Post Office Department—I am not criticising—certain space in the mail cars for parcel post. If that is so, I should think the firms in question should pay for that service.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. member is in error. They have not obtained any special privileges. Of course the Post Office Department must estimate the volume of postal business. There is a very large volume of business done by these companies, and provision must be made for the necessary cars to carry it, but these companies have no privileges. They are on the same basis as other people.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has recieved considerable valuable advice, and we have had many important speeches, but I am afraid that this item cannot go through without keeping us very late. There are three things which I think

should engage the minister's attention more fully before the item goes through. First, what effect will the re-classification have upon the department? Then there is the very important question brought up to-night as to the policy that the Government should follow in the delivery of mails by rail. Now that we have railroads of our own pretty much all over the country, it is only proper that we should patronize them. The next thing is the huge increases in the general operations of the Post Office, brought out by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The country will expect satisfactory information upon these matters before this large amount of nearly twenty million dollars is voted. The minister will understand that there is no disposition to obstruct him in his Estimates but this is the opportunity to get this information, and if he will inform the Committee on these questions on the next occasion I do not think he will have very much trouble in getting the item through. I suggest that as it is nearly twelve o'clock we might be permitted to go home.

Mr. ROWELL: The information my hon. friend asks for I can give in a minute. With reference to the re-classification, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) suggested that the Estimate should stand because we had not full information. I think it would create an unfortunate situation in the country and grave unrest among the Post Office employees if they thought there was hesitation in voting these allowances. Until the re-classification comes down the bonuses will be continued. The re-classification will fix the scale of salaries, but we will have to deal with the re-classification when it comes down, and then will be the time to discuss the matter. With reference to the carrying of mails, the Canadian Pacific railway has been receiving substantial sums because it has been rendering services. It is on the basis of the service rendered that the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National railways are paid. But now that the Government has taken over the system of National railways, and especially if it gets the Grand Trunk, it will be in a position to serve the different communities. Speed and convenient service of the mails are essential and the Government will use the National railways to the full extent that the conditions will warrant. There is no difficulty about the Government's policy in that respect. In reference to increased expenditure I have already given information.

In so far as anything generally in connection with the Post Office is concerned, the Supplementary Estimates will be here and there will be a full opportunity for discussion. We have spent two nights on this one item and there has been a full opportunity to discuss all the aspects of it. We might put this item through now.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am glad to have the information voluntered by the Acting Postmaster General regarding his intention in reference to the railway mail service. It is, he says, his intention to recommend to the department that they use the Government railways wherever possible. What I had in mind was not the general mail service but the mail matter that is usually carried in express cars. There are express cars loaded with mail matter from Toronto to points like Winnipeg and Vancouver and these cars are shipped by express. My idea is that in future mail of this class should be sent over the Government lines and not over the Canadian Pacific. That will help materially in reducing the deficit in operating the Government railways. Another matter that I would like to mention. How does the department arrive at the value of the stamps the revenue from which it is entitled to credit to the Post Office department? Postage stamps are used largely for inland revenue purposes, very few inland revenue stamps are used. By what method does the Post Office department arrive at the division in the sale of stamps for these different purposes? Last year I called the attention of the Postmaster to the point, but it has apparently not been attended to. Postage stamps should not be used for inland revenue purposes and inland revenue stamps should not be used for postage purposes. The Government should be able to state the exact amount of revenue to be credited to each department. As the matter now stands it is mere guesswork.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Are postmasters in rural districts appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will we be allowed to discuss this matter when the Supplementaries come down?

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so, and it will also be open for discussion when the Civil Service Report comes down.

Mr. PEDLOW: How is that division arrived at?

Mr. ROWELL: There is no division. There are no inland revenue stamps being used by the Post Office department. Postage stamps are used for inland revenue purposes.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am quite aware of that fact.

Mr. ROWELL: The department cannot separate the stamps used for inland revenue purposes from those used for post office purposes.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then the Post Office Department is getting an abnormal amount of revenue that it is not entitled to.

Mr. ROWELL: The Post Office Department is getting the full amount of the return from these stamps plus the additional one cent stamp which makes up the revenue to something like $6,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: It was not the intention that the proceeds should go holus bolus to the Post Office Department. I remember that when we returned to the three-cent rate instead of two cents, and when we enacted the law providing for putting stamps on cheques and notes, there was then a discussion in the House and the intention was that the revenue should be kept separate and apart and that the department would be able to tell how much revenue came from the mail service and how much came from other sources. It was thought at that time that a different kind of stamp would be manufactured for cheques and notes. But it was found to be very difficult and inconvenient. The whole thing was dropped and it was confined finally to the stamps issued by the Post Office Department. I am sure the department which my hon. friend represents now does not wish to be receiving money under false pretences. If it wants to get clear of the imputation of swelling its revenues by funds which it has no business to get it would be well to explain how much of its revenue is legitimate and how much is obtained from sources from which it should get nothing at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are two or three seasons of the year when you appoint temporary officials in the large post offices. How are these appointments made?

Mr. ROWELL: By the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am bound to tell the President of the Council about the most marvellous instinct of these commissioners. It is impossible for me to understand how it is that they will ferret and trace out in the remotest portions of the country a good, solid, substantial Tory.

Mr. ROWELL: It may be instinct.

Mr. McKENZIE: I cannot understand how it is. It must be telepathy of some kind existing between the Chairman of the Commission and the remote corners of the country. We know the Chairman of the Commission very well; he sat in Parliament for many years, and if ever there was an orthodox Tory in this country the President of the Commission is one. But he was always a very decent Tory and I do not know that he is responsible for the development of this wonderful instinct the evidence of which is to be found in every part of the country. I found that in several parts of my county last year when an old postmaster died and a new man was to be appointed this instinct never failed to get the right man and the right Tory for the place. Of course, that did not bother me. I knew there was somebody in the vicinity that was giving information. When I asked any question, as I did, I was told: Oh, it is all right. The post office inspector was getting the credit for the whole thing. I do not know whether he was entitled to it or not. The Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is supposed to have something to say about patronage in Nova Scotia; or at least about the appointment to offices that are necessary. He could possibly reveal some information in that regard. At the present moment I am only paying tribute to the marvellous instinct, the pathfinding ability, of the Chairman of the Commission. I think the minister should know about this marvellous capacity to find out Tories just as they always did.

Mr. BLAKE: I want to challenge the statement of the leader of the Opposition. The trouble is, as has been said to me at least a dozen times, that all the appointments being made in Winnipeg are given to the Liberals, and the question was asked, why could I not get anything for the Conservatives.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would not stand for that for one minute.

Mr. BLAKE: The leader of the Opposition seems to stand for it in his own constitu-

ency, and does not come down with a club and kill the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I hesitate to take such a course as that. However, the statement made by the leader of the Opposition is far from the actual fact. Taking the country as a whole I am satisfied there are more appointments probably of men who have been Liberal in the political beliefs than of men who have had Conservative training.

Progress reported.

THE PEACE TREATY.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The press this evening publishes a rumour that the Government has received the text of the Peace Treaty.

I would ask if the report is true, and if so when we may expect that the terms will be made known to the House?

Mr. ROWELL: The report is not correct. The Government does expect to receive, as soon as it is available for release to any part of the world, a summary of some eight thousand words. It is expected that that will be released simultaneously in Ottawa, Washington and other capitals. Shortly after, it may be within two or three days, the Government hopes to receive the full text of the treaty, and it will be laid upon the table of the House as soon as it is released for publication.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell, the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1919

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r. = first, second, or third reading. Amdt. = Amendment. Com. = Committee. Con. = Consideration. Div. = Division. M. = Motion. Ques. = Question. Ref. = Reference. Rep. = Report. Res. = Resolution. Sec. = Section.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 13, 41, 73, 116, 141, 185, 230, 272, 318, 358, 399, 424, 463, 514, 551
No quorum, order lapses, 397; reinstated, 398

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Admiralty Court, Montreal, ques. 1440

Advertising. *See* Government advertising

Aeronautics, 1264, ques. 1340. *See also* Air Board
Air Service, 4689
Canada's hinterland, development by, 302
European-Asiatic route via Canada, 305
Mail service, by, 2036
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Permanent Force in Canada, 2867
Transatlantic flight by Hawker, 2564

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code

Agricultural Education. *See* Technical Education

Agricultural Implements, 4008
Duties on, 3690
Freight rates on, 3926

Agriculture
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601
Department of
Orders in Council respecting, tabled, 270
Report of, tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2959
Experimental farms, prices, markets, pests, cold storage, etc., 2959-2976
Live stock
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee, 113, 2652, 4376

Air Board Bill. 1r., 1865; 2r., com., 2050; 3r., 2143
Provincial jurisdiction, 2052, 2060

Alcohol. *See* Proprietary; Prohibition

Aliens, 222, 375, 497. *See also* Asiatics; Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization
Enemies
Deportation of, 1946

Aliens—*Con.*
Interned, 1712, 1947; ques. 1611
Naturalization of. *See* British nationality
Discrimination—charged, 376
Non-alien territory, in, 1947
Policy respecting, 753
Prohibition of certain classes, Motion, Mr. Stevens, 769
Property and trade amongst, ques. 844
Property of, custodian, ques. 1535
West in, conduct of, 2320

Allan, Mr. G. W. (South Winnipeg)
Board of Commerce, 4511
Industrial unrest, Winnipeg strike, returned soldiers, etc., 3061
Militia, Permanent Force, 3979
Titles, 1474

Alpine Club, 4046

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
Baker, the late Lieut.-Col. Geo. Harold, M.P., 4456
Board of Commerce, 4527-8
Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill, 3738
Divorce, 3778
Housing scheme, 2536, 2542, 2546
Immigration Act Amdt., 1950
Income Tax, ques. 2049, 3722, 3729-35
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Pensions, 4182-9, 4196-7, 4277, 4298
"Unmarried wife," 4277
Purchasing Department, Commissioners' Salaries, 3815
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2768-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement — improving farms, 3882
Unsalaried war workers, 3815
Victory Bonds, ques. 2047

Amherst
Amherst Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Dr. Goodwin and Dr. Bliss, ques. 3377, ques. 4070
Internment Camp, 3848, ques. 4070
Morris, Col., ques. 2565

Amos Station, 2460

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 495. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada at the Peace Conference, 495; Union Government—conscription, 496; disfranchisement of defaulters—aliens—franchise—pensions, 497; returned soldiers and tuberculosis—patronage in Civil Service, 498; Civil Service Commission—public health—Canada's soldiers, 499; national unity, 500
Pensions, ques. 1076
Proprietary Medicines, 2481
Public Health, 1198

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Daylight Saving, 896
Hutterites, 1920
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1920
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Postal workers—Civil Service Re-classification, 2342
Prohibition, 2356
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872
Sympathetic strikes—collective bargaining—Winnipeg strike, etc., 2851, 3019
Yukon placer mining, 632

Anti-loafing, ques. 883

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 32 (for 1919-20, for $52,310,-026.12). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 842
2. Bill No. 113 (for 1818-19, for $18,827,-098.72). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 2462; 3r., 2463
3. Bill No. 123 (for 1919-20, for $148,211,-640.39). Res., 2952; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 2953
4. Bill No. 181 (for 1919-20, for $162,527,-610.91). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4689

Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 435. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French language and seconding of the Address, 436; peace and victory—Kinmel Camp riots—prohibition, 437; high cost of living, 438; prices, profits, food control—titles, 439; industrial unrest—Hon. Mr. Calder and Liberalism, 440; Government measures and Liberalism, 441; Mr. Richardson, M.P., in Europe—Quebec and enlistment—Soldiers' votes, 443; National unity, 445

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Bankruptcy Bill, 1987
Non-traders, 2476
Provinces and, 1998
Trustees, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4530, 4560-4
Printing of Bill in French, 4530
Budget, The, date of, 2752
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments in, ques. 2904
Canadian National Railway, 1857
Canadian soldiers, prisoners of war, ques. 1077
Censorship of soldiers' letters, 1663
Chambly Canal and Highway, ques. 2045
Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066
Cold storage companies, taxation of, ques. 2904
Complaints of Canadian soldiers, alleged suppression of, 1618
Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, ques. 1789
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, motion for, 1908
Fishermen, tax on, ques. 2144
Food Controller McFall, report of, ques. 4464
Franking of pamphlets, ques. 1791
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Gibson, Major, ques. 884, ques. 1440
Immigration, 2598-9
Industrial unrest, 1858
Hull industrial disputes, ques. 2905
Industrial Relations Commission, 1260
Labour Disputes Board, ques. 1535
Labour unions of the West, 1343
Winnipeg strike, nationality of leaders, 2598
Labour, Minister of, ques. 884
Letter carriers' bonuses, ques. 848
McLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905
Montreal Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
National Service Registration, ques. 2145
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4003-5
Pensions, 4031
Pension Commissioners, ques. 1790
Postmaster General, representation of in House of Commons, ques. 974
Public Health, "Social Welfare," 1188
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Siberian Expedition, 4001
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, ques. 974
Soldiers, in Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Toronto meeting—"Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Victory Loan, Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
War Service gratuities, ques. 4241
Washington, representation at, 2077-8

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Agricultural fairs, 2996-7
Arid Belt, so called, irrigation station, 2974
Budget, 3577; Liberal Unionists, 3577; Treatment of immigrants — wheat prices, 3578; Tariff Commission, 3579
Highways and railways, 742
Judges in Saskatchewan, 2311
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2765-6

Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068

Argyll House. *See* War, Military Management

Arisaig Wharf, 2780

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company, 2778-9
Canadian Pacific Railway, 3215
Inter-Imperial trade—ocean transport rates —Board of Investigation, 3240, 3327
Pelee Island, 4041
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2625
Railway Committee, 1864, 1886
Steamship Services, 3829-30
Railway Act Amendment Bill (Coastwise and Inland water traffic), 71
United States, management of ships in, 2210
Upper Lakes, Government ships on, 2255
Water-borne traffic and rates, control of, 2068, 2929-40
Water-powers, Dominion control, 2530

Armistice. *See* Peace; League of Nations

Army, Canadian permanent. *See* Militia Act Amendment

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Budget, 3672. Labour unrest—returned soldiers, 3673; tariff and cost of living, 3674; Tariff Board, 3675
Divorce Court Bill, 3784, 3786
French River waterway, 1087
Mail contractors, 2089
Naturalization, powers of Secretary of State, 4112
Pensions, 4173
Purchasing Commission, 3813
Sailors' wages, 2600
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3865, 3870

Arthurs, Colonel James, M.P.
Service pay and expenses, ques. 2653

Asiatics in Canada, 433, 1048, 1976
Naturalization and voting, 3822

Asphalt, oil for manufacture of, 4003

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605

Auditor General, death of, 115

Auditor General's report, 138, 312, 514, 744

Australia, markets and shipbuilding, 2207, 2222

Automobiles, Government-owned in Ottawa, ques. 880

Baker, the late Col. Geo. Harold, 549, 2224, 4456
Pension to unmarried sisters, 3004

Baldwin, Mr. Willis K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 332; Demobilization—development of natural resources, 332; housing —capital and labour, 333; franchise—Siberian expedition — inland revenue stamp taxes, 334; farmers and production—Department of Trade and Commerce, 335; infant mortality, 336
Budget, 3276. Reciprocity—titles, 3276; public debt—commissions, 3277; shipbuilding—produce and save, 3278; Franchise Act—good roads, 3279; Quebec, 3280
Emigration to United States, ques. 2046
Good roads, 4390
Weights and measures, 2156-8

Ball, Mr. Robt. J. (Southeast Grey)
Fire prevention, 1579
Telephone companies, 2650

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Biological Board, 2568
Budget, 3270. Liberal Party and Free Trade, 3270; Manufacturers and the tariff, 3271; War Profits Tax, 3272; United States competition — foreign trade, 3273; shipping and shipbuilding, 3275; moderate protection, 3275
Buoys, etc., 2608
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill, 2802-8, 3755, 3928-38
Cold storage, Montreal warehouse, 1619
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3270
Dominion steamers, 2600
Fisheries Act. Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2097, 3758-61
Fisheries patrol service, oyster culture, lobsters, hatcheries, etc., 2887-2903
Halifax Harbour Master, 2693-5, 2800-02
Industrial unrest—Speech at Verdun, 3241
Life-saving stations, 2850
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-9, 2613
Livestock shipments, inspection, 2602
Marine and Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2600
Marine hospitals, 2613

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C.—*Con.*
Masters and mates, 2600
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners (rate of interest), 3757
Meteorological service, 2613
Naval Service
Halifax, discharge of men at, 1959, 1996, 2226
Ministerial statement, answer to charges, 2811, 2839-47
Northern waters patrol, 2849
Pilotage, 2610, 2612, 3157-62
Radio-telegraph service, 2848
Royal Naval College, 2850
Schools of navigation, 2601
Shipping, registration of, 2602
St. John Harbour Commission, 4299, 4306, 4337-9
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2608
Shipbuilding, programme, vote, ministerial statement, 2202-16, 2251-3, 2261-3, 4682-6
Steamboat inspection, 2614
Steamers
"Brant," 2607
"Champlain," 2606-7
"Montcalm," 2607
Vancouver Harbour Bill, 3742-54, 4017-21
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Verdun, speech at, 3241
Wharves, generally, 2611
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-4
Wrecks, investigations into, 2601

Bankruptcy Bill. 1r., 229; 2r., 931; com., 1981, 1998, 2263, 2467; 3r., 2510; Senate amdts. concurred in, 4132

Banks. *See also* Finance
Excess circulation, 1103
Mergers, 1088

Bateman, Lieut. R., ques. 3067

Bate, McMahon & Co., 1277

Betiscan protective works, ques. 645

Bear River, N.S. Harbour and shipping master, 3242

Beaverbrook, Lord, 2872

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin (Beauce)
Air Board Bill, 2061
Aliens, interned, 1712
Belgium, reconstruction, 3294
Budget, 3293
Child welfare, 1200
Civil Service examination, 4496
France, steamship line to, 1291
Franchise, 3298
Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 3293
Military Service Act, 1163

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin—*Con.*
Navy, the British, 3301
National unity, 3302
Pensions, 2692, 3001
Prohibition, 2348, 2358
Proprietary medicines, 2484, 2487, 2653
Public health, 1202, 1375
Soothing syrups, amdt., 2488, 2491-3
Three Rivers harbour master, 2694
Trade Commissioners, 4493-4
War Measures Act, 1163
Welcome to on release from German prison, 3
Acknowledgments, 3293

Belanger vs. **The King,** 1021, 1279

Belgium, restoration of, 3294
Cablegram from Belgian Senate, 1955

Bell, Col. F. McKelvey, resignation of, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674

Bench, freedom of, 350. *See also* Judges Act Amdt

Bernier, Mr. K.C., 1021, 1027

Berubé, Esdras, case of, 2250

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Agriculture—seed, 2971
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1558
Re-classification, 1960
Salaries of $2,500 and over, 1439, 4481
Daylight saving, 889
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Good roads, 4425, 4428
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1245
Purchasing Commission, 3812

Biological Board Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2568; 3r., 2617

Blair, Mr. H. C., superannuation, ques. 2398

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646
Eight-hour day and Peace Treaty, 1996
Industrial unrest, labour unions, Bolshevism, strikes, etc., 3004
Partisanship in appointments, 2095
Postmen's 1918 strikes, 2037
Prohibition, 2358, 2665
Soldiers' land settlement; inclusion of Royal Air Force, 1437, 3873

Bliss, Dr. P., payments to, ques. 3377

Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques. 1790, 2042, 2084

Board of Commerce Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., 4497; com., 4527, 4549; 3r., 4567
Protest of Montreal Board of Trade, 4466, 4553
See also Combines

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boisdale Wharf, 2780

Bolshevism, 35, 42, 105, 111, 127, 141, 143, 145, 160, 247, 354, 368, 371, 435, 479, 1062-8, 2284, 2285, 4691
Calgary labour meeting, 1343
"Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Siberian Expedition and, 319
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
See also Criminal Code; Immigration; Industrial unrest

Boivin, Mr. George Henry (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bonnell, Mr. Saul (East Kootenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 445

Boots and Shoes from United States, ques. 978

Boots, purchase of, 3202

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Bell, Lt.-Col. McKelvey, 3240, 3473
Birthday congratulations, 4133
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4474, 4554
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Acts Consolidation Bill, 3585
Bruce Report, 4001
Canada Shipping amdt., 3936-7
Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, 3214
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4696
Civil Service. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Collective bargaining. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3193
Divorce Court Bill, 3777, 3789, 3791
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4621-5, 4644-9
Franchise Bill, 2906
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Good Roads, 4426-30
Suggested amdt., 4430-2
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3211
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3420
Business of the House—legislation pending, 3999
Postponement of legislation, 4690
Inter-Imperial trade, Board of Investigation, ocean transport and rates, 3240, 3327
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Industrial unrest, 3056

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Collective bargaining, 2908
Conference, 2908, 3195
Peace Conference labour principles, 2852
Postal employees, Calgary, 3194
Post office appointments after, 4347-8
Strikes, 3056
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Toronto, 2851, 2953
Winnipeg, 2953, 3069-70, 3472, 3587, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Intoxicating Liquors Bill—Senate Amdt., 4071-2, 4133
Free conference, 4497
Intoxicating liquors, interprovincial trade in, opinion of Minister and Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Letter postage rate, 4621
Members, absence of from Chamber, 3195
Peace celebration, 4238
Peace Conference, presence at. *See* Peace Conference
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Ratification of, 3937
Signing of, 3473
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Poland and Ukranians, etc., 3472, 4534, 4620, 4690
Privilege, Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Purchasing Commission, 3209, 3215, 4453-5
Railway Act Consolidation
Control of rates, 4144
Rates, three-year limit, amdt., 4147, 4152; res. moved, 4169; agreed to, 4170
Senate amdts., 3473-4
Telephones, 4167
Red Cross Society, 3162-4
Return from Europe, reception by the House, 2800
Senators, responsibility for opinions of, 4152
Shipping for St. Lawrence coal trade, 4335
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Wheat, prices, 4466
Canada's contract with Greece, 2907
Ypres, war memorial, 4465

Boughton Island, P.E.I., 2784

Bourdreault, Benjamin, Judge of Exemption, ques. 1439

Bourassa, Mr. Joseph B. (Lévis)
Lévis aqueduct, ques. 1789
Separation allowance, ques. 1908
Transcontinental Railway, accidents, ques. 1211

Bowman, Mr. James (North Huron)
Daylight saving, 927
Bow River, election petition, 4
Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, 4486
Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Connaught rifle range, 1896-7
Daylight saving, 904
Farming, conditions and prospects, 2964
Good roads, 4390
Highways and railways, 743
Income tax, farmers and, 3734
Land grants to religious denominations, ques. 2462
Livestock Amdt. Bill, 2066-7
Mail contractors, 2085
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1249
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4384
Boyer, Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Coteau Landing roadway, ques. 2045
Highways Aid Bill, 732
Isle Perrot bridges, 733
Maple syrup and sugar, ques. 645
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212
St. Zotique—River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144
Vaudreuil-Soulanges rural mail, ques. 2566
Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1246
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2622-8
Senate amdts., 4157
Transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3126
Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107
Bran and shorts, 4007
Brien, Mr. John Wesley (South Essex)
Pelee Island, 4033
Briquetting coal. *See* Coal
Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3098, 3102, 3112, 3124
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2230
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2949
British Columbia Courts. *See* Interpretation Act
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Act Consolidation Bill. 1r., 3585; 2r., 3816; com., 3820, 4110, 4257, 4339; 3r., 4344
Secretary of State, powers of, 4110
Married women, 4127
Naturalization, Canadian autonomy, 4119
British Navy, 3301
British North America Act, method of amdt., 415
Broderick, Mr. Michael E., ques. 729
Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O. (Drummond and Athabaska)
High Commissionership, ques. 3242
Purchasing Commission, ques. 3470
Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068
Bruce Report, the, 1483, 2885, 4001, 4071
Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Lethbridge)
Budget, 3455. Tariff, 3455; cost of living, 3456; production and wealth, 3457; Western farmers, 3458
Canadian National Railway, 1855
Government contracts, personal position, 2033, 2036
Immigration Act Amdt., 1912
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, profiteering, etc., 3021
Irrigation, 4601
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1913
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2033
Taber irrigation district, 4211
Budget, The, 3145. *See also* Ways and Means Amdt., Mr. McMaster, 3260; neg. on div., 3678; debate, 3242, 3293, 3378, 3422, 3474, 3587
Inquiry as to date of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646, 1917-38. *See* Poles, Ukrainians, Ruthenians
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1866, 1910
Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1984
Board of Commerce, 4472, 4497, 4549, 4599-4600
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 605
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3817-23, 4110-33, 4257, 4272
Revocation of certificate, 4119
Secretary of State, powers of, 4111, 4124, 4266
Canada Evidence Act, amdt., 1389-92
Canadian National Railway Company, 1395, 1403, 1414, 1420-21
Capital stock, 1777
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1717-26, 1751, 1765, 1787
Directors
Appointment, 1625, 1631, 1636
No personal responsibility, 1783
Payment of, 1653
Electric and power companies, 4573
Executive committee, 1667-74
Expropriation, 1695
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1705
Head office, 1651-3
Parliamentary control, 1691

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Co.—*Con.*
Public ownership, 1748
Securities
Advances and, 1777-8
Issue of, 1780
Other companies, of, 1781
Steamships, 1682, 1689
Town sites, 1769
Work for the general advantage of Canada, 1706
Civil Service re-classification, 3927
Conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Criminal Code, aliens and British subjects, 4358-61
Dominion lands, pulp, etc., 4251-4
Dominion water-powers, 2512-32
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-81
Amdt., 4580; neg., 4588
Good roads, 3909, 3911-2, 4395, 4423, 4426-7
Housing scheme, 2557-61
Income War Tax Amdt.
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3991-2
Iron, galvanized, 3689
Judges' salaries, 4218, 4235, 4368, 4435-7
Jacobs, Mr., personal explanation, 4234
National harbours, advantages of Three Rivers, 3754
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Newsprint control, 4540-1
Orders in Council, government by, 2557
Peace, celebration, 4238
Pensions, 4193-5, 4197
"Unmarried wife," 4208-10
Purchasing Commission, 3195, 3810-15, 4439-45, 4453-4
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-39
Telephone companies, 2647
Steamship services, 1289
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Decennial payment to provinces, 3892
Toronto Suburban Railway Company, ques. 1611
Tuberculosis, Indians, 4062
Welland Canal contracts, 1594-6

Bureau of Statistics, 3838

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden (West Peterborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 108. Liberal party—reconstruction, 108; wages and cost of living, 110; Bolshevism, 111
Budget, 3599. Minister of Finance—Dominions' interchange of Governors General—Protection or free trade, 3599, 3601; Union Government, 3600; land held vacant for speculation, 3601
Canadian National Railway, 1801

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1385
Civil Service, Outside, delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Combines and trusts in Great Britain, 3741
Cost of production, cost of consumption, 2854
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2466
Foreign credits and home supplies, 3836
Harbours, national, control of, 3746-8
High cost of living and minimum wage, 2908
Income tax, allowance for children, 3724
Industrial unrest, cost of living, wages, etc., 3015
Judges' salaries, 2958
National economic interests, 2253
Public ownership, 1801
Purchasing Commission, 3203
Titles, 1457, 2712, 2715, 2731
Transmission lines on highways, municipal powers, 3088-9, 3110
Trent Canal
Rates of wages, ques. 3586
Remuneration to returned soldiers, ques. 3470
War trophies, 2043

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Bolshevism, 2285
Briquetting lignite, 3472, 4488
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3819
Daylight saving, 914
Geological Survey and mines development, 4491-2
Government advertising, 2023
Government Printing Bureau
Civil Service Commission and, 1812
Strike, 230, 312, 399, 513
Immigration Act Amdt.—advocates of violence, 2285
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1320
Mines Branch, 4489-91
Naturalization, 4264-5
Non-ferrous metals, 3682
Peat experiments, 4489
Public Printing and Stationery Dept. reorganization, 4687
Purchasing Commission, 3220-2
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 833
Technical education, 3801
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 986

Business Profits Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Proceeds, ques. 1791

Butter, price of, 1618

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3821
Budget, 3643. Resignations from Government—Opposition leadership, 3643; all protectionists, 3644; shipping, coal and steel, 3644
Civil Service, sessional employees, 1558
Expropriation, Dominion water-powers, 2518
Housing scheme, 2548
Militia, Permanent Force, 3981
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Naturalization, 4271
Nova Scotia Highways Board, 4435
Patronage, 1272
Pensions, 4280
War expenditure ($350,000,000), shipping and trade, 2234

Cables, 1052, 2794
State control of, 1827

Cadet Corps. *See* Militia

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Air Board Bill, 2051-3
Bank mergers, 1095
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Canadian Government Railways, 2458, 2460
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1405, 1414, 1421
Annual meeting, 1799
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Capital stock, 1777
Directors, 1627, 1639, 1799
Extension of time for construction of lines, 1717, 1770-6
First meeting, 1659, 1664-5
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Parliamentary control, 2119
Political influence, 1633
Profit sharing with employees, 1622
Publicity, 1644
Public ownership, 1770, 2219
Civil Service, 2913
Cold storage, 2984-5
Combines, 4568
Cost of living, 4332
Dominion water-powers, 2513, 2516
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Experimental farms, 2976-8
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1574, 1585
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2889, 2893
Foreign trade, credits to other countries, 2167, 2834-6
Gold, prohibition of export of, 1102-3

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Good roads, 3907, 3912, 4411, 4429
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 399, 666, 1127, 1130-1, 1157
Hanna, Alta., removal of engine crew to, 671, 1407
Housing scheme, 2538-40, 2561, 2564
Immigration and Colonization Department, work of, 2570, 2593-4
Advertising, 2597-9
Exodus of settlers, 2579
Free land as attraction for settlers, 2572-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570
Land speculation and, 2574
North Ontario as field for, 2574
Income tax
Farmers and, 3735
Publicity, 3718
Timber limits, 3721
Industrial unrest, 2908, 2953
Winnipeg strike, 2508, 2753
Lobster packing, 2989
Ottawa-Pembroke postal service, 2034
Packing companies, taxation, 4478
Parliament Building, 2336, 2340-1
Pensions, 4292
Railways, nationalization of, politics and, etc., 667-671
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2799-2800
Seed grain, 628, 1030
Shipbuilding, 4684
Steamship subsidies, 1293
Surveys, 4049-55
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 831
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3099-3104, 3115
Welland Canal contract, 1594-7

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 62. Victory—after-war problems, 63; demobilization, 64; employment—soldier settlement, 65; reconstruction and repatriation, 67; progressive legislation—returned soldiers, 68; United Canada party, 69; tariff, 70
Aliens. *See, under this head,* Immigration
Budget, the, 3337. Union Government—tariff, 3338; elections, 3339; tariff revision, 3340; gravity of pending questions, 3341
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines in Saskatchewan, 1766-7
Connor, Mr., Immigration agent, 2591-3
Dominion Elections Act, 4651, 4656-7
Exhibitions, 2600, 4682
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 767
Good roads, 787, 3917

Calder, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Immigration. *See also, under this head,* Immigration Act Amdt.; Immigration and Colonization Department
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Chinese, of, 1975, 2599
Dangerous and undesirable aliens, 759
Great Britain, from, 2594
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1875, 2570-1
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 2573-4
Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to, 2573, 2582
Policy
All Canada, for, 2585
Need for, 2577
United States, from, 2598
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 1206, 1866-83, 3175, 3211-3
Acts of violence, 2283
Conspiracy, ques. 1949
Deportees, 1978
Domicile, 1971, 2286
Enemy aliens, 1945
Espionage, 1948
Illiterates, 1954, 1960, 1964
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Officers, 1972
Psycopathic inferiority, 1945
Immigration and Colonization Department
Advertising, 2597-8
Agencies, 2569, 2586-94
Colonization work, 2570
Connor, Mr., agent, 2591-3
Deputy Minister
Extra work, payment for, 2441, 2442
Purposes and methods of, 1972, 2568, 2572, 2594, 2598
Land grants to Canadian Northern, 1873
Land prices in the West, 2579
Patriotic Fund, 3240, 3738
Public Health, 1199
Director General of, 2572
Quarantine, 4682
Retaining settlers, 2579, 2590
Technical education, res., vote $10,000,000, 3164-74
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Distribution of grants, 4136
Town planning, 767
United States head tax, 1111, 1942

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 3556. Public debt and natural resources, 3556; Manitoba's forests, fisheries and mines, 3558; Great War Veterans' scheme of mineral prospecting, 3560; development of resources by Government, 3561; Stefansson's proposition for development of the North, 3561; Mr. McMaster's amdt., 3564
Canadian National Railway, 1837
Lines, description of, 1838
Dominion Elections Act, 4647-8
Experimental farm, 2979
Good roads, 4409
Hudson Bay Railway, 4688
Judges' salaries, 2958
Land for soldiers—forest reserves, 3070-3
Naturalization, 4126
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, statistics, 2651-2
Titles, 2744

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 928; 2r., 1383, 1388; com., 1388; 3r 1619

Canada Food Board
Expenses, ques. 602, ques. 613
Fish, 121; ques. 2750
Licenses, ques. 602
Reports of Controller McFall, 4070, ques. 4464
Revenues, ques. 602

Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837

Canada Grain Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3940, 3949; 1r., 3966; 2r., com., 4073, 4380; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4662
Appeal Board, 4099
Surplus, 4073, 4380

Canada Medical Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3240

Canada Registration Act
Cost and result, ques. 728
Lamontagne, Miss., ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Operation, ques. 844
Pictou, registrar at, ques. 2144

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Pilotage and harbour masters. Res., 2802; 1r., 2808; 2r., com., 3157; 3r., 3162
2. Transfer of ships. Res., 3754; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 3928; 3r., 4002

Canada Trade Commission, 4493

Canada Year Book, 3839

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See* Council

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See also* Shipping
Rates of freight charged by, ques. 4241
Vessel for, ques. 3998

Canadian Mining Institute, 4492

Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905

Canadian National Railway Company Bill. Res., 1380, 1394; 1r., 1422; 2r., 1620; com., 1623, 1663, 1713, 1734, 1797; 3r., 2143. Amdt. (Mr. Fielding—Revenue and Audit Act to apply), 2102; neg. on div., 2130; amdt. (Mr. Copp—Intercolonial Railway), 2133, neg. 2137; amdt. (Mr. Lapointe, Kamouraska—labour representation), 2138, neg. on div., 2141
Clauses and discussions
Abandoned lines, 1708
Advances and securities, 1777
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Capital stock, 1647, 1776
Charters, schedule of, 1766
Closure, discussion under, 1797-1864
Constituent companies, 1694, 1784
Construction, extension of time for, 1709
Authority of Parliament necessary, 1779
Directors
Nomination of, 1623
Nomination of returned soldier, 1638
No personal responsibility, 1783
Payment of, 1623, 1653
Responsibility of, 1671
Term of office, 1646
Estimated expenditure, 4688
Executive Com., 1667
Finance, expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 2102
First meeting, 1657-64
Fiscal year, 1705
Freight rates, 2457
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Head office, 1648
Inquiries—Minister may provide for, 1782
Lines to be included, 1677, 1784
United States, in, 1693
Municipalities, consent of, 1782
Name, 1779
Orders in Council, powers under to construct, 1767
Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1694
Securities
Issue of, 1779
Other companies, of, 1781, 1861
Steamships, 1681-2
Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706

Canadian National Railway
Cap Rouge, repairs, 2460
Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
Coal, ques. 611, ques. 1211, ques. 1906, res. for papers 2906, ques. 4377
Construction and betterments, 30, 4614
Directors, ques. 612
Employees (Canadian Northern) for, ques. 846
Government Railways
Construction and betterments, 3190
Expenditure proposed in year 1920-21, 3190
Locomotives, 1212
Halifax terminals, ques. 2398
Intercolonial. *See that title*
Labour troubles, reported, 1617
Lands at Fort William, Canadian Northern, ques. 883
Legal expenses paid
Bureau and Bigué, to, ques. 2047
Tachereau, Roy, Cannon & Parent, to, ques. 2047
Locomotives, ques. 1212
Managers, ques. 748
Mileage, rolling stock and equipment, finance, value, etc.—answers to questions by Leader of Opposition, 1610
Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
National Transcontinental. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bill
Accidents, ques. 1211
Business during 1918, ques. 3065
Damage claims, ques. 616
Government use of line, Winnipeg, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, ques. 2398
Station operations and receipts, ques. 1211
Officials, transfer from Moncton, ques. 748
Patronage, abolition of, 1624
Prince Edward Island Railway
Coal purchase, ques. 4377
Gauge, broadening of, 460
Quebec and Cochrane line, 2456
Quebec bridge, ques. 977
Toronto building occupied by, ques. 612
West, in, 424

Canadian Northern Railway
Arbitration, ques. 2045, ques. 2145
Bonds, ques. 4241
Common stock, ques. 1214
Date of Government taking possession, ques. 1212
Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
Liabilities, ques. 1212
Net earnings, 1918, ques. 2462
New Westminster, 423
Port Mann, ques. 979
Securities, ques. 1214

Canadian Official Record. *See* Public Information

Canadian Patriotic Fund, 1164

Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill. 1r., 3240; 2r., com., 3738; 3r., 3740

Canadian Press News Service, 4482

Canadian Red Cross Society, 2874

Canadian Red Cross Society Incorporation Bill. 1r., 3004; 2r., com., 3162; 3r., 3164

Canals
Appointments on, 3175
Chambly, ques. 2045
Trent, returned soldiers, ques. 3470
Wages, ques. 3586
Welland, lock tenders, ques. 604
Construction, 1592

Canned Goods. *See* Weights and Measures; Meat and Canned Foods

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 264. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—military service defaulters, 264; Canada's war record, comparison of provinces—national unity—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 265; German fleet—Canadian Navy—Canada a nation, 266; the Press—reconstruction, 267; party government—Union Government, 268; legislation by Order in Council—provincial rights, 269; franchise, 270
Bankruptcy Bill—Provinces and, 2008
Blondin, Hon. P. E., Postmaster General, 2042
Budget, the, 3413. Hon. Mr. Calder and Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3414; Peace Conference, 3415; public finance, 3416; industrial unrest, 3417; development of the Cabinet as an institution, 3419
Canadian National Railway
Lines in United States, 1693
Lines to be included, 1686
National Transcontinental, damage claims, ques. 616
Parliamentary control, 1670-1
Pesident's salary, 1659
Canadian soldiers in Ireland, ques. 849
Divorce Court Bill, 3789
Dominion parks, 2302
Expropriation for, 2304
Dorchester county
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849
German merchant fleet, 1289
Good roads, 4418
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Illiterates, 1954
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Kent House site, ques. 976
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2042
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1323

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1323
Pensions, 2692
Pomeroy, Major A. L., ques. 2657
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Public health, jurisdiction, 1199
Quebec Harbour Commission, ques. 601
Railway Act—"avocats," 2632
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2695
Technical education, 3795, 3805-7
Titles, 2727
War Expenditure Bill, "any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244

Canso
Censorship, ques. 847
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour Master, 3158

Capilano Bridge, 2790

Capital and Labour. *See* Industrial Unrest

Capital Punishment, 1957

Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727

Carter, Mr. T. J., Solicitor, Public Works Department, 1270, 1274

Carvell, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 41. Reconstruction, 41; Bolshevism—Government expenditure, 42; shipping—unemployment — highways, 43; Department of Public Works, 44; housing, 45; branch railways—demands upon the Government, 46; local public works, 47; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—income and other taxes, 48; wanted, $100,000,000 a year, 49; immigration—duty of private employers, 50
Aerial service and works, 1265
Cables, 2794
Canadian National Railway, position of Intercolonial, 2135
Daylight Saving, 91
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4647-59
Dry docks, 2360, 4307
French River waterway, 1080
Harbours and rivers, 4613
Highways Aid Bill, 740-3, 4405
Hospitals, 1264
Hydroplane stations, 1263, 1274
La Prairie dyke road, 4059
Militia pensions, 2756
Ottawa City, arrangement with, 2495-2500, 4380-5
Ottawa highways, 2791-2
Parliament buildings, 2331-41, 4621
Provincial voters' lists, 2446
Public buildings, 4610-2
Public works, explanations in Committee, 2359-94, 2780-97

Carvell, Hon. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Demands on Government for, 46, 2792
Department—staff, salaries, etc., 1262, 1266-70
Railway Act Consolidation—transmission lines on highways, hydro-electric, 3097, 3106-8, 3112, 3117, 3120
St. John Harbour, 2359, 4301-6, 4337-8
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2800
St. Charles River works, 1297
Seignorial rights, 2787
Slides and booms, 4607
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 828
Telegraphs and telephones, 2793-6, 4608
Tender and contract, 1263
Titles, 2737
War structures and works, 1263
Wireless, 2794-5

Casgrain, Mr. P. F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 3427. Complaint of governmental delay, 3427; prices, 3429; patronage, 3430; wealthy ministers, 3431; extravagant expenditure, 3432; taxes, 3433; Government and the Press, 3434; "Produce and save," 3435
Canadian National Railway, 1835
Branch lines, 1693
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Intercolonial, ques. 750
Quebec and Saguenay Railway
Baie St. Paul, branch, 2449
Flag stations, 1690
Transcontinental, accidents, ques. 1211
Capital punishment, commutation, 753
Compassionate allowance, case for, 3175
Debates, printing of, 424
Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-noir"), ques. 750
Dominion Bills, issues of, ques. 616
Experimental farms, ques. 1077
Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619
Government printing, ques. 844
Isle aux Coudres, 2609
Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608
Newsprint inquiry, ques. 752
Pilots, 2613
Prohibition, 2358
Steamers
Cold storage on, ques. 882
"Champlain," ques. 616, 2606, 2614
War, correspondence concerning, motion dropped, 753
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946
Winnipeg strike, 2508

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Highways, 787, 789, 790
Weights and measures, 2153
"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1383-8
Cavell, Edith, monument to, 2447
Censorship, 226, 295, 1110
Cable, ques. 847
Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Literature, forbidden, case of J. H. Lewis, 270
Removal of, 135
Chambly Canal highway, ques. 2045
Champlain Market wharves, ques. 1438
Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Prohibition, 2349
Charges of Management, 4475
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, 4464
Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Daylight Saving, 913
Chartered Banks, Excess Circulation Bill. *See* Finance Act
Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Prohibition, 2663
Child Welfare. *See* Public health
Children, medicines for. *See* Proprietary
Chinese in Canada. *See* Asiatics; Immigration
Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Amherst internment camp, 4070
Buoy picked up, 2607
Cheticamp and Grand Etang, port physician, 2614
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Inverness Railway, 4614
Mail contracts, 2082
Port Hood wharf, 2782
Steamship services
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1302, 3828
Hendrie & Co., 3830
Sick Mariners' Fund and fishermen, 2615
Circulation and Reserve, ques. 614, 637. *See also* Finance Act
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. *For Departments, see their titles*
Appointments, ques. 2049
Temporary, 279
Commission, 85, 293, 404, 1498
Appointments by, 161-6, 260, 963, 3230
Charges against
Chief clerk of files, 163, 286
Fruit inspector, 161, 282
Immigration and Colonization publicity agent, 279
Schools, preparatory for Civil Service, 164, 288

Civil Service—*Con.*
Charges against—*Con.*
Superintendent of penitentiaries, 162, 283
Theft of examination papers, 164, 289
Toronto Customs hardware appraiser, 161, 278
Toronto deputy postmaster, 161, 276
Examinations and examination papers, 162, 164, 282-4, 287, ques. 750
Printing Bureau appointments placed under, 1812
Returned soldier suggested as member of, 996
Salaries, 4495
Secretary, 165, 289, 292
Disadvantages of, 962, 4477
Double salaries, 1902
Examination, 985, 987, 990, 998. *See also this title under* Commission, *above*
Income tax, 3497. *See also* Ottawa Improvement
Pensions, on, 3713
Inside, efficiency of—Special Committee of Inquiry into
Appointment, 1554, 1709
Reports, 2652, 3004, 3376, 3420, 4133, 4534
Insurance, report tabled, 138
List, tabled, 398
Murray, Sir George, report of, 2113, 2920
No minister of, 1559-60
Outside
Delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Dissatisfaction amongst, 404
Salary increases, 945-6
Overmanning of, 4605, 4670
Overseas men
Civil and military pay, 2925
Promotions, ques. 729
Patronage in, 58, 498, 1267, 1271, 3234
Postal employees' salaries, 1794
Postmasters at sub-stations, 404
Post Office appointments after strike, 4345
Promotions, 983
Reclassification, ques. 610, 956, 1267, 2292, 3827. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Arthur Young & Co., 2911
Coms. of Civil Service Commission engaged in, ques. 617
Postal workers, correspondence, 2342
Report asked for, 1960
Report of, 3519
Returned soldiers, and, 291, 962
Wounded men and; motion Mr. McCurdy, 981; amdt., Mr. Morphy, 997; withdrawn, 1002
Salaries, 86, 1559
$2,500 and over, ques. 1439
Specialists, appointment of, 983, 989, 1182
Strikes

Civil Service—*Con.*
Appointments after, confirmation of, 3809
Superannuation, 1266-9, 4476
Report tabled, 138
Special com. report, 4133
Transferring officials, 278
Vacancies, advertising of, 2049
War bonus, 1, 955, 4687
Mail carriers, ques. 848
Vote of $2,500,000, 2824
Women in, ques. 2751

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2909; 1r., 3293

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Militia and Defence)
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2764
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1014

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 231. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 231; victory and peace, 232; conscription—Liberal party, 233; tariff, reciprocity, free trade, 235; reconstruction, 236; markets and their effect on trade, 238; taxation, cost of living—farmers' movement, 239; income tax—British Corn Laws, 240; free wheat—competition, 241
Board of Commerce, 4467
Budget, the, 3378. Political independence, 3378; bureaucracy, 3380; lowering tariff—Messrs. Calder and Crerar, 3381; reconstruction, 3382; tariff proposals, 3383; prices and tariff, 3384; Britain under free trade, 3386; revenue raising methods—tax-free bonds, 3387; industrial unrest, 3388; Canada a bond of nations, 3390
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3932-4
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1729
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2118
Public ownership, 2118
Civil Service, deputy ministers, payments to, 1591, 2442
Daylight Saving
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342
Railroad time, 1453
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Grain trade, operation of elevators, 4089
Highways, 787, 3914, 3919, 3924, 4387, 4401, 4411, 4416
Provincial jurisdiction, 3901
Housing scheme, 2541, 2548

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 2596
Prohibition of certain classes, 1918
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1317, 1339
Militia, permanent force, 3974
Naturalization, 4122-3
National harbours, control of, 3745
Pensions, 5203-4
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4288
Ploughs, duty on, 3690-6, 3701, 3704
Post Office appointments after strike, 4348
Prohibition, 2657, 2664, 2679
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Public health, social welfare, 1138-40
Purchasing Commission, 3203, 3815, 4454, 4620
Scientific research, 4462
Shipbuilding, 2217-9, 2253-4, 2257
Soldiers' land settlement, 3866
Tariff
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 813
Explanation of vote, 3749
Titles, 1467, 2712, 2746

Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066

Clements, Mr. Herbert S. (Comox-Alberni)
Alien enemies and treatment of soldiers, motion, 753
Mounted Police, 761
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Naturalization papers, 754
Technical education, 756

Closure
Canadian National Railway. Notice, 1789; discussion, 1797
Interpretation of rule, 1796, 1799

Coal
Canadian National Railway, ques. 1906
Lignite, briquetting of, 3472
Railway contracts for, 1909
Railway rates, and. *See* Budget
St. Lawrence route, ques. 3471, 4335
Supply, 174

Coal Tar derivatives. *See* Proprietary

Coasting Trade
Railway Commission control. *See also* Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Bill to provide, 71
United States, with, 1110, 1209, 1260

Cochrane, Hon. Francis, Senate request his attendance at Hudson Bay Com., 2511

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 124. Peace and victory, 125; Bolshevism—capital and labour, 127, 130; His Majesty the King, 128; income tax, 130; tariff, 131; Peace Conference, presence of the Prime Minister, 132
Agricultural implements, duties, etc., 3072, 3099
Ploughs, 3691
Bankruptcy Bill, 1990, 1994, 1999, 2003, 2475
Budget, the, 3349. Industrial unrest—Peace Treaty, 3349; Russia, 3351; trade conditions and tariff, 3353; tariff investigation commission, 3359; coal duties and freight rates, 3361; dumping, 3362
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1850
Freight rates and tariff duties, 3700
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership—nationalization; railways extending into United States, etc., 687
Illiterates, immigration of, 1965
Income tax, 3737
Materials for manufacture, purchase of in Canada, 3699, 3702
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart and others, 1531
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1329
Militia, permanent force, 1899, 3973
Passports, 1052
Pensions, 4031
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3087
Railway rates, Commission control, 4146
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 999
Shipbuilding, 2257
Titles, 1469, 2723, 2739, 2746-8

Cold Storage, 2062
Taxation of companies, ques. 2904
Transportation, 2980
Warehouses, 2982
Food in, destruction of, ques. 2906
Montreal, proposed building, 1619, 2062

Collective Bargaining, 3908. *See also* Industrial unrest

Collins, Mr., case under Military Service Act, 1326

Combines and Fair Prices Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., com., 4567, 4588; 3r., 4601. *See also* Board of Commerce

Commercial Cable Company, property at Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046

Commissions, return of number of, ques. 646

Connaught Rifle Range, 1894-8

Conner, Mr., Immigration agent, 2590

Conscientious Objectors. *See* Military Service

Conscription, 233, 346, 489, 496, 510. *See also* Military Service Act

Conservation, Commission of, report tabled, 312

Consular Officers, payment to, 1900

Contract by Tender vs. Force contracts, 1606

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 336. General Currie — St. Julien, 337; Cambrai, Mons, 337; Canada's war record, decorations won—proposed grant to Sir Arthur Currie, 339; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 339, 340; scholarships as war memorials, 340; national defence service—women in Government service—aliens and fishing licenses—public works to give employment, 341; immigration—war service gratuity and clothing allowance, 342; war service button—land settlement — pensions — prohibition — taxes —vocational training, 343; party government, 344
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3822
Daylight Saving, 887
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Pensions, 4175, 4201
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3868-9
Women in Civil Service, 2751

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Air Board Bill, 2051-6
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004, 2007
Canada Food Board, ques. 613
Canadian National Railway
Coal purchases, ques. 1906
Directors, ques. 612
Appointment—politics and patronage, 1639
Intercolonial Railway
Lines to be included, 1677
Managers, ques. 948
Moncton, transfer of officials from, ques. 948
Operation, 4615-8
Position of in C.N.R., amdt., 2131-7
Pugwash spur, 3067
Steamships, P.E.I., ferry, 1690
Toronto, buildings in, occupied by, 612
Demobilization, men in garrison at St. John, 3236-7
Divorce Court Bill, 3784
Economy in expenditure, 4053
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2464
Fisheries
Lobsters, 714-24, 2902
Oysters, 2897
Petitcodiac River, fishway in, 2898

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4
Franchise, 4635
Government employees' compensation, 705-6
Housing scheme, 2560-1
Immigration agents, 2588
Indians, 4061
Judges' salaries, 4371
Lighthouse keepers, 2609
Migratory birds, 4604
Napadogan, ice at, ques. 972
Naval Service, 2241
Newcastle wireless station, 2849
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4299
Commissioners' salaries, 2452
Proprietary medicines, 2486-7
Public Health, Director General, 2572
Purchasing Commission, 3237
Sackville public building, 4612
St. John harbour, 4300, 4305
Steamship services, freight rates, 1285
Steamships, management of, 4685-6
Technical education, 4136
Payment to provinces by population, 3893
Tinplate, 4447

Cost of Living. *See* High Cost

Costa Rica, message in celebration of peace, 2

Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," 2808

Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566

Coteau Landing, highway, ques. 2045

Cottonseed Meal, 2446

Council of Agriculture, 578
Platform, 531
Policy and representatives, 556
Wood, Mr. H. W., 556, 566, 586

Courts Martial. *See* War, Naval Service, Military Service Act

Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 168. Liberal Party, 168; Peace Conference, presence of Prime Minister, 168; Union Government—co-operation in the work of government, 170; medical men and patronage—housing, 171; tariff, 172; railways—Mounted Police, 173; coal supply—Health Department, 174; industrial unrest, 175
Budget, 3474. Tariff and reciprocity, 3474; Western problems, 3478; Hon. Mr. Crerar and wheat prices, 3479; tariff and prices, 3480; manufacturers' action under protection, 3481; implement prices, 3483; Western Provinces and natural resources, 3484

Cowan, Mr. Walter D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1840
Cold storage warehouses, 2983-4
Daylight Saving, 898
Housing scheme, 2538-40
Immigration, 2576
Package goods, net weight, 2153
Postmasters and inspectors, 2031-3
Proprietary medicines, 2482-3
Public health, 1197
Red Cross Society, 3168
Rentals paid by Government, 2505
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2319
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2774-5
Water-powers, 4049
Wheat, drought resisting, 2972

Credits, foreign. *See* Trade

***Crerar, Hon. T. A.** (Minister of Agriculture)
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2963
Budget, the, 3328. Resignation from the Government, 3329; tariff and national development, 3330; prices, 3332; tax proposals, 3336
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3953, 3961-4
Cattle, number in Canada, 2997
Co-operation, federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, 2966
Cold storage
Transportation, 2981
Warehouses, 2982-8
Dairy products and the war, 2967
Daylight saving, 926
Experimental farms, 2965, 2976-80
Fairs, 2996-7
Flax, 1550
Grain trade—elevators, 4073, 4082
Health of animals, 2988
International Institute, 2992
Livestock Act Amdt. Bill, 1570, 2061-7
Livestock, pure bred, 2992
Meat and Canned Goods Act, 2989
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pests, 2979-80
Publications, 2990
Resignation from Government, 3193, 3329
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 820
Wheat
Drought resisting, 2972
Local mills and, 2974
Market for, 2999-3000
Wheeler, Mr. S., experiments of, 2972-3
Yukon, wheat growing in, 2974

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Fire prevention. 1r., 1382; 2r., 1573; com., 1574; 3r., 1619
2. Sexual offences. 1r., 1710; 2r., com., 2159; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 4634, 4689

Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
3. Excessive punishment. 1r., 2851
4. Unlawful associations, etc. 1r., 4134; 2r., com., 4355; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4660
Unlawful associations, 4355; concealed weapons, 4356; bribing peace officers, 4361; venereal disease, 4362; indictable offences, corporations, 4363; election by prisoners, 4363; challenging jurors, 4363

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Immigration Act. Amdt., 1876
Alien enemies, 1948
Illiterates, 1953, 1961, 1968
Prohibited classes, amdt., 1969, 2280; withdrawn, 2283
Imperial Conference, 1919, 1948
Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4296
Prohibition, 2349, 2655; amdt., 2656-7, 2688
Research, scientific, 4457
National Research Institute, 1565
Seed grain, 1031

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (West Elgin)
Militia pensions, 2755
Resignation as Minister of Labour, 129

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Capilano Bridge, 2790
Chinese and Japanese immigration, 1976
Daylight Saving, 920

Cruelty to Animals, 2603

Currency Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 637; 1r., 639; 2r., com., 1044; 3r, 1111

Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur, 336, 370, 500
Currie, Col. John A. and, 545, 547
Proclamations by, ques. 607
Proposed grant and testimonial, 339, 548

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 545, 551. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — personal reference, war record, second battle of Ypres, 545; Canada's soldiers deserving of the nation's thanks — returned soldiers, 548; tribute to dead soldiers—Col. Baker, Col. Sharpe, 549; Rhyl riots, 550; tariff—economic war, 551; free wheat, 552; manufacturers and exports, 553; demobilization — soldiers' land settlement, 554; manufacturers' earnings—class hatred, 555; Canadian Council of Agriculture, 556; income tax—industries and resources of the several provinces, 559; proposals of action—elevators, ships, factories, 564;

*Resigned as Minister of Agriculture June 4; p. 3194

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Conservative party, 566; Mr. Wood, President, United Farmers of Alberta, 556, 566
Franchise, 4642-3
Pensions, 4197
Railway Commission and freight rates, 4145
Shipbuilding, 2219
Siberian Expedition, ques. 1440

Customs and Inland Revenue
Department
Commissionership of, 3927, 4380
Messrs. H. C. Blair, Bryson Macdougald, John Ridley, ques. 2398
Preventive service, 965
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Salaries, 954
Duty, rebates of, ques. 646

Customs Tariff Act Amdt. *See* Revenue Bills

Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, 1789

Dairying Industry, development of, 2980

Dams, Government, 2796

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 224. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 224; bi-lingualism, 225; women's franchise—censorship—Orders in Council, 226; Siberian expedition—Military Service Act defaulters, 227; franchise, War-time Elections Act—Union Government—national unity, 228
Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107
Budget, 3450. War and conscription, 3450; election law, 3451; Siberian expedition—French-Canadians in the war, 3452; Guelph Novitiate, 3453; Hon. Mr. Crerar and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3454; tariff, 3455
Enlistments, May-December, 1917, ques. 609
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 609
Intercolonial, express parcels, ques. 2047
Keddy, Dr. O. B., ques. 2797
Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135
Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612
Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295
Military Service Act, ques. 1306, 1332
Militia, permanent force, 3977
Naval Service recruiting, ques. 747
Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213
Thompson, Lieut.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Dansereau, Mr. Lionel, 357

Davidson, Mr. Avard Longley (Digby and Annapolis)
Canadian National Railway, legal expenses, ques. 2047
Good roads, 3913-25, 4387, 4390, 4394, 4430, 4433
Point of order: discussion of motion standing on Order Paper not permissible—upheld, 190

Davis, Mr. Fred Langdon (Neepawa)
Board of Commerce, 4518
Budget, 3631. Greater revenues needed, 3631; excise and land taxes, 3632; tariff revision, 3633; farm labour shortage, 3634
Civil Service, com. on efficiency, 1517
Fire prevention, 1577-8
Immigration, restriction of, 1938
Livestock, pure bred, 2993
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Naturalization, 4130
Ruthenians, 1938

Daylight Saving, 456, 505, 1074, 1208, 1383, ques. 3242
Ethier, Mr., vote of, 1482
Government's policy, 647, 970
Health and, 912, 915
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Point of order (Mr. Denis) as to hour of sitting, 1432
Railway time, 929, 1433
Special motion to take up order, 886
Res. (Mr. Cooper), 887; amdt. (Mr. McCoig), 892; point of order (Mr. Guthrie), 903; amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Mackie, Edmonton), 910; div. 928

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Déchène, Mr. Aimé Miville (Montmagny)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 87. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. 87; soldiers' settlement, 88; immigration—commissions, 90; foreign trade 91; war indemnity—pensions, 92; taxation — thrift, 92; tariff — public health, 94; returned soldiers, 95
Canadian National Railway, 2129
Dominion Police, ques. 2047, ques. 2144
St. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464
Spirituous liquors, entered at Quebec, 1533

Deep Brook post office, ques. 751

Defaulters. *See* Military Service Act

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon (Portneuf)
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534
Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534
"Hochelaga," steamship, ques. 606
Life-saving stations, ques. 606

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon—*Con.*
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Seymour Narrows batteries, ques. 975
"Stadacona," steamer, ques. 880
Trawlers, ques. 746

Demobilization. *See* War

Demers, Mr. Marie Joseph (St. Johns and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 344. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—reconstruction—franchise, War-time Elections Act, 344; aliens—independence of judges, 341; conscription—defaulters, 346; Canadian autonomy, 347
Conscriptions, number of, ques. 972

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 446. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadians and national unity, 447; Quebec province and the "Black Robes," 448; the Orange Sentinel and national unity, 449; war indemnity, 450; Canada's sacrifice in war—Military Service Act, defaulters, 451; tariff and the Liberal party, 452; Liberals and Unionists, 453
Business of the House, pending legislation, 3420
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1390
Daylight saving, point of order as to time of meeting of House, 1432
Franchise, 3420
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 692
Parliament Buildings fire, 725
Pensions, 4181, 4185

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Amendments
Changing character of Bill, 1745
Procedure in, 1198, 1204
Committee, in
Reading of clauses by Chairman, 2001
Motion to refer back, 4064
Preamble read and postponed, 1623
Principle not to be discussed in Committee, 1929, 2053
Reconsideration of clause only by unanimous consent, 2929
Schedule, order of, 1725
Taxation measures originating in Senate, 2490
Chair to be addressd, 2538
Closing of debate, 3207
Closure, 1799

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Committee, limitations of debate in, 1034-5, 2508
Committees appointable by the House, not by Committee, 1639
Conversations in Chamber, 4200
Interruptions, 1174, 2869
Language
Not disorderly except as applied to members, 1930
Objected to
Bolshevists—"Your friends," 1068
"Wilfully leading the House into error," 1854
Leader of the House, announcements by, 1566
Motion and amdt. debatable together, 2725, 2728
Motions not debatable
That Committee rise, 1583, 3816
To report a Bill, 4017
No motion before the House, 1566
Opportunity for discussion under the rules, 2760
Order and "Privilege," 2840
Past debate, 1608, 2885, 4588
Quorum, 397, 2361
Relevancy, 1175, 1273, 1631, 1746, 2068, 2480, 2661, 2977, 3734, 3813, 3984, 3986, 4480
Nickel, 3684, 3689
Orders in Council, 4487
Ottawa agreement, 4384-5
Pensions, 4257
Vancouver harbour, 3752-3
Repetitions, 3978
Resolution standing on Order Paper, debate not permissible, 190
Senate debates, reference to, 3278
Statement of member to be accepted, 1607
Taxes cannot be increased by Committee, 2487

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Batiscan, works, ques. 645
Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques, 1790
Enlistment of certain soldiers, ques. 3067

Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-Noir"), ques. 750

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 353. Profiteers—returned soldiers, 353; immigration—Bolshevism—Siberian expedition, 354
Budget, 3531. Social unrest, 3532, 3535; unsatisfactory answers to question,

Deslaurier, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
3533; cost of living, 3534; soldiers and liquor, 3536; Military Service Act, defaulters, 3537
"Canada," C.G.S., ques. 745
Canadian National Railway, locomotives, ques. 1212
Daylight Saving, 3242
Halifax disaster, ques. 879
Hull armoury, ques. 1215
Labour Union convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Luxuries, taxes on, ques. 749
Montreal, port of, labour, ques. 3997
Montreal strike, 1482, 1615
National Service Registration, accounts, ques. 2296, ques. 2565
Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonization, ques. 748
Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958
Salvarsan, ques. 2144
Strikes in Canada, ques. 1792, ques. 2143
Transcontinental Railway
Business during 1918, ques. 3064
Stations, ques. 1211
Weights and measures, inspectors, ques. 2296

Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534

Destructive Insects and Pests, 111, 2979

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Budget, 3343. Pending questions and government, 3343; Canada's tariff history, 3344; waste, 3345; increased production, 3347
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1722-4
Directors
Salaries, 1623
Term of office, 1797
Head office, 1665
Patronage, 1625
Civil Service war bonus, 2919
Arthur Young & Co., 2920
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2163
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 877
French River waterway, 1086
Influenza, cure of, 1175
Judges' salaries, 2957
Loans, public, 4198
Military Service Act, administration in Wright county, 2399-2402
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1254
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Tariff, 824
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Dickson, Mr., contractor, 1376

Divisions
Budget, 3678
Canadian National Railway
Finance, 2130
Labour representation, 2141
Third reading, 2142
Cost of Living, 4334
Daylight Saving, 928
Divorce Court Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1619
Intoxicating liquors, 4072
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4336
Permanent force, 4002
Purchasing Commission, 3226
Railway Act
Power clause, 4165
Telephone clause, 4169
Tariff, 841
Titles, 1481, 2748

Divorce
Fees, remission of, number of divorces, 2779
Jurisdiction of Provincial Courts, 1438, 2779, 4535

Divorce Court Bill. 1r., 1662; 2r., 3761; motion (Mr. Fripp), six-months hoist, 3777; neg. on div., 3781; com., 3783

Dogfish, ques. 979

Dominion Bills, issues, ques. 616. *See* Currency

Dominion Coal Company, demand for ships, 2406

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4533; res., 4534, 4621; 2r., 4622, 4635; com., 4646; 3r., 4659

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt. Bills
1. Bill No. 79. 1r., 1789; 2r., com., 2297; 3r., 3344
2. Bill No. 125 (Land for soldiers). 1r., 2953; 2r., com., 3070; 3r., 3073

Dominion Iron and Steel and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal companies
No amalgamation, 2342
Steel rails, 2251

Dominion Lands
Orders in Council tabled, 185
Provincial taxation of, 709

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Rates of interest). Res., 1111, 1112; 1r., 4063; 2r., com., 4251; 3r., 4254

Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 72; 2r., com., 930; 3r., 1029

Dominion Parks, expenditure, 4046

Dominion Police, 2925, 4670
Bourdon, Henri, ques. 1440
Men employed, ques. 2047
Special force, ques. 2144
Suspensions, ques. 1440

Dominion Power Board, 4028

Dominion Revenue and Expenditure, ques. 1217

Dominion Steamers, 2600. *See* Vessels

Dominion Water Powers Bill. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 2512; 3r., 2576
Application, 2512
Bond issues, 2526
Director of water-power, 2523
Private lands, expropriation, etc., 2517, 2524
Surveys, 2522
Title in Crown, 2516

Dorchester
Customs receipts, ques. 882
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Post offices and mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849

Dorval, buildings, ques. 610

Douglas, Mr. James McCrie (Strathcona)
Board of Commerce, 4505
Canadian National Railway, branch lines in the West, 1771-3
Postal employees' war bonus, 2928
Returned soldiers
Civil re-establishment, 2764-7
Civil Service positions for, 1000
Telegraphs, North country, 2795

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Petit de Grat—Mulgrave service, 1303

Doukhobors, 2043

Draftees. *See* Military Service Act

Drainage. *See* Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M., ques. 3999

Drugs. *See* Proprietary

Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447

Drummond, Mr. Huntley, Commissionership of Canada, ques. 3242

Dryden, Mr. Michael, appointment, 287

Dry Docks, 2360

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 4306; 1r., 2r., com., 4307; 3r., 4337

Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 116. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadian Liberals—peace and victory, 116; United States' part in the war, 117; demobilization—franchise, 118; resignation of Mr. McCurdy, 119; reconstruction, 120; fish prices, 121; Canada Registration Act—Peace Conference, 122; shipbuilding—coal miners, 123; ideals in public life, 124
Aliens, naturalization, ques. 616
Amherst Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Blair, Mr. H. C. and MacDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398
Buoys, Magdalen Islands, 1866
Canada Registration Act, ques. 978
Canada Shipping Act. Amdt., 3929-34
"Canada," steamer, coal, ques. 1340
Customs and Inland Revenue salaries, 961
Dennis building, Halifax, ques. 972
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9
Fish, Canadian, alleged accumulation in Great Britain, 3328
Fish, compulsory inspection, 949-951
Fisheries, British Columbia, 935, 3759
Fort George postmistress, ques. 602
Halifax harbour master, 2694
"Hochelaga," steamer, dismissals from, ques. 1340
Immigration Department, appointments, 2592-4
Immigration, discharged seamen, 1980
Liquor on patrol vessels, ques. 1340
"Lottie Russell," steamer, ques. 746
Lunenburg harbour, 2607
Marine hospitals, salaries, 2613-4
Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610
Military Service Act, ques. 749
Naval Service
Administration of, 2176
Boys in, ques. 607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 606
Canadian vessels in action, ques. 607
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Efficiency—conduct in war, 2821, 2840
Pay, increase of, ques. 607, ques. 746
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615
Prize money, ques. 607
Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616
Trawler "T-30"
Men sentenced, 3472
Repairs, ques. 2397
Newfoundland steamship service, 3829
Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Pilotage, 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2483
Public Information Department, ques. 750
Pugwash brickyard railway spur, ques. 4239

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Shipbuilding, 2252, 2262
Steamship services
Britain, 1282
Clipper ships, 1288
Jamaica, 1284
Steel plate, price of, 2252, 2262
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534, ques. 1905
Victory Loan, cost of, ques. 1918, 2798
Wireless operators, separation allowance, ques. 1905
Woodbury, Harry, and Military Service Act, ques. 2048
Wrecking plants, 2605

Duff, Mr. Justice, allowance for Imperial Privy Council, 4687

Dunkirk, base commandant at, report of, ques. 1216

Du Tremblay, Mr. Pamphile Réal (Laurier-Outremont)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 149. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's war record, 149; French Canadian Brigade—industrial unrest—public expenditure, 150; business situation—tariff, 151; development, use of natural resources, 152; soldiers' settlement—labour problems—trade relations with the United States, 153; Victory Loan—war indemnity and public debt, 154; national unity, 155
Daylight Saving, 910
Public health, provincial rights, 1367
Seed grain, 1032, 1041
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 773

Ecum Secum wharf, 2780

Edmonton Bridge, 2790

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208

Education. *See also* Schools; Technical; Vocational
Land for school purposes, ques. 848
Mennonite schools, 2571
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Quebec, schools in, 2914

Edward VII, His late Majesty, monument to, 2797

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 254. New Opposition leader, 254; Liberal party, record of leading Liberals, 255; franchise—Peace Conference, attendance of the Prime Minister, 256; repatriation in Quebec—war activities of various parts of Canada, 257; enlistment figures by provinces, 258; tariff, free trade record of Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and others, 259; Civil Service appointments by the Commission, 260; Union Government—tariff—defaulters and slackers, 263

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, duties, 3704-5
Bank mergers, 1097
Barriefield, militia buildings, 3985
Board of Commerce, 4552, 4555
Budget, 3435. Reply to Mr. Casgrain, 3435; reply to Mr. McMaster, reciprocity, 3437; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3438; protection and agricultural prosperity—profits and prices, 3440; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices, 3442, 3638; tariff, 3444; Union Government, 3449
Calvin residence, Kingston, ques. 3377
Civil Service
Commission, 260, 2916
Examinations, 4490
Salaries, increases, 2915, 4480
Conscientious objectors, 1929
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2161
Daylight Saving, 913
Education
Bi-lingualism in schools, 241
National non-sectarian schools, 2403
Technical, 2897-9
Eight-hour day, 914
Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749
Feldspar, 3693
Finance Department, vacancies, ques. 847
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment of, 850, 877, 1102
Good roads, 792, 3903, 3917-9, 3924, 4398, 4430
Immigration
Illiterates, 1965
Prohibition of certain classes, 1929
Income tax, judges, 3714
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 1898, 3985
Policy and system, 1888
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4298
Post Office
Mail contractors, 2085
Postmasters, 2085, 2927
Surplus, 2090
Privilege: statement of Ottawa "Journal," 1997
Prohibition, 2684
Return of Canadian soldiers, strikes delaying, 3741
Ross, Mr. P. D., 1997, 2915-7

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Royal Military College, clerk of works, ques. 4377
Titles, 2736
Correction, 3753

Electrical Measure. *See* Units

Electrical Development. *See* Canadian National Railway; Water power

Electric and Power Companies Bill. 1r., 4377; 2r., com., 4572; 3r., 4588

Elevators. *See* Grain

Electrocution Bill. 1r., 1957

Elkin, Mr. Stanley Edward (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Agricultural implement duties—rebates, 3702-3
Fire prevention, 1576
Gold taken into United States, 637

Embezzlement, Quebec officer charged with, 2294

Emigration
Belgium, from, ques. 1874
United States, to, ques. 2046

Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749

Employment Bureaux. *See* Unemployment

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 2450

Employment Works, 1597

Ethier, Mr. Joseph Arthur Calixte (Laval-Two Mountains)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 133, 141. Peace—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — reconstruction, 133; Military Service Act, defaulters, 134; censorship—public works—highways—returned soldiers, 135; Public Health Department—unemployment—Georgian Bay canal, 136; prohibition, 137, 138, 141; General Pau's visit, 137, 141; Bolsheviki, 141, 143; duties on implements and raw materials—Prime Minister at Peace Conference, 142; financial situation—Siberian expedition, 143
Vote on Daylight Saving, recording of, 1482

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 370. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—German - Canadian soldiers, 370; Canada's national status—Union Government and Bolshevism—Liberals and Unionists, 371; censorship—conscientious objectors, 372; reconstruction—financial situation—taxation, 373; succession tax—industrial unrest, 374; aliens, 375; discrimination in naturalization, 376

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Budget, 3589. Cost of living—industrial unrest, 3590; tariff and manufactures, 3591
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1727
Directors, 1805
Public ownership, 1750
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Eight-hour day, 2856
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1959
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1576, 1586
Grand Trunk Railway, obligations, 666
Immigration
Agents in United States, 2569-70
Exodus of settlers, 2580
Mennonites, 1927, 2570-1
Prohibition of certain classes, 1927
Ministers and Commons, motion, 1002
Naturalization, alien enemies, 4114-6, 4130, 4339
Prohibition, 2662
Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Power clause, 4163
Transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3086
Roumania, credit to, 1110
Steamship services, 1296
Welland Canal, collapse of walls, 1593

Ewart, Mr., Public Works Department, 2331

Excess Profits War Tax, 419, 430, 526, ques. 977

Exchange Rate, ques. 2145

Exchequer Court
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership and, 664
Land expropriation, Belanger vs. The King, 1021

Exhibitions, ques. 1215, 2600, 4682

Experimental Farms, 2976. *See also* Agriculture
Number and location, ques. 1077
Report tabled, 111

Exports. *See also* Trade
Feed, ques. 2048
Woollens, ques. 845

Expropriation of buildings by the Government, 2506

External Affairs Department, 4669

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Budget, 3522. Government by Order in Council, 3522; free speech—industry and finance, 3523; industrial unrest 3524; Military Service Act administration, 3525; minorities, 3526

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1421
Fertilizers, 2979
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 978
"Princess," steamer to replace, ques. 2797

Fairweather, Mr., Canadian Northern Railway arbitration, ques. 2145

Farm Help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958

Farm Life, good roads and, 789

Farm Loans. *See* Banks

Federal District, 4385

Federal Hotel, Ottawa, lease of, ques. 2045

Ferguson, Sir Charles, and Canadian soldiers, 469

Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1568; 1r., 1570; 2r., com., 2286, 2463; 3r., 2510

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens (Shelburne and Queen's)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 473. Latitude of Debate on Address—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—returned soldiers in Parliament, Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C.—financial situation, 473; absence from Parliament of Ministers, 474; Peace Conference, war indemnity, 475; Peace Congress organization, 476; Canada's place therein, 477; Bolsheviki, 479; Canada's national status—Imperialism and Imperialism, 480; manufacturers and the West, 482; Laurier Government and the tariff, 483; party government, 484; Tariff Commission, 485; personal position as a candidate in election, 486; Union Government, 487; Liberals and Unionists, 488; conscription—Dominion grants and provincial rights, 489; highways—public health—prohibition, 490; franchise, 492; War-time Elections Act—aliens—"The word of an Englishman," 493; a free Parliament—titles, 494
Bank mergers, 1093
Board of Commerce, 4498
Bridges, Dominion responsibility, 2789-92
Budget, 3664. Fiscal situation, 3664; Civil Service—salaries of Ministers—currency, 3666; tax-free bonds, 3667; tariff—reciprocity, 3668
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3931-7
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Closure, 2099
Directorate, 1628, 1633, 1653
Labour representative on, 2141
Returned soldier on, 1638

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Finance, 1698, 1702, 2098
Amdt., receipts and expenditures subject to Revenue and Audit Act, 2102
First meeting, 1666-7
Fiscal year, 1705-6
Head office, 1652
President's salary, 1657
Railway Act, application of, 1694
Supplies, purchase of, 3197
Canadian Press, news service, 4485
Chartered banks, excess circulation, 636
Civil Service, 2761
Extra work, deputy ministers, 2441
Overmanning of, 4671-2
Reclassification, 4488
Salaries, 964, 4476-7
Superannuation, 2761
Cost of Living Com., 4322
Daylight Saving, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3784
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572, 4584-6
Fees, payment of officials by, 2692
Fish, cost of, 2890
Fisheries Com., 2463
Good roads, 784, 786, 4432-3
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 708
Halifax
Dry dock, 1281
Harbour master, 2692
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3376, 3421
Housing scheme, 2537
Immigration Act Amdt., 1879
Illiterates, 1966
Income tax, 3720
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 4377
Judges' salaries and taxation, 2956, 4231-4, 4436-9
Lobster, canned, 725
Migratory birds, 2165-6
Militia pensions, 2754-7, 2761
Parliament buildings, 2339
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4178-83
Postage stamps used on cheques, 2031
Prohibition, 2349
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Soothing syrups, 2492
Provincial autonomy (technical education), 3169
Public health, 1374
Public works, Nova Scotia, 2783
Railway Act Consolidation
Senate amdts., 4156
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095-8
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2696

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Seed grain advances, 627
Steamship services
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
United States ports to, proposed, 1296
West Indies, 1288
Subsidies—steamship vs. railway, 1297
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 837
Taxation, not to be increased by Com.—point of order, 2487
Technical education, 3169, 3796
Telephone companies, 2647
Titles, 1478, 2740
War Expenditures ($3,500,000,000) Bill, "Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2242-5
Borrowing powers under, 2248

Finance. *See* Budget; Canadian National Railway; Highways; Technical Education; Loans
Canada's war expenditure, 14
Imperial Munitions Board, ques. 977
Loans, public, flotation cost, 211, 274, 290

Finance Act Bill. Res., 633; 1r., 644; 2r., com., 1103; res. referred to com., 1102; 3r., 1111

Finance, Department of
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Salaries, 4475
Vacancies, ques. 847

Finley, Mr. Albert Ernest (Souris)
Immigration of illiterates, 1952

Fire Prevention. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill (British Columbia licenses). Res., 933; 1r., 936; 2r., 2097; ref. to special com., 2098; com., 3757; 3r., 3761

Fish and Fisheries
Alleged accumulation of Canadian fish in Great Britain, 3328
Breeding establishments, 2899
British Columbia, 426
Canadian Fisheries Association, 2888
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fisheries Com., 114, 2463
Report tabled, 111
Fishways, 2898
Graft alleged, Major Burde's charges, 427
Inspection. *See also* Fish Inspection Act
Maritime Provinces, in, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Lobsters, 2894, 2899. *See also* Meat and Canned Goods Bill
Canned, 2902
Hatcheries, 2899
Port Daniel West, 609
Marketing overseas, ques. 2750

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Naval men, returned, and, 451, 1959
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Officers
British Columbia, Chief Inspector, ques. 1534
Maritime Provinces, Inspector, 2896
Overseers, 2893-4
Salaries and disbursements of, 2887
Oysters, 2894-9
Prices, 121
Protection service, 2848
Salesmen, 2889
Salmon fishing by farmers, 2896
Salmon and halibut, ques. 1535
Souris, P.E.I., fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Tax on fishermen, 2144
Twine and cordage, 3708
Utilization of waste, 3341

Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 949. 1r., 952; 2r., ref. to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 2098

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Letter from, 971
Payments to, 850, 1102
Pension, ques. 1109

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 202, 2074

Flax Industry
Bounty, 3842
Res., Mr. Glass, 1537

Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph Eloi (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 417. Financial situation—the war and profiteering—War-time Elections Act, 417; returned soldiers, 418; Military Service defaulters—tariff, 418; surplus profits tax—economy—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 419
Civil Service, 2921
Cost of living, 2921
Government property in Hull, ques. 1215
Loans to Imperial Government, ques. 1215
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4249
Royal Air Force, repatriation of, ques. 1611

Food Board. *See* Canada Food Board

Food Control. *See* High Cost of Living

Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607

Foran, Mr. William, Secretary Civil Service Commission, 165, 289, 292

Forbidden Literature. *See* Censorship

Foreign Trade. *See also* Trade
Roumania, 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton, and, 1908

Forest Products Laboratories, ques., 3068

Forests. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest Reserves

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers
Com. appointed, 114

Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379

Fort George Postmistress, ques. 602

Fortier, Mr. Hyacinthe Adelard (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 508. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —centralization of government, 508; government by Order in Council, 509; conscription, defaulters, 510; autonomy and British connection, 511
Budget, 3554. "Produce and save," 3554; alleged persecutions under Military Service Act, 3555

Fort Lawrence, N.S., dredging, ques. 3680

Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 397, 399. Sir Thomas White, Acting Prime Minister, 397; immigration, 399; highways and the provinces —transcontinental highway, 401; farm work and Government highway assistance—housing, 402; temperance question, 403; Outside Civil Service—postmasters at sub-stations — Civil Service Commission, 404; women's franchise, 405; War-time Elections Act and aliens — Ministers in the Senate, 406
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Daylight Saving, 926
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4578-9
Fire prevention, 1586
Highways, 731
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1571
Prohibition, 2658
Public Works Department, unexpended balances, 1280
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate, power clause, 4162
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3093
Telephone companies, 2644
Toronto Harbour improvements, 2363

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 176. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Canada's war record—post-bellum conditions, finance, demobilization, returned soldiers, 176-7; franchise—tariff, 178; high cost of living, 179; profiteering—the Press, 180

Fournier, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1649, 1801
Liquor for Siberian Expedition, ques. 845
Pilotage—Shipping Act Amdt., 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2484-7, 3824-7, 3939
Public ownership of railways, 1866
St. Valerie wharf, 2786

Franchise. *See* Women; Dominion Elections Act; Enemy Aliens
Governor General's Speech, 1
Nova Scotia franchise law, 518

Franking of Pamphlets, ques. 1791

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Welland Canal lock tenders, 604

Fraser, the late John, Auditor General, 115

Fraser River works, 422

Fraser Seigniory, ques. 882

Fraser Valley, *See* Representation Act

Fraserville, Que., Riou Store, ques. 1611

Fraternal Societies, foreign. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Free Trade. *See* Budget; Tariff

French Language
Income tax forms, 3712
Loan, printing bonds, 4475
Use of in seconding Address, 17

French River, 1077, 2796

Fripp, Mr. Alfred Ernest (Ottawa)
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Settlement and preference, 2008-9
Trustee, remuneration of, 2011-2
Board of Commerce, 4557
Daylight Saving, 920
Divorce Court Bill, 3776
Dominion Police, pay of, 2926
Horse racing, 1710
Letter postage rate, 745
Ottawa City and the Dominion Government, 2498, 4250
Pensions, 4191-6, 4207
Prohibition, 2349
War memorial building, ques., 1216
War Purchasing Commission, 3200

Frozen Beef, 1287, 1292

Fuel Control, ques. 612, ques. 1532, ques. 2145

Fulton, Mr. Frederick John (Cariboo)
Good roads, 3904
Judges' salaries, 2954-5
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4288

Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455

Gabarus, beach protection, 2780

Galicians and Poland, 3472. *See also* Poles and Ukrainains

Galvanized Iron, 3681, 3689

Game, protection of. *See* Migratory Birds

Garden Villages
Returned soldiers, for, 761, 4012. *See also* War, Soldiers; Soldiers' Land Settlement

Gauthier, Mr. Louis Joseph (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 73. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—unemployment—war debt of France, 73; shipping and conscription—patronage in repatriation medical service, 74; industrial unrest—Liberal party, 76; reconstruction—capital and labour, 77; agrarian question—Opposition's duty, 78

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles Arthur (Témiscouata)
Alcohol in medicines, ques., 646
Berubé, Esdras, 2250
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434
"Champlain," steamer, 2606
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 946
Intercolonial Pension Fund, ques. 605
Isle Verte, 2784
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Medical officer to Indians, 1906
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 971, 1866, 1957, 2250
Privilege, correction, 970
Proprietary medicines, 2481-7
Public Information, Department of, 2145
Riou store, Fraserville, ques. 1611
Seigniorial rights, ques. 882, 2786-7
Taxation Bills originating in Senate, 2490

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles, fire ranger, 2921

Georgian Bay Canal, ques., 843, 1082. *See also* French River Waterway

German Fleet. *See* War

Gibson, Judge, ques. 1440

Gibson, Major, ques. 884

Glace Bay harbour, 4613

Gladu, Mr. Joseph Ernest Oscar (Yamaska)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1240

Glass, Mr. Samuel Francis (East Middlesex)
Canadian National Railway, 1859
Daylight Saving, 900, 1431
Flax industry, 1537, 1553
London public building, 4611
Proprietary medicines, 3487

Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619

Gold. *See also* Finance Act
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Shipments, ques. 614

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 3377, ques. 4070,

Gordon, Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440

Government Employees' Compensation Bill.
Res., 701. 1r., 708; 2r., com., 938; 3r., 1029
ques. 4465

Government Ownership
Aeronautics, of, 2053, 2059
Railways, of. *See* Canadian National

Government Printing Bureau. *See* Printing Bureau

Government Railways. *See* Canadian National

Governor General's Speech, 1
Address in reply. *See* Address

Goyette, Magistrate, 2400

Grain. *See also* Canada Grain Act
Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604, ques. 605
Interior terminal, 505
Terminal, statistics of, ques. 880
Great Lakes, on, ques. 599
Prices, 537
Seed, ques. 979
Wheat. *See that title*

Grain Supervisors, Board of, 3837

Grand Etang, 2609

Grand Trunk Railway. *See also* Grand Trunk Pacific; Canadian National
Superannuation and Provident Fund, ques. 1213

Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada Bill. 1r., 111; 2r., 229; com., 1184; 3r., 1210
Government's offer, company's counter 659, 694

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Receivership Bill. *See also* Canadian National
Res., 649; 1r., 696; 2r., com., 1112; 3r., 1261-2
Statement by Minister, 316

Great Lakes
Armed vessels on, 1261
Government ships on, 2255-8

Great War Veterans' Association
Housing, resolution, 762

Greece, contract with Canada for wheat, ques. 2907

Greek Catholics in communion with Church of Rome, 1383

Green, Mr. Robert Francis (West Kootenay)
Dominion lands, reclamation of, 641
Good roads, 3901
Immigration Act Amdt., 1914

Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601

Grey, Mr. George Edwin, habeas corpus, 111

Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Griesbach, Brig.-Gen. William A. (West Edmonton)
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3819; amdt., 3821; withdrawn, 4118
Militia, permanent force, 3976, 3981
Pensions, 4174, 4180, 4195, 4201, 4206, 4282, 4292
"Unmarried wife," 4282
Titles, 2717, 2719

Grisdale, Mr., Deputy Minister of Agriculture, 2961, 2965

Grocers, Wholesale. *See* Private Bills

Grosse Isle, 2784

Guelph Novitiate. *See* Military Service Act

Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196, 3201, 3211

Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483

Gustave, Stuart, property bequeathed to Government, 544, ques. 604, 648, 2769, 2770

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 229, 1981-95, 1998-2015, 2467-78
Arrest of debtor ("abscond"), 2266-8, 2279
Bona fide transactions, 2471
Claims, 2472-3
Composition, 1983
Assent to, 1984
Contributory, 2009
Court's jurisdiction, 2268-70, 2474-5
Dividends, no action for, 2471
Inspectors, 2015
Limited partnerships, 2270, 2475
Malicious proceedings, 2272-4, 2279
Meetings of creditors notices, 2014
Non-traders, 2477
Order of Court, 2010
Proof of debt, 2263-4
Secured creditors, by, 2265
Provinces, and, 1998-9, 2008
Settlements and preferences, 2008, 2469-70
Trustees
Appointment, 1984-90, 2468
Discharge, 2472
Insurance by, sale of patented articles, 2006-7
Powers, 2468
Reports, 2468
Security by, 1992-5, 2468-9
Surrendered, 2001
To be kept in force, 1998-9
Substitute, 2000-4
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3816-23, 4110-32, 4257-74

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Criminal Code, Aliens and British subjects, 4357-8
Daylight Saving, 903
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1315
Religious conscientious objectors, 782
Sedition, report of Special Com., 3285

Guysborough public library, ques. 846

Halifax
Dennis building, ques. 972
Dry dock, 1281
Explosion, ques. 879
Overseas mails, 886, 929
Terminals, cost of, ques. 2398

Halifax Harbour Master Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2692; 1r., 2695; 2r., com., 2800; 3r., 2802

Halladay, Mr. Howard H. (Bow River)
Budget, 3582
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2162
Daylight Saving, 902
Hanna townsite and Mr. D. B. Hanna, 1410

Hamilton, Mr. Charles McGill, Director Canadian National Railway, 1638, 1834

Hamilton, Major W. J., ques. 3067

Hanmer, Mr. I. B., cattle breeder, 2995

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1408. *See* Canadian National Railway

Hanna, Alberta, townsite of, ques. 1535

Harbours. *See their names*
Dues, statement tabled, 40

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Budget, 3505. Reply to Mr. McKenzie, 3506; Canadian and American manufacturers, 3507; agricultural implements, 3508; business profits tax, 3509; land tax, 3510; free trade or protection, 3511
Canadian Expeditionary Force, files mislaid, ques. 1108
Freight rates, 3699
Gundy, the late W. P., 3201
Manufacturers' profits, 3699
Ploughs, duty on, 3701
Purchasing Commission, 3200-3
War; removal of bodies of the dead, ques. 1107

Harrison, Mr. Charles Robert (Nipissing)
French River waterway, 1077
Government employees' compensation, 945
Lake Nipissing water-power, ques. 1341

Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602

Harvesters, admission into Canada, 1944

Hastings, Mr. J. R., appointment, 161, 283

Hawker, Mr., transatlantic flier, 2564

Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Budget, 3583
Immigration, illiterates, 1967
Indian Reserves, expropriation, 2302
Purchasing Commission, 3209

Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Health. *See* Public Health

Health Department Bill. 1r., 843; 2r., 1164; com., 1182, 1185, 1366; 3r., 1383

Hebrews, illiteracy among, 1967
"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998

Henders, Mr. Richard Coe (Macdonald)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 454. Peace and its problems, 454; Union Government — Military Service Act, 455; public health—prohibition—daylight saving, 456; reconstruction—tariff, 457
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4376
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Board of Commerce, 4558
Budget, 3647. War and after-war problems, 3648; Western farmers and direct taxation — tariff, 3649; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt.—co-operation of interests, 3650
Daylight Saving, 902
Grain trade
Appeal Board, 4100, 4103-4
Speculation, 4105-9
Warehouses and elevators, 4097
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 1572
Pensions, 4297
Ploughs, duty on, 3692
Prohibition, 2662
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2950

High Commissioner, ques. 3242
Reported resignation, 647

High Cost of Living, 394, 409, 523, 1594, 1663, 2921, 3280-3. *See also* Board of Commerce; Combines; Industrial Unrest
Butter, price of, 2063
Daylight Saving and, 896
Measures to reduce, ques. 1792
Minimum wage and, 2908
Special Committee
Appointed, 2953
Reports:
2nd, 4069. Motion (Mr. Nicholson) to concur, 4307; amdt. Mr. McKenzie, neg. on div., motion agreed to, 4333
3rd (recommendations), 4664

Highways, 16, 25, 43, 53, 135, 167, 184, 302, 312, 458, 490, 530, 542, 2791-2
British Columbia mountains, through, 431
Farm work, effect on, 402, 732
Government policy, 731
Prices and, 789
Provinces and, 401
Railways and, 742-4
Transcontinental, 401

Highways Aid Bill. Res., 729, 784, 3899; 1r., 3926; 2r., com., 4386; 3r., 4435

His Majesty the King
Banquet to President Wilson, 103, 148

Historical Monuments, report tabled, 184

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 155. Canada's sacrifice in the war—"Department of Public Welfare"—mothers' pensions, 156; old-age pensions, unemployment insurance—trades unions—housing, 157; returned soldiers, pensions, 159; franchise—Bolshevism—the Civil Service, 160; theft of examination papers, 164
Board of Commerce, 4502-3
Canadian National Railway, 1807
Civil Service
Commission, 160
Committees, list of, ques. 617
Examination papers, theft of, 164, 2082, 2084
Post Office Department, salaries, 2082
Toronto letter carriers, 1341
Daylight Saving, 905
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 876
Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607
Guelph Novitiate, 1237
National non-sectarian schools, 2430
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2023-6
Newsprint control, 4539, 4547
Post Office statistics, ques. 2903
Quebec City, post office, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton post offices, ques. 2750
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg post offices, ques. 2750
Transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3126

Holbrook, Mr. George H., ques. 646

Homestead Entries, ques. 751

Horse Racing, 1710, 4466

Hospitals, 2774. *See also* War
Maternity, 1374
Quebec Military, ques. 844
St. Anne's, 1264
Toronto Base, ques. 845

House of Commons. *For questions of Parliamentary procedure see* Speaker; Deputy Speaker
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2851
Ash Wednesday, 185
Easter, 886, 1075, 1109, 1162
Leave to discuss urgent matter
Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt, charges of, 1099
Quorum, for want of, 397
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 4, 605
Business of the House
Budget Speech, time of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Government business, precedence for, 1110
Initial Committee rule, suspension of, 4456
Legislation forthcoming or postponed, 599, 1342, 1616, 2398, 3999, 4690
Questions, outstanding, 1342
Chamber, acoustic properties of, 2331, 2337, 2396, 2538, 2657
Committees, standing, 4, 111-2, 696
Estimates, Committee on, proposed, 1557
Daylight Saving and sittings of the House, 970, 1432
Debates, official report of
Committee appointed, 114
Reports
Special editions of members' speeches, 1162, 1206
Volumes, publication of, 2198
Divisions. *See that title*
Galleries, admission to, 1910
Members
Apartments for, proposed, 2498
Representing two ridings. *See* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Sessional indemnity of, 749
War record of, personal list, 195
Ministers in Senate, representation in, ques. 884, ques. 974
Motion, Mr. Euler, 1002
Officers
Clerk of French Journals, 357
Deputy Sergeant at Arms, 4
Messengers, pay of, 1558
Press Gallery, record in the war, 209
Privilege, Senate Address in place of request by Message, 642
Quorum, 397, 2361
Reading room, 318, ques. 843
Returns, inquiries for and statements concerning, 886, 1908, 4000
Sittings
Dominion Day, 4198
Non-suspension of, conference with Senate, 3948
House of Commons—*Con.*
Sittings—*Con.*
Saturday and morning, 3376, 3420
Wednesday, 1109
Speaker, living allowance, 2444
Vacancies, 1163. *See also* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Votes and Proceedings and Journals, 41, 3065, 3292
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 643
Housing, 15, 30, 45, 53, 144, 157, 223, 333, 530, 542, 1188. *See also* Public Health
Farm buildings in the West, 171
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761
Loan to provinces of $25,000,000
Inquiry as to time of presenting measures, 1616
Order in Council tabled, 71
Resolution and debate, 2532
Hudson Bay and Strait, 2511
Hudson Bay Railway, 4409
Port Nelson terminals, 4688
Hughes, Gen. William S., 162, 285
Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam (Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 195. House of Commons members' war record, 195; Military Service Act—Union Government—War Measures Act, 199; politics, patronage, independence — soldiers, regulars vs. irregulars, 200; Canada's rights—political intrigues, 201; the Press, 201, 203; Munitions Board—formation of Union Government, 202; "Canadian Official Record," 203; organization of Canada's forces at the front, 204; St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205; demobilization and repatriation, 207; population, development — Press Gallery record in the war, 209; finance, public debt, 210; munitions—Victory Bonds, 213
Canadians entering United States, head tax, 1110
Canadian Expeditionary Force, rifles and ammunition, 1614
Canadians in Imperal service, 1997
Canadians in Royal Air Force, ques. 646
Canadian soldiers imprisoned, 1434
Circular, farmers and military service, 1326
Civil and religious liberty in re-established countries, 2043
Commercial Cable property, Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4584
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1658-70, 2464-5
Greek Catholic children, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion for Com. of inquiry, 1218

Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam—*Con.*
Halifax Harbour Master, 2801
House of Commons galleries, 1910
Immigration agents in United States, 2586
Interim supply—agreement of leaders, 842
Juvenile delinquents, 1383-8, 3843
Kinmel Camp riots, 316, 424
Land for soldiers, 3071-2
Marine insurance, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798
Military escort of Roman Catholic bishop, ques. 2296
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1517, 1527
Military Service Act
Defaulters, 4238-9
Uniformity of administration, motion, 1308
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia pensions, 2755-7
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Nova Scotia, farm conditions, 2586
Pensions, 4183, 4289-91
Committee, 139
Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 2343, 3472, 4466
Princess Patricia's Regiment, ques. 616
Prohibition, 2348, 2350-6, 2668
Purchasing Commission, 3204
Roumania, credit to, 3241
St. John Harbour—Fort Latour, 4302
Scientific research, 4461
Selkirk postmaster, ques. 1308
Service medal, ques. 883
Soldiers' complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers' graves, 332
Trawlers built for Canada, 2210
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
War Purchasing Commission, 3199
Wireless stations, 2795
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 984

Hull
Armoury, ques., 1215
Government property in, ques. 1215
Industrial disputes, ques. 2905

Hutterites. *See also* Immigration; Mennonites
Admission to Canada, 1382, 1875
Mass meeting in Winnipeg regarding, 1920

Hydro-Electric. *See* Railway Act

Immigration, 90, 99, 217, 300, 342, 354, 395, 399, 433, 1047
Chinese, ques. 751

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills. *See also* Immigration and Colonization
1. (General.) 1r., 1206; 2r., 1866; com., 1876, 1910, 1960, 2280; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 3175

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Alien Labour Act and, 1943
Aliens, enemy, 1945
Definition, 1876
Deportation, 1977
Deputy Minister, 1980
Domicile, 1942, 2286
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916, 1944, 1976-1969, 1923
Inquiry, Board of, 1972
Inspection, 1973
Non-immigrant classes, 1980
Officers, 1972-1980
Transportation companies, 1978-9
2. (Advocates of violence.) 1r., 3211; 2r., com., 3r., 3213

Immigration and Colonization. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt
Aliens, Government policy respecting, 753
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Department of
Agents
United States, 2569, 2588
West, in, 2588
Staff and salaries, 2568-72
Deputy Minister, 1915, 2440
Interpreters, 1972
Exodus of settlers, 2579-81, 2590, 2595
Great Britain, from, 2594, 2596
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570-1
Land, cheap, 2572-9
Naturalization papers, 754
Northern Ontario and Quebec, to, 2574
Nova Scotia, to, 2582
Policy for all Canada, 2585
Restrictions, proposed changes in the law, 769
Parliament's powers, 773

Imperial Board of Investigation, 3240

Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075. *See also* Supreme Court

Imperial Government, loans to, ques. 1215

Imperial Guards, 2753

Imperial Munitions Board, 19, 2073

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference, 40, 244, 1044
Cables, 1052
Minister's (Hon. Mr Rowell) statement., 1044
Passports, 1052
Ratification of acts of, 1059
Resolution, 1918 Conference, 1948
Resources of Empire, 1052

Income War Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Assessment, total, ques. 2049
Evasions, alleged, 429

Income war tax—*Con.*

Exemptions, 1917-18, ques. 611
Farmers, ques. 2049
Gross taxable income, ques. 2296
Judges and, 3711-3
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Officials, 2798
Unmarried women and, 3992

Independent Workers of the World. *See* Industrial unrest; Bolshevism; Winnipeg strike

India
Famine in, 2616
Status of, 1045

Indian Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4171; 2r., com., 4254; 3r., 4257

Indians
British Columbia, 4062
Caughnawaga, 4057
Greater production on farms, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Northwest Territories, 4061
Medical attendance, 4060
Medical officer, ques. 1906
New Brunswick, 4061
Nova Scotia, 4060
Reserves
Opening up of, 414
Parks, expropriation for, 2302
Restigouche, ques. 609
Returned soldiers, lands for, 3807, 4015
Roads and bridges on, 4057
St. Peter's, ques. 1076
Seabird Island, 414
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062

Industrial Disability, Government insurance against, 994

Industrial Relations Commission, 1260, 4620
Personnel, 1305
Scope, 1432

Industrial and Scientific Research, 4376
Com., 1709, 2097, 4457
Report, motion to concur, 4457
Health laboratory, 1370
National Institute proposed, 1565
Vote of $120,000, 3341

Industrial Unrest, 16, 20, 26, 57, 73, 150, 296, 374, 393, 443, 574, 890, 899, 1858, 2883, 2929. *See also* Bolshevism; Board of Commerce; High Cost of Living; Industrial Relations
Conference to settle disputes, 2908, 3194
Discussion on motion to adjourn, 3004
Situation in the West, 2798

Industrial Unrest—*Con.*
Strikes
Canada, in, since signing of Armistice, ques. 2143
England, in, delaying return of Canadian soldiers, 3741
Montreal, 1482, 1615, 1663
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Sympathetic, "Collective bargaining," 2851
Time lost due to, 1792
Winnipeg, 2508, 2565, 2616, 2752-4, 2598, 2953, 3241, 3472, 3927. *See also* Post Office Appointments Bill
Arrests and trials, 3740
Prisoners' mooted removal to Kingston, 3587
Riots, 3843
Western situation, 2908

Infant Mortality. *See* Health

Inland Revenue
Bonded warehouses and liquors, 966
Violations, ques. 1536
Department
Expenses of, ques. 3242
Report tabled, 550

Inland Water Navigation
Railway Commission Control Bill. 1r., 71. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bill (Containers). Res., 2344; 1r., 2345; dropped, 3940

Insurance. *See also* Criminal Code
Department, 4479
Marine, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., 1567; ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1568; com., 3987; 3r., 3988

Intercolonial Railway. *See also* Canadian National
Express parcels, ques. 2047
Freight stolen at Charmy, ques. 2396
Mulgrave services, 1302
Operation, 4616
Position of, 2131
Property, earnings, expenses, ques. 750
Provident Fund, ques. 605, ques. 2045. *See also* Government Employees' Compensation

Inter-Imperial Trade, proposed Investigation Board, 3327

Interior Department
Deputy Minister, extra salary for immigration work, 2440

International Joint Commission, 462, 1901-4, 2396, 4670
Lake of the Woods Board, 1904

International Waters, sewage in, 1195

Interpretation Act Amdt. Bill (Superior Courts). 1r., 1957; 2r., com., 3r., 2313; Senate amdts., 2959

Interpreters for immigration service, 1972

Intoxicating Liquors
Custom houses as storage places for, 956, 966
Illicit stills, 969
Interprovincial trade in, opinions of Minister and Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Northwest, in, statement tabled, 229
Quebec, entered at, ques. 1533
Shipments, prosecutions for, ques. 882
Siberian expedition, for, ques. 845

Intoxicating Liquors Act, 1919, Amdt. Bill. Res., 2345; 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2654; 3r., 2752. Amdt. (Mr. Cronyn), 2656-7; neg., 2689
Senate amdt., 3782; House disagrees, res., Sir Robert Borden agreed to on div., 4071-2, 4133; Senate insists, 4475; free conference, 4497, 4550, 4572; House insists, 4659-60
Dominion Alliance, 2685
Intemperance
Causes of, 2686
Recreation, a cure for, 2686
Labour and, 2660, 2670-1, 2680
Medicinal value of liquor, 2667, 2682
Native wines, 2668
Ontario Temperance Act, 2655, 2678 2688
Prohibition, extension of, 2658-9
Provinces, 2347, 2662, 2679
Manitoba, 2673, 2678
Ontario, 2676, 2682
Rowntree and Sherwell report, 2685
Saleeby, Dr., opinion of, 2683

Inverness Railway, 4614

Iron, material for galvanizing, 3781, 3689

Irrigation, 4601

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 633; 3r., 696

Isle Perrot bridges, 733

Isle Verte wharf, 2784

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William (George Etienne Cartier)
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1983-5, 1992-5, 2000-15, 2264-73, 2468-78
Board of Commerce, 4460, 4552
Bolshevism, 2284

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William—*Con.*
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Budget, 3624. Reply to Minister of Finance—Mr. M. Clark and party government, 3625; post-war tariff revision, 3626; Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3627; Bankruptcy Bill—vacancies in House of Commons, 3630; Hon. Mr. Rowell and Cabinet secrets, 3627, 3631
Butter, price of, 1618
Canadian National Railway
Finance, parliamentary control, 2128
Head office, amdt. 1648, neg. 1653
Combines, 4569, 4590
Amdt., "British subjects," 4590-8; neg., 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-63
Aliens and British subjects, 4356-61
Sexual offences, 2164
Daylight Saving, 893
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Electric and power companies, 4577-9
Employment works, Welland canal, 1600-4
Franchise, 4639
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-8
Hebrews
Crime, absence of, 1881
Illiteracy unknown, 1967
Juvenile delinquents, 1386
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill, 643
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Deported conspirators, 1949
Illiterates, 1952, 1967; amdt. proposed, 1960
Open-door policy, 1880
Temporary residents, 1942
Travelling musicians, 1942
Violence against constituted authority, 2284
Income tax, judges—personal explanation, 3720, 4234
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, Peace Conference labour principles, collective bargaining, etc., 3043
Interned alien enemies, ques. 1611
Judges' salaries, 2956-9, 4374
Naturalization, 4118
Amdt., 4120; neg., 4126
Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618
Roumania
Credit to, 1618
Proposed Canadian guard for border, 1618
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, resignations, 4673-6
War expenditure, 1865
Weights and measures, 2150-2, 2159

Japan
Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455
Immigration from. *See* Asiatics; Immigration
Market for ships, 2220

Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751

Jenkins, Colonel, report of, 2285, 2294

Jesuits. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Budget, 3462. Industrial unrest, 3462; wheat and prices, 3463; School Lands Trust Fund, 3463; Hudson Bay Railway—Victory Loans, 3463; tariff and the land, 3465
Canadian National Railway, 1834
Franchise, 4641
Livestock, pure-bred, 2994
Ploughs, duty on, 3693
Titles, 1478

Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615

Judges Act Amdt. Bills
1. (British Columbia.) Res., 2305; 1r., 2313; 2r., com., 2954; 3r., 2959
2. (Salaries.) Res., 4063, 4212; 1r., 4376; 2r., 4435; com., 4436; 3r., 4439; Senate amdts., 4661
3. (From the Senate.) 4135; 1r., 4377

Jurisdiction, federal and provincial. *See* Public Health; Highways; Technical Education

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. 1r., 970; 2r., com., 1383; not proceeded with, 3843

Kay, Mr. William Frederic (Missisquoi)
Automobiles, Government-owned, ques. 880
Ayrshire and Holstein bulls, ques. 601
Canadian merchant marine, ques. 3998
"Canadian Volunteer," steamer, ques. 3998
Daylight Saving, 921
Food Board revenues, ques. 611
Fuel Control Board, ques. 1532
Military service payments, ques. 601
Newsprint control, ques. 613
Oleomargarine, 3708
Opposition and lower duties, 3703
Public Information Department, ques. 728

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Canadian Grain Act Amdt., 3955, 4097
Canadian National Railway
Annual meetings, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1718, 1754
Directors, 1632
Expropriation, 1696
Head office, 1648

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry—*Con.*
Cost of Living Com., 4317
Demobilization, N.W.M. Police, 2175
Dominion Police, 2926
External Affairs Department, 4669
French River waterway, 1083
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81
Public health, 1195
Medical profession and, 1378
Sewage in international waters, 1195
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2175, 2326
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Overseas Military Forces from Canada in the United Kingdom)
Administration of overseas forces, 2294, 2856-83
Demobilization, strikes delaying, 3741
Jenkins, Col., report of, 2294
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Permanent Air Force in Canada, 2867-8

Kennedy, Mr. William Costello (North Essex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 101. Government promises—franchise, 101; Paris Conference, Ministers in attendance, 102; foreign trade, 103; Bolsheviki—returned soldiers, 105; Siberian expedition—pensions, 106; employment of returned soldiers, 107
Budget, 3512. Taxation and public debt, 3512; tax-free debts, 3513; bank amalgamations, 3516; unwise regulation of trade, 3517
Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340

Kingston, Calvin residence as nurses' home, ques. 3377

Kinmel Camp Riots, 315, 462, 550, 1100, 1320. *See also* War
Courts-martial, ques. 3469
Statement by Acting Prime Minister, 512

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Budget, 3646. Soldiers' land settlement, 3646; a protectionist Budget, 3647
Fisheries of Prairie Provinces, 2892

Kohn, Mr. Louis, ques. 747

Kriegoff, paintings of, 2447

Labelle, Mr. F. A., ques. 1306

Labour. *See also* Industrial
British Columbia, in, during war, 754
Eight-hour day, 914, 1996, 2856
Farm, shortage—returned soldiers, 140, 3905

Labour—*Con.*
Interprovincial Convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Organized, opinions on prohibition, 2660
Peace Conference, principles on, 2852
Strikes in 1918, ques. 619

Labour Bureaux, 4607

Labour Department
Crothers, Hon. T. W., resignation as Minister, 139
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 884
Work of, 145

Labour Disputes Board, Chairman, ques. 1535

Lachute, Custom house, ques. 976

Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135

Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750, 2042, 2084

Lake of the Woods Technical and Control Boards, 1904, 2067

Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Bank mergers, 1098
Board of Commerce, 4553
Income tax, 3714
Farmers and, 3733
War expenditures, 1363
Woollen trade, orders, 1363

Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 3321. The war, 3321, 3324; Province of Quebec—national debt, 3322; expenditure, 3323; French language—tax-free bonds, 3324; indirect taxation, 3326
Judges' pensions, ques. 1109
Loans to Allied countries, ques. 2565

Land. *See also* Dominion
Grants
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 975
Railway companies, 1873
Religious denominations, ques. 2462
Policy, 587
Settlement of British sailors on, 1875
Surveying—Paris foot, 952-4
Tax, 819. *See* Revenue Bills

Lang, Mr. Norman (Humboldt)
Budget, 3467. Finance and tariff, 3467; aliens and franchise, 3468; pensions and land settlement, 3469
Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Langlier, Mr. Justice, 1312

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 242. Canada's soldiers—Peace Conference and world peace, 242; indemnity payable by Germany—Prime Minister's presence at Peace Conference, 243; Imperial War Cabinet—Canada a nation, 244; Mr. M. Clark—reconstruction, 245; tariff — national unity—The Press, 246; Bolshevism—War-time Elections Act, 247
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 3926, 4008
Air Board Bill, 2052
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, schedule, 1787
Directors, 1654
Government ownership, 1746
Head office, 1648
Labour representatives, amdt., 1643, 2137-40
Collective bargaining, 2908
Daylight Saving, 647, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3785, 3791
Dominion Elections Act, 4622, 4650, 4658
Experimental Farm labourers, war bonus, 2924
Good roads, 4431
Provincial jurisdiction, 3906
Government Employees' Compensation 704, 947-8
Imperial Cabinet and Conference
Constitutional changes resulting from, 1068
Ratification of acts, 1059
Intoxicating Liquors Bill, Senate amdt., 4072
Judges' salaries, 4213, 4228-9, 4237
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2084
Mail-car route, Quebec-Edmundston, 2083
Naturalization, 3816, 3820-2, 4117-26, 4249
Retroactive effect, amdt., neg., 4126
Peace Treaty labour provisions, 4239
Pensions, 4209
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Statistics Act Amdt., 599
Tea duty, 4005
Technical education, 3794, 3804
Titles, 1477
War Measures Act, 2148

Lapointe, Mr. Louis Audet (St. James)
Canadian National Railway
Directors, 1654
Head office, 1649
Labour, industrial unrest, etc., 1663, 3009, 3194
Steamship services, 1285, 1291
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 840
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Laurier, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid, death of
Adjournment out of respect for, 4
Eulogies: Sir Thomas White, 5; Mr. McKenzie, 7; Mr. Lemieux, 9; Mr. Redman, 14; Mr. Manion, 18; Mr. McMaster, 32; Mr. Sinclair, 51; Mr. Gauthier, 73; Mr. Dechene, 87; Mr. Kennedy, 108; Mr. Duff, 116; Mr. Cockshutt, Mr. Ethier, 133; Mr. DuTremblay, 149; Mr. Clark (Red Deer), 231; Mr. McIsaac, 248; Mr. McCoig, 251; Mr. Edwards, 254; Mr. Cannon, 264; Mr. Maclean (Halifax), 272; Mr. Whidden, 221; Mr. d'Anjou, 224; Mr. Cooper, 339; Mr. Pelletier, 393; Mr. Savard, 407; Mr. Stacey, 412; Mr. Fontaine, 419; Mr. McQuarrie, 420; Mr. Archambault, 436; Mr. Denis, 447; Mr. Sinclair (Queen's), 458; Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C., 463; Mr. Fournier, 176; Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka), 181; Mr. Pedlow, 185-6; Mr. Turgeon, 307; Major-General Mewburn, 319; Mr. Cooper, 339-40; Mr. Demers, 344; Mr. Euler, 370; Mr. Anderson, 495; Mr. Ross (Middlesex), 508; Mr. Fortier, 508; Mr. Prevost, 521; Mr. Maharg, 529; Mr. Parent, 540; Mr. Currie (Simcoe), 545; Mr. Lemieux, 567; Mr. Reid (Mackenzie), 587; Mr. Michaud, 166; Mr. Fielding, 473; Mr. Béland, 3293
Monument to, 2797
State funeral ordered, 2

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Canada-Great Britain steamship service, ques. 1107
Canadian National Railway
Improvements, ques. 978
Quebec bridge, ques. 977
Quebec and Halifax, ques. 977
Daylight Saving, 891
Dominion exhibitions, ques. 1215
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
National harbours, Quebec, 3752-3
Quebec, Champlain market wharves, ques. 1438
St. Malo workshops, ques. 1212
Transcontinental Railway, ques. 2398

Leader of the House, congratulations to Sir Thomas White as, 397

Leader of the Opposition
McKenzie, Mr. D. D.; Congratulations on election as Leader of the Opposition, 27, 51, 254, 567

League of Nations, 308, 348, 367, 1382, 2042. *See also* Peace
Covenant tabled, 138
Reference in Governor General's Speech, 2

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henri)
Dorval building, ques., 610

Leger, Mr. Auguste Théophile (Kent, N.B.)
Agricultural pamphlets, 2991
Canadian National Railway, 1652
Cold storage, 2986
Daylight Saving, 904
Lobster, canned, 722
Local mills and wheat, 2973
Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498
Moncton and Buctouch Railway, 1382
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208; ques. 2566
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Soldiers, furlough in France, 271
Weights and measures, 2153

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve, and Gaspé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 567. Tariff and embargo—new Opposition leader—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 567; "Quebec situation"—Liberals and Unionists, 568; victory and peace—Canada's national status—party government, 570; a free Parliament, 571; outlook for Canada, balance of trade, industrial unrest, 574; complaint of Government inaction, charges by General Smart and Col. Pratt, 575; Council of Agriculture platform, 578; Ministers interrogated, 579; Canada and the Empire, 582; national unity, 585
Aerial service, 1264
Air Board, 2053, 2055-7
Agriculture
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2962
Literature in both languages, 2975
Production, 2959-60
Baie St. Paul, branch line, 2450
Bank mergers, 1088
Bankruptcy Bill, 1982-93
Belgium, 1874, 2586
Borden, Sir Robert, birthday congratulations, 4133
British sailors on land, settlement of, 1875
Bruce report, 4000
Budget, 3363. Party politics, 3363; Prime Minister and Cabinet, 3364; public debt and economy, 3366; war indemnity—reconstruction, 3369; low tariff, 3370; industrial unrest, 3374; French Canadian Liberals, 3375
Budget Speech, date of, 1712
Business profits war tax, suggested booklet, 4003

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Cables
St. Lawrence, 2794
State control of, 1827
Cadet corps, 1888
Canadian National Railway, 1399
Capital stock, 1826
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1713-5, 1728-9
Directors, ex-soldier, 1638
Finance — receipts and expenditures through consolidated revenue, amdt. 1415, neg. 1418
Lines to be included, 1678-9
Securities of other companies, 1781
Canadian Press news service, 4483
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, oath, 2016
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4699
Canals
Trent, 3187-9
Welland, deepening of, 3184-6
Caughnawaga and St. Lambert roads, 4058
Cavell, Edith, proposed monument, 2447
Civil Service
Commission
Appointment of woman as member of, 2909
Commissioners' salaries, 4496
Commissionership of Customs, 3927, 4380
Post office appointments after strike, 4346-8
Salaries, 2914
Superannuation, 2914-5
Cold storage and food, ques. 2906
Combines, 4593-4
Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," case of, 2440, 2808
Criminal code—medietate linguae, 4363-6
Daylight Saving, 888, 1208
Government policy, 970
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Divorce
Fees remitted, number of divorces, 2779
Provincial authority in, 1438, 2779
Dominion Parks, bird sanctuaries, 2304
Dominion Police, 2925-6
Dominion Steel Company, 2251
Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447
Fish, inspection, 950
Foreign trade
Credits, 1615, 2171
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
Japan, 4019
France, need of steamship service to, 1291

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Franchise, 4621-3, 4637
Woman suffrage, 4638
Fuel control, ques. 612
Government measures, time of presentation, 1617
Grand Trunk Railway bondholders, 4245
Housing scheme, 2557, 2562
Immigration, exodus, repatriation, 2581
Imperial Cabinet and Conference, 1070
Imperial Guards, 2753
Income tax, 3712-4
Children, allowance for, 3723
Judges' and others' pensions, 3713
Military pensions, 3722
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Industrial unrest, cause of, 2883
International Joint Commission, 462, 4670
Judges' salaries, 2312, 2955-6, 4221
Kreigoff, paintings of, 2447
Land grants, Canadian Northern, 1873
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 9
Loan, $100,000,000, 4243-6
Magdalen Islands, 623, 1300
Mail order houses, 2093
Maps, engraving and distribution, 4047-8
Mercier, Cardinal, visit of, 1482; ques. 1611
Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670
Military management overseas, 2883-7
Charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1483, 1494-5
Military Service Act, 1312
Guelph Novitiate, 1232
Militia Department, overseas administration, 1099-1100
Militia
Pensions, 2758
Permanent force, 2980-1
Policy concerning, 1888
Mining industry, 4007-8
Montreal income tax office, ques. 2905
Murray Bay, ferry, 4335
Naturalization, 4111-31
Judicial vs. administrative powers, 4111
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 2024-30, 4482
Nile Voyageurs, 4380
Ocean rates, 1051
Orders in Council, government by, 2554
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248-50, 4380-3
Ottawa highways, 2792
Paradis, Mr., claim of, 3189
Paris agency, 1901
Parliament Building, 4621
Peace Treaty, 3473
Ratification of, 3937
Text, receipt of, 2096

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Pensions, 4186, 4200-4, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4275, 4278, 4284-6
Amdt., neg. on div., 4338
Pilotage—Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 2805
Press, The, attitude of, 2917. *See also under this head* Newspapers
Proprietary medicines, 2488, 2492, 3939
Purchasing Commission, 3216, 4445
Advertising, 3232
Amdt. (six months' hoist), 3220; neg. on div. 3226
Exclusive power, 3232
Supplies that may be purchased, 3238-9
Religious conscientious objectors, 781, 784
Rental of buildings for the Government, 3236
Returned soldiers as mining prospectors, 4045
Rimouski and overseas mail, 886
St. Charles River improvements, Belanger vs. The King, 1021, 1026
St. Lawrence River water powers, 886, 1796, 1901, 4048
Schools and religious teaching, 2415
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Shell Oil Company, 929, 4070
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2227
Sifton, Sir Clifford, office in London, ques. 1908
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762, 2765, 2771
Technical education, 3171
Titles, 2742
Trade and Commerce Department, 2171, 2227-9
Transatlantic mail service, 1711
Vancouver harbour, 4017-9
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
War expenditures ($350,000,000), 2169-71
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2172, 2241
Washington, representation at, 1075, 2075-7, 2201
Witley Camp riot, 3472
Woman masquerading as man, 2440, 2808
Woman suffrage, 4638
Ypres war memorial, 4465

Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612

Lesage, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Hochelaga)
Montreal, conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Public health—Orders in Council, 1369
Registration of defaulters, ques. 610

Letter Carriers, 1341. *See also* Civil Service

Letter postage rate, ques. 745, 4621

Lévis
Aqueduct, ques. 1789
Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Station, 2458

Lewis, Mr. J. H., 270

L'Hereux, Major Napoleon, ques. 978

Library of Parliament
Committee, 114-5
Report, 2

Life-saving stations, ques. 606, 2850

Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-13

Little Current, 2789

Little Sands, 2609

Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1570; 1r., 1572; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2143

Livestock, shipments, inspection, 2603

Livingstone's Cove, 2780

Loans
Allied countries, to, ques. 2565
Imperial Government, to, ques. 1215
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Temporary, outstanding, report tabled, 138
$100,000,000, New York, cost of, ques. 1907
$75,000,000, 4198
$100,000,000 Loan Bill. Res., 1r., 4242; 2r., com., 4243; 3r., 4335

Loggie, Mr. William Stewart (Northumberland, N.B.)
Bankruptcy Bill, 2005, 2012
Budget, 3651. Free food, 3651; manufacturers' profits, 3652; cost of living—wheat prices—Union Government, 3653
Fish, refrigerator service, 2890
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—cold storage, 2063
Lobster, canned, 714-727
Pilotage, 2610, 2805
Steamship services
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
West Indies, 1287-8
Weights and measures, 2156

Lunenburg Harbour, 2607

Lyons Fair, 3840

Macauley, Capt. A. C. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., trade discrimination, cable from, 140

Macdonell, soldier imprisoned, 1434

Mackenzie & Mann. *See* Canadian National; Railway Act Consolidation

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur (East Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 347. League of Nations, 348; Canada's national status—Province of Quebec—tariff, 349; freedom of the Press and of the Bench, 350; military service defaulters—Peace Conference and attendance of Prime Minister—war indemnity—education, provincial rights, 351; autocracy and democracy, 352

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Extension of time, 1713-9, 1726, 1745
Public ownership, 1745
Canadian Northern Railway
Arbitration, ques. 1214
Bonds, ques. 4241
Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
Securities, ques. 1214
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2921
Civil Service and returned soldiers—Rangers Gauvreau and Trudel, 2921
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Criminal Code—neglect, 4362
Daylight Saving, 910
Deputy Minister of Railways, ques. 1215
Fairweather, Mr., ques. 2145
Good roads, 4422
Henry and Ferguson, Messrs, ques. 2045
House of Commons, difficulty in hearing speakers, 1211
Housing scheme, 2538-9, 2548
Immigration, 1932
Labour situation in the West, 2799
Militia, permanent force, 3978
Naturalization, 4262-8
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4282, 4286
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-22, 2628, 2652
Judges, transportation on railways, 2640-1
Schools, national, 2430
Ukrainians, 1932-8

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Canadian National Railway, coal, res., 2906
Mail contracts, 2081
Pembroke wharf, 2787
Pensions, case of Col. G. Hunter Ogilvie, 2761
Upper Ottawa dams, 2796

MacLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Minister without portfolio)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 272. Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 272; finance, public loans, 274; Civil Service Commission, appointments, methods, Secretary, 274
Air Board Bill, 1864, 2050-6
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1910
Bureau of Statistics, 3838-9
Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837-8, 4094-4109
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3942
Senate amdts., 4664
Canada Trade Commission, 4493-4

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 3839
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842
Canadian National Railway
Directors, payment of, 1654
First meeting, 1660
Head office, 1649
Civil Service
Commission. *See also, under this title,* Address
Appointments, 3230
Returned soldiers and women representation on, 2909, 2918
Salaries and contingencies, 4496-7
Efficiency, Committee of Inquiry, 1556-7
Labour and statistics, 4672
Overmanning of, 4604
Reclassification, 2203, 3519, 3927-8. *See also under this head,* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Returned soldiers and, 1001, 2921
Trade and Commerce Department, salaries, 4606
War bonus, 2924-8
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2909-22
Arthur Young & Co., 2111
Commissioners, 2914
Salaries of civil servants, 2914, 2922
Superannuation, 2915
Coasting, reciprocity in, 1209
Copyright, 4022
Editorial Com., 1566
Eight-hour day, 2856
Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill, 1568, 2286-90, 2463-7
Fisheries
British Columbia licenses, 933, 936
Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill, 949-952
Flax, bounty, 3842
Foreign credits, 3832-6, 3831
Foreign trade
Lyons and other fairs, 3340
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
High cost of living, 2908
House of Commons—Free conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3249
Industrial and scientific research, 3341
Industrial unrest
Strikes
Montreal, 1566, 1615, 1663
Winnipeg, 2508, 2799, 2854-5, 2665, 3845
Danger to constituted authority, after-war conditions, etc., 3046
Magdalen Islands—Pictou service, 625
Marking of containers, 2344-5
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt.—lobsters, 713-727

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Montreal power strike, 1566
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1565
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt., 4021
Patents Branch, 3808
Proprietary Medicine Bill, 2479-87, 2492-3, 2653-4, 3823-7, 3939-40
Royal Navy, Canadians in, 1568
Shipping and shipping rates, 4684-6
Statistics Act Amdt., 139, 595-9
Steamship services, 1105-6, 1282-1305
Australia, etc., 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1300
European ports, subsidy not needed, 1291
Freight rates, 3830
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Great Britain, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, 3827-8
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Mulgrave, 1302-4
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
South Africa, 1289
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283
Trade Commissioners, 3831
Units of electrical measure, 139
Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill, 952-4, 2149-59, 2290
Senate amdt., 4021

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Canadian National Railway, 1824
Cost of Living Com., 4317, 4325
Daylight Saving, 906
Freight rates and Government-owned railways, 3697
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 672
Non-ferrous metals—nickel, 3681-2
Railway Act Consolidation—Municipal and provincial freight bargains, 4141, 4147, 4150
Railway question and tariff question, 675
Railways, public ownership of, 672, 3694
Senate and House of Commons, 643
Senate reform, 4167
Tariff and public ownership, 3694
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat prices, 4466

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Budget, 3567. Production and taxation, 3568; land tax—manufacturers' prices, 3569

McCoig, Mr. Archibald Blake (Kent, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 250. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—tariff—free tractors and ditchers, 251; prices, competition in agricultural implements, 252; highways—housing—commissions, Food Board, 253; Civil Service—demobilization of men in camps in Canada, 254
Board of Commerce, 4501-5
Budget, 3601. Production and economy, 3602; profiteering — conscription of wealth, 3603; agricultural implement duties—tractors, 3604; food prices, 3605
Daylight Saving, 892, 903
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569, 2465
Government railways, private cars, 1589
Livestock Act Amdt., 1572
Oleomargarine, 2201
Rural mail couriers, pay of, 2926
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat, price of 1919 crop, 4466

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Bank mergers, 1096
Board of Commerce, 4515
Canadian National Railway, 1850
Civil Service organization, 1271
Daylight Saving, 925
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Good roads, 4410
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 1154
Newsprint control, 4541, 4547
Seed grain, 1033-5
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 838

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Colchester)
Civil Service appointments, ques., 2049
Intercolonial Railway rates, 4170
Public Buildings, 4610
Truro, 4611
Resignation from Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4676
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, res., 981; withdrawn, 1002

McDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398

McFall, Mr., Food Controller, ques. 4464

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 181. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Liberal party, 181; Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—public debt and resources, 182; returned soldiers—tubercular cases, 183; highways—public health, 184

McGibbon, Mr. Peter—*Con.*
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3823
Canadian Expeditionary Force, patients in England, ques. 615
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier for, 2918
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3790
Good roads, 3909
Housing scheme, 2534, 2547
Interned enemy aliens, ques. 844
Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1244
Militia, Permanent Force, 3974
Paralytic military patients in Euclid Hall, ques. 749
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions, 4172
Board, ques. 3066
Payments, ques. 1307
Pratt, Col. A. C., statements of, ques. 1213, ques. 1216
Proprietary medicines, 2480-6, 2492, 2654, 2825-6
Public Health Department, appointments, 1182
Purchasing Commission, 3227
Scientific research, 1193, 1371
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-8, 2774-6
Deputy Minister, ques. 2586
Staff, ques. 4240
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3886
Technical education, 3174, 3805
Telephone companies, 2648
Totally disabled soldiers, ques. 1213
Transatlantic flight, ques. 2143
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Farming will save the country, 2963
Lachute custom house, ques. 970
Live Stock Act Amdt., 2066-7
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1502
Soldiers' land settlement, 3870

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Pictou registrar, ques. 2144

McGregor, Mr. James D., cattle breeder, 2995

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 248. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's status after the war, 248; franchise—alien enemies—Opposition critics—Peace Conference and presence of Prime Minister, 249; Liberal party—national unity, 250
Boughton Island, 2784
"Brant," steamer, 2607

McIsaac, Mr. James—*Con.*
Budget, 3517, 3519. Policy of protection—debt and revenue, 3518; reciprocity, 3519; labour troubles, East and West, 3520; public debt, 3521
Divorce Court Bill, 3779
Good roads, 3906
Judges' salaries, 2306, 4214, 4372
Little Sands, 2609
Magdalen Islands-Pictou service, 624
North Lake, 2784
Pictou-Montague service, 1304
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190
Prohibition, 2687
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Souris fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Technical education, 3799, 3893, 4136

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria). *See also* Leader of the Opposition
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 21. Chosen leader of the Opposition—congratulations to mover and seconder—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 22; returned soldiers—distribution of population, 23; Canada's war record—orders in council—franchise, 24; highways—public health, 25; capital and labour, 26; economy—standard of living—Liberal party—"Light in the window," 27
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Agriculture, increased production, 2959-60
Small farms, 2975
Agriculture Department, publications, 2989-91
Air Board Bill, 2051-2, 2059
"Alert," The, 1966
Alien enemies, 773. *See also under this head*, Immigration
Baddeck and Iona wharves, 2611
Bankruptcy Bill, 933
Proof of debts, 2264
Trustee, 1981, 1986-8
Remuneration of, 2012
Replacement by creditors, 2003
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Board of Commerce, 4471, 4530, 4554, 4566
Bronze coins, 638
Budget, 3487. Reply to Mr. Cowan, 3487; coal and iron duties, 3490; bounties and protective duties, 3491; public expenditures, 3493; cost of living, 3494; Hon. Mr. Rowell, 3495; Government control of profits—"produce and save," 3496; fisheries, 3497; aliens—labour, 3498; industrial court proposed, 3499; party government — Liberal party's

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade policy, 3501; lessons of the war, 3504
Business of the House
Measures forthcoming, 1342, 3999
Business profits and income taxes, 3709
Cabinet Ministers in Senate, 1009, 2073
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1389-93
Canada Medical Act Amdt., 3240
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3755-6, 3935
Canadian National Railway Bill
Capital stock, 1842
Committee, reference to, suggested, 1621
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1709, 1719, 1721, 1730, 1760-7
Directors, 1656, 1661
Responsibility to Parliament, 1674
Executive Com., 1668
Expenditures, how controlled, 2115
First meeting, amdt., 1667
Fiscal year, 1705
General policy, 1730
Labour troubles, reported, 1617
Lines to be included, 1677-80
Management and "politics," 1675
Parliamentary control, 1418
Power to acquire securities of other companies, 1862
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Questions asked, 1610
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016, 2295
Canadians in distress abroad, 2600
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4698
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3176-7
Welland, deepening of, 3180
Cape Breton public works, 2782
Censorship: Lewis, Mr. J. H., case of, 270
Christmas Island-East Bay postal route, 2083
Civil Service
Commission, 3234
Efficiency, special com., 1560, 2913
Extra employees during war, 4706
Patronage, 3234
Sessional employees, bonus, 2313-4, 2927
Clark, Mr. Michael, and protection, 3748
Closure, interpretation of rule, 1796
Coal, briquetting of, 4489
Coal used by government railways, ques., 611
Cold storage, 2980-1, 2986
Combines, 4601

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Corporation, influence in public affairs, 2039
Cost of Living Com., 4320
Criminal Code
Seditious books, etc., 4368
Sexual offences, 2166, 4689
Unlawful associations, 4356
Customs, preventive service, 966
Customs warehouses as storage places for liquor, 956
Customs war tax, 3708
Deserters, punishment of, 72
Divorce Court Bill, 3783-9
Divorce, Privy Council decision, 4535
Dominion Elections Act, 4623, 4648, 4655-7
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 2298-9
Mineral claims, 2300
Dominion Steel Company, 2251, 2254
Dominion water powers, 2519, 2531
Economy in expenditure, 4245
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Elevators and American grain, 3837-8
Employment works and contracts, 1604-6
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2288
Finance Department salaries, 4477
Fire prevention, 1578-9, 1583
Fisheries
British Columbia canning, 2098
Guardians, 2890-3
Inspection, 949, 951
Maritime Provinces, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment to, 865
Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341
Foreign credits, 1359, 2188, 2196, 3832
Gabarus beach protection, 2780
Government advertising, 2038
Government by Order in Council, 4488
Government Printing Bureau, strike, 513
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 651, 1145, 1161
Government's legal position, 695
Grand Trunk Railway Bill, 1184
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483
Halifax harbour master, 2694, 2801
Halifax-St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092
Health Department, 4380
Highways, 731, 4408, 4431-3
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons
Privileges of—Senate's action, 642
Procedure, reinstatement, preliminary motion under rule 25, 398
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Housing scheme, 2555, 2559, 2564

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Immigration and Colonization
Aliens, 2584
Chinese, 2599
Clearance, 1975
Deportees returning, 1977
Illiterates, 1954-67
Inspection, 1973
Lands and land policy, 2575, 2582-3
Nova Scotia, to, 2582-6
Income tax, judges, 3175-9
Indians and Eskimo, 4669
Industrial unrest—Government responsibility; cost of living, capital and labour—tribunal to settle disputes, etc., 3051, 3499
Inland Revenue Act Amdt., 1588
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2955-9, 4368, 4373, 4437-9, 4661
Kinmel Camp, 462
Labour disputes, conference, 2908, 3051
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 7
Little Bras d'Or, 2789
Live stock, pure-bred, 2992-7
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1570, 2062-6
Loans made and to be made, 2245-50
$100,000,000, 4245
$75,000,000, 4198
Lobster packing, 2989
Magistrates and Military Service, 1313
Mail contracts, 2079-83
McRae, Col. J. D., 2234
Migratory birds, 2165
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1529
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 4238
Guelph Novitiate, 1257-9
Mining Act, need of, 425-7
Minister of Railways, annual statement expcted, 1588-9
Ministerial changes, 139
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners, 3757
National harbours, control of, 3742, 3745
Naturalization, 4265-73
Naval service
Charges of Mr. Duff, 2842
Halifax, demobilization of men, 2224
Rebuff by master of N.R. 30, 2947
Neil's harbour, 2781-2
Newsprint control, 4548, 4662
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2038
Opposition and the tariff, 3701
Orders in Council, 1368
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248
Ottawa Street Railway strike, 4535
Partisan appointments, 2095

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Peat, 4490
Pensions, 3000, 4187-90, 4208
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4293
Pilotage, 2806-7, 3158, 3160
Post office revenue and expenses, 2037
Printing Bureau strike, 312
Public Health Bill, 1186, 1189, 1203
Social welfare, 1193-4
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Purchasing Commission, 3228-39, 3810, 3814, 4454
Radiotelegraph service, 2849
Railway Act Consolidation, 2617-33
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631-3
Disagreement with Senate, proposed three-year limit, 4169
Telephone companies — compensation, 2649, 4168
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3090, 3098, 3103, 3115
Railway crossings, 937
Railway rates, municipal and provincial bargains, 4142
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reclamation of Dominion lands, 639
Royal Naval College, 2851
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
St. John harbour, 2359, 4306, 4337-8
Scotch Cove, breakwater, 2782
Seed grain, 1036, 1041
Shipbuilding, 2251, 2254
Soldiers' war gratuity, 2234
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4681
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2778, 3870
Default, re-sale, 3883
Exemption from legal process, 3885-7
Expropriation, 3889-90
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Steamship subsidies
Baddeck and Iona, 1296, 1299
Home prices and, 1292
Newfoundland, 1295, 3829
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
Strikes
Calgary, postal employees, 3194
Post office appointments after strike, 4351
Winnipeg, 2855, 2953, 3070, 3241, 3328, 3472, 3587, 3843, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Supply, interim vote, 1919-20, 842
Sydney port, charges, 3158
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Technical education, 3166, 3173
Payment of subsidy by population, 3893
Provinces and, 3894-8
Titles, 1471, 2703
Trade Commissioners, 4494
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2989
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793
Vancouver harbour, 4017-20
Vocational training, under-age soldiers, 1019
War expenditure, 1359
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2187, 2198, 2224-6, 2232
"Any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 777-780
War Measures Act, 2148
Weights and measures, 952-3, 2154-8, 2290
Welland Canal contracts, 1597-1610
Wrecking plants, 2604
Yarmouth bar, 2783
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-5
Yukon placer mining, 630-2

McLean, Mr. Hugh Havelock (Royal)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1989, 1992-4
New trustee (amdt.), 2002-4
Notice of purpose of meeting, 2014
Order of court, 2010
Security, default, 2000
Trustee, remuneration, 2011

McLean, Mr., Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross (Brome)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 32. League of Nations, 32; financial position — taxation — franchise, 33; congratulations to mover and seconder—national unity—labour and capital, 34; Bolshevism, 35; Siberian force, 36; orders in council —party government, 37; finance and tariff, 38
Agricultural implements, freight on, 4009
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1985, 1992-5, 2006-8, 2265-74, 2278-80
Beef production, 2962
Board of Commerce, 4528-33, 4549-54, 4561
Budget, 3242; amdt. moved, 3260
War expenditures—purchase of Canadian Northern Railway, 3243; national debt—Canadian currency, 3244; taxation, 3247, 3251; trade balance, 3250; estimates, 3251; "Canadian Official Record"—Bureau of Public Information—shipbuilding—housing scheme—Roumanian loan, 3252; high cost of living—tariff, 3254; duty on coal, 3256; mergers, 3259

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1647, 1805
Capital stock, 1821
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715-7
Directors, amdt., 1632; withdrawn, 1636
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1701, 1705, 2111
First meeting, 1659
Government policy asked for, 1396-7
Orders in Council, 1692
Parliament and expenditure, 2111
Canadian Press news service, 4482-6
Cheese, 2962
Civil Service, equality of conditions in, 4479
Combines, 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-62
Aliens and British subjects, 4358-9
Sexual offences, 2161
Unlawful associations, 4356
Dominion Elections Act, 4658
Dominion Iron & Steel, and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Dominion water powers, 2526-9
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2289-90
Fisheries inspectors, 2891
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Good roads, 4389
Government by Order in Council, 2549
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-6
Grain Act Amdt., Appeal Board, 4101
Housing scheme, 2537, 2549
Immigration Act Amdt.—deportation, 1977
Income War Tax
Payment on making return, 3737
Personal and living expenses, 3988-9
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727
Unmarried women, 3993
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, Mr. Justice Weir, 4369
Labour's share in railway management, 1823
Lobster, canned, 715-6
Militia
Permanent force, 3967-9
Policy and expenditure, 1889
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Mines Branch, 4490-1
Newsprint control, 4539
Objectionable words addressed to, point of order, 2538
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Ottawa, Wellington street, 2497
Parliament Buildings, Hall of Fame, 2503
Patronage, 1271, 1278

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Pensions, 4280, 4292
Grandjean, Julien, case of, 4032
"Unmarried wife," 4280
Press, the, and Government advertising, 1822
Public health, 1377
Purchasing Commission, 3222, 4449
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2631
Seed grain, 1040, 1043
Shipbuilding, 2255
Steamship subsidies, 1290
Subsidies, policy, 1298
Tariff—amdt. to Supply, 794
Titles, 1464, 2710
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3110
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1015
Wheeler, Mr. S., wheat grower, 2973
Wireless on Government vessels, 2809
Yukon placer mining, 631

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland (New Westminster)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 419, 424. British Empire and Canada, 419; Royalty and aristocracy and the war—Canada's war record—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 420—new leader of the Opposition—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—Ministers and their duties, 421; Fraser river works, 422; Canadian Northern and New Westminster, 423; Canadian National Railway, 424-5; New Westminster and railways—British Columbia fisheries, 426; International Commission, Major Burdé's charges, 427; waste of fish, 428; Chief Inspector of Fisheries, office—income tax, abuses, 429; business profits tax—highways, 430; highway through British Columbia mountains—"Official Record"—technical schools—Health Department, 431; cost of living—immigration, Orientals in Canada, 433; Bolshevism—returned soldiers, 433, 435
Canadian National Railway, director from British Columbia, 1629
Civil Service war bonus, 2927
Daylight Saving, 904
Fisheries, British Columbia inspector, ques. 1534
Good roads, 3904
Railway Act Consolidation
Amdts., opportunity to make, sought, 2929, 3476, 4064, 4137
Municipal agreement, 4137

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation—*Con.*
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Magdalen Islands, 623, 1910, 2794
Pictou service, 625

Magistrates. *See* Military Service

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 529. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 529; Peace Conference—Party and the farmers, 530; highways—housing—prohibition, 531; farmers' platform, 532; tariff, 534; manufacturers and Western farmers, 535; Union Government, 536; question of markets, 537; grain prices, 539; possible by-elections, 540
Bankruptcy Bill, provinces and, 2007
Budget, 3634. Returned soldiers—Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3635; direct taxation—freights, 3636; Hon. Mr. Calder, 3637; Western farmers' organizations, 3638; Western farmers and co-operation and income tax, 3639; apples—oleomargarine—labour troubles, 3640; regulation of food prices—land values tax, 3641; tariff reductions, 3642
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 4957-65, 4084-7
Appeal Board, 4101-5
Excess profits tax, ques. 977
Franchise, 4641
Good roads, 3899, 3910, 3925
National harbours and grain trade, 2749-52
Ploughs, duties on, 3690-6
Amdt., 3704
Seed grain, 1038, 1043
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3869
Incumbrances, 3884
Initial payments, 3881
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707

Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295

Manion, Mr. Robert James (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (seconder), 17. Bi-lingualism, 17; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Victory—demobilization, 18; Canada's war record, 19; employment bureaux—Canada's development—war work of women, 20; public health—immigration—Canada's duty, 21
Budget, 3280. Tariff changes, 3280; high cost of living, profiteering, 3281; New Zealand's experience, 3282; profiteering and revolution condemned—

Manion, Mr. Robert James—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
natural resources, development of, 3283
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3943, 3957
Appeal Board, 4103-4
Canadian National Railway, 1803
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier as member, 2909
Elevators and American grain, 3838
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 871
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1526
Militia pensions, 2760
Parliament Buildings, 2339
Pensions, 4199, 4203
Case of John Taylor, 3001
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Proprietary medicines, 2491-3, 3824-6
Public Health Bill, 1179, 1202-3
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2325
Shipbuilding, 2259-60
Slate River—Roslyn station, ques. 3191
Technical education, 3798
Titles, 1475, 2718
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 985

Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
ity and, 711

Manitoba Surface Waters, Dominion author-

Manufacturers. *See* Tariff

Maple Syrup and Sugar, ques. 645

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Armed vessels on Great Lakes, 1261
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines, 1677, 1681-2
Directorate, representation of provinces, 1670
Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727
Civil Service reclassification, ques. 610
Fisheries jurisdiction, ques. 609
Good roads, 4424
Matapedia Valley, ques. 1662
Government vessels, employees on, ques. 609
Matapedia aqueduct, ques. 745
Naturalization, 4258-9
New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727
Oyster culture, ques. 609
Pensions, 4178, 4201, 4205-9
Port Daniel lobster hatchery, ques. 609
Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605
Restigouche Indian Reserve, ques. 610
Strikes, 1663
Vocational training, ques. 971
West Indies, trade with, ques. 1533

Marcile, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Bagot)
National Service registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1307, ques. 2296

Marine and Fisheries
Committee, 114
Department
Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439, ques. 1439
Report tabled, 40
Staff and salaries, 2600

Marine Hospitals, 1201

Market Gardening, profits of, 764

Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066

Marshall, Mr. David (East Elgin)
Canned goods, net weight, 2153
Daylight Saving, 903

Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790

Martin, Mr. Peter Francis (Halifax)
Pilotage, 2808

Massett, wharf, ques. 603

Masters and Mates, examination, 2601

Matapedia
Aqueduct, ques. 745
Bridge, 2790
Highway expenditure, ques. 1662

Matches, stamps on, 969

Mayrand, Mr. Hormisdas (Maskinongé)
Coast protection, ques. 745
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Guinness, Hon. Rupert, and, ques. 603

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. (Lobsters). Res., 713; 1r., 727; 2r., ref. to standing com., 2097

Meat Supply and foreign demand, 3831

Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 514. Tariff, duty on implements, 514; freedom of Parliament—party government, 515; War-time Elections Act, 518; disfranchisement—Canada at the Peace Conference, 518; Union government, 521
Alien enemies, 756
Alpine Club, 4046-7
Bills to be introduced, 4456
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4524, 4528-9, 4549-67
British subjects interned in Canada, 1713
Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill, 1388-94

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Bill
Abandoning lines, 1709
Capital stock, 1776-8
Advances and securities, 1778
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Closure of debate, 1789
Interpretation of rule, 1796
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715, 1727, 1760, 1765
Schedule, 1785
Directors, 1624-7, 1653-6, 1783
Executive Com., 1668-74
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1703, 1781-2
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675-6
Head office, 1652
Inquiries, 1782
Labour representation, 2139
Lines to be included, 1679
Parliamentary authority for construction, 1779
Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1695-6
Securities of other companies, 1781; amdt., 1782; withdrawn, 1862
Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706
Criminal Code amdts.
1. Unlawful associations, concealed weapons, etc., 4134, 4355-67
Senate amdts., 4660
2. Sexual Offences, 1710, 2159, 2164
Senate amdt., 4634, 4689-90
3. Fire prevention, 1573-85
Combines Bill, 4198, 4567-70, 4588-4601
Cost of Living Com., 4327
County Court judgeships, vacancies, 1796
Daylight Saving, 1422
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt.
1. Corrective, 1789, 2297-2305
2. Land for soldiers, 2953, 3070-3
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 1111, 1112
Pre-emptions, power sites, mining, timber, etc., 4251-4
Dominion Lands and Parks. *See above,* Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks
Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt., 72, 930-1
Expenditures, 4046-56
Dominion Power Board, 4048
Dominion water powers, 2291, 2512-31
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1149-59
Greek Catholics in communion with the Church of Rome, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 1227, 1258-9
Indian lands, mining rights, etc., 4254-7
Indians
Greater production, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Medical attendance, 4060
Ontario and Quebec, 4668
Reserves, roads and bridges on, 4057-60
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, pretensions of strikers, duties and responsibilities of Government, Bolshevism, collective bargaining, etc., 3035
Interpretation Act Amdt. (Superior Courts), 1957, 2313, 2959
Irrigation, 4603
Irrigation Act Amdt., 71, 632-3, 696
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2305-13, 2954-9
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (salaries), 4063-4212-38, 4435-9
Senate amdts., 4661
Juvenile Delinquents Bill, 1383, 3843
Langelier, Magistrate, 1324
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Migratory birds, 4604
Convention, 2164-6
Military Service Act
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Defaulters, 971, 1910, 2198, 4238
Uniformity of administration, 1308
Wright County, administration, 2400-2
Mining laws, 4257
Oil-bearing lands, 929, 4136
Pelee Island, 4042
Post office appointments after strike, 4349
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 5, 592
Railway policy of Government, 1397
Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill, 71, 639-642, 708-713
Returned soldiers
Government policy concerning, 759
Mining prospectors, as, 4045
St. Lawrence river dams, 886
Seed grain advances, 625-9, 1029-40, 4047, 4054-5
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2291, 3848-91, 4012-7. *See also, under this head,* Returned soldiers
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1438
Surveys, 4049-51
Taber irrigation district, 4210-2
Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
War Measures Act Extension Bill, 1433, 1566, 2097, 2148
Water-power, 4049
Winnipeg strike, 3845
Yukon Act Amdt. Bill, 5, 592
Yukon, government of, 4045-6
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. Bill, 71, 629-632

Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498

Mennonites, 1260, 1913, 1920-7. *See also* Immigration

Mercier, Cardinal, 1482, ques. 1611

Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 319. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Siberian expedition, 319; demobilization, 322; pensions—soldiers' land settlement, 323; dispersal areas, documentation, transportation, 324; the returned man and his job, 328; priority in return—war service badges, orders, decorations and medals, 327; war records and documents, 330; French Canadian Brigade, 331; soldiers' graves, 332
Air Board and Air Service, 2054, 4687
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Canadians in Imperial Service, 1997
Demobilization, 2173-6
Dental Service, and, 2775
Farmers' sons, of, 1958
Ministerial statement, 1793
Portland, 648
Port of debarkation, 2403
Progress of, 4535
St. John, men in garrison, 2236
22nd Battalion, 1616
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, preparation of, 1908
Guelph Novitiate, 1222
Imperial Guards, 2753
Jenkins report on Canadian Army Medical Corps, 358
Kinmel Camp riots, 315
Military management, charges of General Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1493
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208, 4238
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892
Cadet corps, 1888, 1892

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C.—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Command pay, 1886
Engineer services and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Returned soldiers and, 1893-8
Peace rank of war officers, 1890
Permanent force, 1898-9, 4495
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, camps, 1900
Transport and freight, 1900
Units, war, continuance of, 1887
War record of militia, 1889
Militia Act Amdt. (Permanent Force), 3469, 3966-87
Militia Pensions Act Amdt., 2691-2, 2754-61
Period of service, 2754
Widows and children, 2758
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, 550
Purchasing Commission, 4448
Roumanian border, proposed Canadian guard, 1618
Siberian expedition, 971
Soldiers
Complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Furlough in France, 272
Halifax, discharge or leave, 1663, 1711
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1896
War expenditure ($350,000,000), 2173
War trophies and paintings, 2043
Winnipeg strike, 2753
Witley Camp riot, 3472

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 166. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—after-war conditions, 166; women's war work—national unity—highways, 167; railways — tariff — soldiers' dependents, 168
Canadian National Railway, 1816
Clair, N. B., Immigration agent, 2569
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 944-5
Militia, permanent force, 2969
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1000

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1995, 2266-7, 2279
Board of Commerce Bill, 4559
Second reading—Yeas and nays asked for, 4527
Canadian Pacific Railway Company Bill, 3214
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sexual Offences), 2163

Middlebro, Mr. William S.—*Con.*
Exportable wheat, ques. 1790
Fire prevention, 1577-82
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 869
Population of cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Prohibition, 2665
Railway Act, disagreement with Senate, power and telephone clauses, 4164
Railway Committee, permission to sit while House is in session, 1864
Revenue, expenditure, ques. 1217

Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670

Migratory Birds, 4604

Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2097; 2r., com., 2164; 3r., 2305

Militarism, 1888

Military Defaulters' Disqualification Bill. 1r., 2198, 2293

Military Escort of Roman Catholic Bishop, ques. 2296

Military Hospitals Commission, 1264. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Military Service Act
Administration
Expense of, ques. 601, ques. 645, ques. 749, ques. 973, ques. 1306, ques. 1438
Localities: Montreal, ques. 973; L'Islet, ques. 979; M.D. No. 3, ques. 1076; Hull, ques. 1306; M.D. No. 4, ques. 1439; Wright, 2399
Persons: Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306; Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439; Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566; Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306; Harris, Mr. S. L. Dale, 3926; Labelle, Mr., ques. 1306; Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612; Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066; Woodbury, Mr. Harry, ques. 2048
Uniformity of, res., Sir Sam Hughes, 1308
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Conscientious objectors, 781, 1929
Defaulters, 134, 227, 264, 346, 351, 396, 451, 461, 545, ques. 883, 971, 1910, 2250, 4238
Deserters, 72
Disfranchisement of, 496, ques. 1957, 2198, 2293
Evaders, Chicoutimi, 409
Imprisonment of, ques. 2566
Return of, 1866
Shot at, alleged, 1208
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Exemptions, ques. 884, ques. 1108
Farmers, and, 1233
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion, Sir Sam Hughes, 1218; withdrawn, 1259

Military Service Act—*Con.*
Number conscripted, ques. 972
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973

Military Votes Overseas, Judge Gibson, ques. 1440

Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892, 4495
Barrack labourers, etc., 1899
Barriefield Militia buildings, 3985
Cadets, 1888, 1892
Command pay, 1886
Department
Audit of accounts, ques. 2199
Engineers' service and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Officers, peace rank, 1890
Overseas administration, Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt charges, 1099
Printers in department plant, 312. *See also* Printing Bureau
Salaries, 1532
Permanent force, 1898, 4495. *See also* Militia Act Amdt.
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Steam shovels, ques. 1907
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, 1900
Transfers and promotions, report tabled, 40
Transport and freight, 1899
War record of, 1887
War units, continuation of, 1887

Militia Act Amdt. Bill (Permanent Force). 1r., 3469; 2r., 3966; com., 3968, 3971; 3r., 4002; amdt., Mr. Robb, neg., 4002

Militia Council, report tabled, 40

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2690; 1r., 2692; 2r., com., 2753-4; 3r., 2856; Senate amdts., 3782

Mines and Minerals
Canadian Mining Institute, 4492
Coal, lignite briquetting, 4488
Committee, 114
Copper refineries, ques. 1106
Mineral rights in Dominion lands, 4251-7. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Non-ferrous metals, 1052, 3681
Prospectors' tools, etc., 4007
Returned soldiers as prospectors, 4045

Mines Branch estimates, 4489

Minister of Marine, speech at Verdun, 3241

Ministers of the Crown
Absence from Parliament, of. *See* Address
House of Commons and, 1002

Ministers of the Crown—*Con.*
Resignations
Hon. T. A. Crerar, 3193. *See also that title*
Hon. T. W. Crothers, 139
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Model Towns. *See* Garden Villages
Molloy, Mr. John Patrick (Provencher)
Budget, 3309. Protection, 3309; farming and tariff, 3311; industrial unrest—Victory loans, 3313; elections, 3314
Hutterites, 1382
"Montmagny," Government steamer, ques. 1613
St. Peter's Reserve, ques. 1076; ques. 1613
Sheep industry, pure-bred stock, 2994
Moncton and Buctouche Railway, 1382
Money. *See also* Banks
Bank and Dominion notes, figures at end of war, 634
Bronze coins. *See* Currency
Gold held against notes, 635
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
Montreal
Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
Conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Port, labour at, ques. 3997
Terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Montreal-Ottawa highway, 2791-2
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 3293; 2r., com., 3757; 3r., 3761
Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustee, replacement of, 2005
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3961, 3965
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1829
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1723
First meeting, 1665
Head office, 1665
Civil Service
Efficiency, inquiry into, 1560
Salaries, high and low, 3811
War bonus, 2925
Wounded soldiers, positions for, 997, 1002
Combines, 4596-7
Criminal Code—aliens and British subjects, 4359-61
Demobilization, Canadians in British units, 2175
Fisheries, refrigerator service, 2890
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 870
Highways, 786
Housing scheme, 2544, 2550-2, 2560
Morphy, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Income war tax—trainmen's expenses, 2990-1
Judges' salaries, 4226, 4371
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2662
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1334
Militia, permanent force, 3970
Naturalization, property rights of aliens, 4260-1, 4270-1
Pensions, 4179, 4181, 4195, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4295
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Purchasing Commission, 3811
Quebec officer charged with embezzlement, 2294
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2621-34
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2632
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3129
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762-3
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066
Trade Commissioners, 4493
Weights and measures, 2150-1
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 997, 1002
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mothers' Pensions, 156
Mounted Police. *See* Royal Northwest
Moving Pictures, 267
Mowat, Mr. Herbert Macdonald (Parkdale)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Bankruptcy Bill, 1986-8, 1994, 2274
Farmers and, 2007
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2003, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4558-60, 4566
Civil Service, efficiency of, 1558
Divorce Court Bill, 3783, 3786-8
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4585
Electrocution Bill, 1957
Fire prevention, 1582
French River waterway, 1082
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761, 4012-3
Judges' salaries and duties, 2312, 2956
Militia, permanent force, 2982
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2620-4, 2637
Power clause, amdt., 4147; withdrawn, 4165
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, Hydro-Electric, 3073; amdt., 3082; neg., 3133; 2nd. amdt., 3133; agreed to, 3134
Universal military training, 1891

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Bell, Col. McKelvey. *See under this head,* Soldiers
Bruce report, 4071
Canadian Army Medical Service, 358, 513
Censorship, 1110
Dominion Elections Act. Amdt., 4652, 4658
Dominion water powers, 2512, 2515
Doukhobor lands, 2043
Easter adjournment, 886
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 140
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 942
House of Commons, Wednesday evening sittings, 929
Kinmel Camp riots, 315, 357
Labour situation in the West, 2798-9
Lobster, canned, 715
Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066
North Bruce, returning officer, ques. 2406
Oil, Peace River district, 4135
Pratt, Lt.-Col., statements of and reported resignation of High Commissioner, 647
Printing Bureau strike, 314, 398
Sedition, 3291, 4134
Seed grain, 1029
Shaughnessy, Lord, report interview, 648
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Director of Medical Services, 3240, 3472, 4240
Soldiers, penal servitude, cases, 1029, 1163
Trade discrimination against Canada, 115, 229, 314
Winnipeg strike, 3069
Postal employees, replacement of, 2855
Witley Camp riots, 462

Murray Bay
Ferry, 4335
Train service, 2449

Musicians, travelling, immigration of, 1942

Myers, Mr. Edward Thomas Wordon (Kindersley)
Budget, 3526. Tariff revision — wheat prices, 3526; returned soldiers and the land—income tax, 3529; natural resources of Western Provinces—tariff, 3530; optimism, 3531.
Eston, Sask., experimental farm, 2979
Live stock, pure-bred, 2993-4
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat
Crop of 1919, 3471
Shipment facilities, 2261

Napadogan, ice at., ques. 972

National Battlefields Commission, 138, 4482

National Gallery, 2797

National Research Institute, 1565, 1709. *See also* Industrial

National Service Registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1076, ques. 1306, ques. 2296, ques. 2296, ques. 2296
Assistant Registrars, payment of, ques. 1907
Bagot County, ques. 1307
Employees, ques. 2145
Expenditure, ques. 2296
Rental, ques. 2145
Salaries, ques. 1306, ques. 1440, ques. 2565
Unpaid accounts, ques. 2296

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Natural Gas, Pelican Rapids, 4605

Naturalization, 1046. *See* British Nationality; Immigration

Natural Resources. *See* Dominion Lands; Mines and Minerals
Development of, 302, 3283

Naval Air Bases, ques. 1532

Naval Service
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1340, ques. 1534
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434, 1483
Courts martial, members of, ques. 1534
Department of
Report tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2811
Destroyers, ques. 880, ques. 1534
Discharge of men, 1959, 1996
"Hochelaga," dismissal of officer, ques. 1340
Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340
Ministerial statement, 2810
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Pay claims, ques. 746
Recruiting, ques. 646, ques. 747
Seymour Narrows battery, ques. 975
Trawler No. 30, ques. 975
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., sale of, ques. 1534
Wireless, separation allowance, ques. 1905

Navigation, Aids to, 2608-10

Negroes, Rioting in England by, 3741

Neil's Harbour, 2781

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter (North Oxford)
Bank mergers, 1095
Bankrupty Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2006, 2012
Board of Commerce, 4506, 4551-3
Budget, 3547. Cost of living, 3547; tariff and profits, 3549; business profits war

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tax, 3551; tariff and freight rates, 3552; taxes, tariffs and tax-free bonds, 3553
Canadian National Railway Company
Commission control, 1403
Executive Com., 1673
Cost of Living Com., 4313
Daylight Saving, 899
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 691
Immigration of illiterates, 1961, 1964
Income tax, number of taxpayers, 3726
Militia pensions, 2757-8
Pensions, 4182-98, 4201-10
Prohibition, 2351
Public ownership of railways, 692
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2626-34, 2640
Telephone companies, 2643-4, 2649
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3131
Railway crossings, 937
Seed grain advances, 626
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763, 2769

New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727

Newfoundland. *See* Steamship services

New Harbour, N.S., 2783

Newspaper Postage, ques., 727

Newspapers and Periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 4483

Newsprint Control, ques. 613, ques. 752

Newsprint Control Bill. Res., 4535; 1r., 4549; 2r., 4662; 3r., 4663

New Westminster, railways, and, 423, 426

New Zealand, markets in, 2222

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Judges' salaries, 4369, 4373

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken (East Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 143. Returned soldiers, 143; housing—capital and labour, 144, 145; tariff, 144; Department of Labour—franchise, alien enemies — Bolsheviki, 145; returned soldiers — patronage — commissions, 146; General Pau—prohibition—His Majesty's complimentary banquet to President Wilson, 147; Prime Minister and Peace Conference —Canada's war record, 148

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, 4499
Canadians in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian National Railway, 1402-19
Combines, 4571
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 683, 1137
High Cost of Living Com., 4009
Special report, motion for concurrence, 4307-8, 4333
Immigration Act Amdt.
Illiterates, 1962
Interned alien enemies, 1947
Land for soldiers, 3071
Liquor, illegal exportation, 960
Little Current, 2789
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1527
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1333
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4287
Post office appointments after strike, 4352
Prohibition, 2669
Public ownership of railways, 682
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2627
Telephone companies, 2649-50
Railway engineers—cattle on track, 2617
Rural postmasters, 2035
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769
Titles, 2720
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2951

Nickel, 1053, 3681

Nickle, Mr. William Folger (Kingston)
Board of Commerce, 4519
Coasting trade with United States, 1110, 1209
Criminal Code
Election by prisoner, 4366-7
Unmarried registering as married, 2160
Divorce Court Bill, 1662, 3761, 3779, 3883-91
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Good roads, 3910, 4416
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 677
Immigration, orchestras, 1943
Income tax, 3736
Judges, 3716
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3728
Industrial unrest — after-war conditions, profits, sympathetic strikes, etc., 3025
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1336
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Militia, permanent force, 2967, 3971, 3985
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4283-5
Public ownership of railways, 680

Nickle, Mr. William Folger—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate
Form of resolutions, 4157
Free conference, rep. 4067
Power clauses, 4159
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities; Hydro-Electric, 3105, 3109
Railway crossings, 700
Railway situation, responsibility for, 678
Returned soldiers, appointments to Civil Service, 290
Scientific research, 1566
Seditious books, etc., 4367
Titles, 1441, 1479, 2395
Correction of report, 2615
Motion for adoption of Com.'s rep., 2696, 2713-4, 2722, 2743
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
Wounded soldiers
Civil Service positions for, 987
Disability, insurance against, 994
Vocational training for under-age, 1018

Nile Voyageurs, 4380

Nipissing Lake, water power, ques. 1341

Non-ferrous Metals. *See* Mines

Non-sectarian Schools. *See* Education

North Bruce, Returning Officer, ques. 2046

Northern Canada, development of, 302

Northern Construction Company, 1645

"Northland" Inquiry, rep. tabled, 111

North Sydney, works at, 1263-78

Northwest Territories, Commissioner of, 4045

Nova Scotia
Fair wage officer, ques. 1907
Fishing fleet, 1866

Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066

Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., 2342

Noxious Weeds, 4091

Nurses, Military, residence for at Kingston, ques. 3377

Oath, administered by private parties, 2016

Oaths of Office Bill, 2

Ocean Freight Rates, 1051. *See also* Waterborne traffic

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2452

"Official Record," 431

O'Halloran, Mr., 4021

Oil-bearing Lands
Leases, ques. 2199
Northern Alberta, 4070
Peace River district, 4135
Shell Transport and Trading Co., 929, 4070

Old Age Pensions, 157

Oleomargarine, 2201, 3708

"One Big Union"—Calgary, ques. 2143

O'Neill, Mr., contractor, 1274

Ontario, North, Vacancy, 4

Ontario, Prohibition Votes, 2663

Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonizing of, ques. 748

Opposition Leadership
Congratulations by Sir Thomas White, 27
Mackenzie, Mr. D. D., announces his election as temporary leader, 21-2
Robb, Mr., Chief Whip, 3

Orchestras, admission to Canada, of, 1943

Orders in Council under War Measures Act, 4486. *See also* War Measures Act Extension
Alien enemies, deportation of, 1977
Number passed, ques. 2145

Ottawa. *See also* Parliament Buildings
Central Station, ques. 1213
Government arrangement with, 2495, 4380
Highways, 2791
Hunter Building, 2507
Public buildings, lighting, 2503
Wellington street, repairs, 2495

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, 2855

Ottawa-Hull Bridge, 2790

Ottawa Improvement Commission, 138. *See also* Ottawa

Ottawa Improvement Commission Bill. Res., 4246; 1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4380; 3r., 4386

Ottawa River Dams, 2796

Oyster Culture, ques. 609. *See also* Fish

Packing Companies
Overcharges, 3281
Taxation of, 4478

Palmer, Rev. Kennedy H. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Panet, Mr. Louis Charles, 4

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph (Beauharnois)
Bust of Sir Robert Borden, ques. 2050, ques. 2295

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 1212
Civil Service, state of, 4605
Fuel Controller, ques. 2145
Leases of oil lands, ques. 2199
Public health, social welfare, ques. 1205
Rate of exchange, ques. 2145

Pardee, Mr. Frederick Forsyth (West Lambton)
Budget, 3532. Tariff and popular unrest, 3542; profiteering, 3544; income tax—tax-free bonds, 3545; duties of labour and of capital, 3546
Daylight Saving, 918
Housing scheme, 2547
Judges' salaries, 2955
Railway Act Consolidation: transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3123
Shipping, transfers, 3928

Parent, Mr. George (West Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 540. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 540; returned soldiers, 541; highways—housing—Northern Quebec, Ungava, 542; excess profits tax—Military Service defaulters, 544; Quebec and national unity, 545
Bankruptcy, remuneration of trustees, 2013
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821
Canadian National Railway
Deficit, 2456
Quebec, conditions in, 2457
Dominion water powers, 2517, 2529
Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Pilotage, 2806
St. Charles River dredging, 2788
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans, 2785
St. Lawrence ship channel, 2608
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769-70
Steamers, "Lady Evelyn" and "Princess," ques. 3680

Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213

Paris Agency, 1901

Paris or French Foot (measure), 952-4

Pariseault, Lieut., ques. 884

Parkinson, Lieut.-Col., ques. 1441

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Speaker; Deputy Speaker; House of Commons

Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Allocation of space, joint Committee with Senate, 3782, 3585, 3680
Materials, construction, plans, probable date of completion, etc., 2331-41, 4621

Parliamentary Documents, distribution of, 2455

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee on, 115

Paroles, McMillan, Pearson and Heaton, 4070

Party Government and parties, 15, 27, 32, 37, 55, 69, 97, 108, 125, 268, 344, 371, 376-391, 412, 440, 489, 515, 530, 566, 570, 807, 1633, 1746

Patent Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Patent Record, 3842

Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3808; 2r., 4021; com., 3r., 4023

Patents, Commissioner of. *See* Patent, etc., Bill

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic

Patronage, 146. *See also* Highways
Canadian National Railway, 1639
Civil Service and, 387. *See also* Civil Service
Medical men and, 171
Port Hastings, 961
Postmasters, 410, 412
Printing Bureau and, 387

Pau, General, visit of to House, 137, 141, 147

Peace, 1, 125. *See also* League of Nations; War; Reconstruction
Armistice, terms of, 2042
Celebration of, 4238
Costa Rica, message, 2

Peace Conference, 446
Canada's position in, 248, 777
Canada's representation at, 1, 14, 18, 132, 142, 148, 169, 182, 242, 249, 265, 272, 351, 367, 389, 421, 474, 478, 495, 530, 1381, 3676
Poland and Ukrainians, etc., 3472. *See also* Poles

Peace Treaty, 2096
Civil and religious liberty, 2043
Copy of terms, 4239
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Eight-hour day, 2044
Ratification, 2200
Signing of, 3473
Summary, 2146

Pearson, Sir Arthur, 2874

Peat, 4489

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus Wesley, V.C. (Skeena)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 463. Thanks for reception—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—answer to criticisms of leaders of Canadian Corps, 463; Cambrai, 464; La Vicoigne—Sir Arthur Currie's care of soldiers' lives, 466; his promotion—Mons, 467; Canadian soldiers and British press and public, 468; Sir Charles Ferguson, 469; reconstruction, support of public opinion needed—women's war work, 470; Kinmel Camp riots, conduct of Canadian soldiers at Rhyl—Union government—Liberals and Unionists—free trade, 471; Grand Trunk Pacific—unifying effect of the trenches, 472
British Columbia salmon and halibut, 1535
Budget, 3676. Prime Minister and Peace Conference—free trade, 3676; social unrest—income, inheritance and land values taxes, 3677
Enters House of Commons Chamber, 185
Massett wharf, ques. 603
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1501
Pensions, 4174, 4178, 4180, 4293
Railway Act—municipal rate bargains, 4141
Soldiers' graves, 332

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis (South Renfrew)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 185. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 185-186; Col. Peck, V.C., 185; victory and peace, 186; returned soldiers, 187; Liberal party, 189; finance, 191; tariff, 193
Agricultural implements, duties on, 3694, 3705
Arthurs, Col. James, M.P., ques. 2653
Bankruptcy, 2472-3
Bureau of Statistics, 3178
Business profits war tax, 3710
Canadian National Railway, 1410
Capital stock, 1816
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1773
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2137
President's salary, 1658
Canadian Press news service, 4485
Canal statistics; salaries, 3178-9
Cold storage, 2984, 2987
Combines, 4568-71, 4588
Draper, Mr. P. M., Printing Bureau, ques. 3999
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Electric wiring in public buildings, 2505
Exchange, rate of, 1362

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis—*Con.*
Fire prevention, 1574-81
Good roads, 4409
Government agricultural publications, 2991
House of Commons, cross benches, desks for, 2503
Housing scheme, 2562
Income war tax, 3718-23
Bad debts, 3722
Garment factory operators, 3994
Travellers on commission, 3990
Insurance Act Amdt. (actuaries), 3988
Letter postage rate, 4621
Military Service Act, 1312
Naturalization, 4128-9, 4258-9
Newsprint control, 4538
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4250
Oysters, 2899
Pensions, 4200, 4204, 4206
"Unmarried wife," 4287
Proprietary medicines, 2487, 3824
Purchasing Commission, 3207
Railway mail service, 2087-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872-3
Exemption from legal process, 3866-7
Notice of expropriation, 4016
Technical education, 3174-5, 3895-7
Titles, 1468
War expenditures, 1362
Weights and measures, 953, 2152-9
Wheat, market for, 1711, 2998-3000
Wool, 2989

Pelee Island, 4033

Pelican Rapids Gas Well, 4605

Pelletier, Mr. Francois Jean (Matane)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 393. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—industrial unrest, 393; cost of living, 394; soldiers' land settlement—immigration—War-time Elections Act, 395; national unity—titles—military service defaulters, 396; "Light in the window," 397
Canadian National Railway, 1831
Cold storage, 2984
Industrial unrest, after-war conditions, etc., 3017
Lumber purchases for railways, ques. 1217
Order, relevancy, 2725
Pilotage, 2808, 3160

Pembroke wharf, 2787

Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 1616. Res., 4033; 1r., 4033; 2r., com., 4171, 4199, 4274; 3r., 4335
Amdt., Mr. Lemieux, neg. on div., 4336
"Unmarried wife," 4198-9, 4274

Pensions, 17, 79, 92, 107, 159, 294, 323, 343, 497, 502, 588, ques. 882
Board, ques. 1790, 2448, ques. 3066
Appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Employees, ques. 611
Vancouver office, ques. 3377
Committee, 139, 424, 550, 3926, 3997
European war and active militia (vote of $28,000,000), 3000
Number, etc., ques. 1076
Orders in Council tabled, 312
Payments, ques. 1307
Widows of Generals, 2448

Permanent Force. *See* Militia Act Amdt.

Peticlerc, Mr. Joseph, 164

Petitcodiac River, 2898

Piche, Lt.-Col., ques. 600, ques. 2871

Pictou Island, 2793

Pilotage, 2610
Report tabled, 185. *See also* Canada Shipping

Ploughs, Duty on, 3690. *See also* Agricultural implements; Budget

Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 3472, 4465, 4534, 4620, 4690. *See also* Peace

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 2199

Pomeroy, Major A. L., Inspector of Farms, ques. 2567

Population
Cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Trend to urban centres, 896

Porter, Mr. Sydney P., 1638, 1834

Port Felix, Custom House, 956

Port Hood Wharf, 2782

Portland Cement, duty on, ques. 1612

Port Mann, ques. 979

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay

Postmaster General
Report tabled, 40
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 1974. *See also* Ministers

Post Office. *See also* Industrial unrest; Strikes
Calgary employees after strike, 3194
Letter carriers
Bonus, 2084
Overseas service, 2444
Toronto, 1341
Letter rate, 4621
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 3068
Mail carriers, 413
Mail contracts, rural mail, rural post offices, surplus, 2079-96

Post Office—*Con.*
Mails and Canadian National Railway, 2087, 2094
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Outside service, salaries, 2079
Postmasters, rural, 413, ques. 1536
Quebec City, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton, ques. 2750
Refusal to deliver mail, 1435
Rural mail boxes—parcel post, 2093
Rural mail couriers, 2926
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 2016
Statistics, ques. 2903
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg, ques. 2750
Transatlantic mails, 886, 929

Post Office Appointments Bill. 1r., 3809; 2r., com., 4345; 3r., 4355

Power Companies. *See* Electric and Power Companies; Canadian National Railway

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan (South Quebec)
Allowance to officers, ques. 1667
Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., speech at Verdun, 3241
Canadian National Railway
Directorate to include a returned soldier, amdt. 1637, neg. 1638
Lines to be included, 1686
Steamships, 1689
Canadian Pacific Railway Station, Quebec, ques. 3587
Civil Service vacancies, ques. 2049
Daylight Saving, 923
Employment agent, Quebec, ques. 1791
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1573-8
Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Forest Products Laboratories, ques. 3068
Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601
Immigration Act Amdt.—conspiracy, 1948
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, after-war conditions, etc., 3032
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Kinmel Camp riots, ques. 3469
Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067
Lévis Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Marine Department, Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1523, 1531
Militia
Permanent force, 1898
Staff positions and returned soldiers, 1893
Units and members, war record of, 1890-
Pensions, 4288-92, 4297

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan—*Con.*
Piché, Lt.-Col., ques. 600
Public Health, social welfare, 1206
Quebec terminal facilities, ques. 3469
Questions and answers, complaint of contradiction, 648
St. Louis Road property, ques. 604, 2769-70
Soldiers
Courts martial, 3470
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, ques. 1307
Returned
Port of debarkation, 2402
Usurers and, ques. 977
22nd Battalion, 1616
Russia, in, 1216
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2770, 2773-4
Allegations of Lt.-Col. McKelvey Bell, 3422
Solicitors, Department of Railways and Government Railways, 1591-2
Strikes, 1918, ques. 619
Titles—Com. to consider. Points of order—unanimous consent, and acceptance of principle, 1482
War bonus, arsenal and marine employees, 2926
War service gratuity, ques. 1791
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2945

Pratt, Lieut.-Col., charges by, 1099, ques. 1213, ques. 1216, ques. 1483

Precious Metals in Nickel Ores, 3682-9

Press, The, 201-3, 246, 267
Attitude of, 2917
Freedom of, 350
Government advertising, 1822
Public announcement of ownership, 1562

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 1912, 4135

Prevost, Mr. Jules Edouard (Terrebonne)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 521. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 521; allegations of Gen. Hughes and Gen. Smart, 522; after-war problems, 523; prices, 524; tariff, 525; excess profits tax, 526; Union government, 528; French Canadians—grants for housing, highways, public health, 529
Casualties amongst French Canadians, ques. 644
Catholics, enlistment of, ques. 3998
Exemption tribunals, ques. 1438
Georgian Bay Canal, ques. 843
House of Commons reading room, 318, ques. 843
Military Service Act, ques. 2296
National Service Registration, ques. 1306, ques. 1440
War tax, income, exemption, ques. 611

Prices. *See* Canada Food; Combines; Cost of Living; Board of Commerce; Budget; Industrial unrest

Prince Edward Island
Greater production grant, ques. 601, ques. 2566

Prince of Wales, 420
H.R.H. visit to Canada, 2629

Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. *See also* War
Travelling accommodation, ques. 1307

Printing Bureau, 424
Commission of investigation, 1812
Editorial Com., 1435
Expenses, ques. 844
Printing done by, ques. 844
Report, 229, 230
Strike, 398, 513, 1561
Statement by Minister, 312

Printing Com., 113, 115

Printing and Stationery Dept., 4687

Private Bills Com., 112

Private Bills Discussed
Athabasca, Grande Prairie and Fort Vermilion Railway, 2778, 4534
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4344
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 3782
Senate amdt., 3214
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2015, 2295
Senate amdts., 2903
Grey, Margaret, divorce, 4533
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway, 1404
London and Port Stanley Railway, 1184

Privilege
Borden, Sir Robert—Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Bureau, Mr.—Statement of Mr. H. A. Mackie, 4002
Edwards, Mr.—Report in Ottawa Journal, 1997
Fournier, Mr.—Public ownership of railways, 1866
Gauvreau, Mr.—Hansard, correction, 970
Lemieux, Mr.—erroneous report of speech of Mr. J. D. Reid, 3378
Stacey, Mr.—misunderstanding of remarks of Mr. Lemieux, 3422

Privileges and Elections Com., 112

Privy Council Department, salaries, 4486

Production, grants to encourage, ques. 2566

Profiteering. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Industrial unrest

Prohibition, 2, 137, 147, 223, 343, 403, 437, 456, 490, 531, 588, 2658. *See also* Intoxicating Liquors; War Measures Extension

Properties Leased by Government 3377

Proportional Representation, 3069, 4620

Proprietary Medicines
Alcoholic content of, ques. 646
War tax, ques. 1107

Proprietary Medicine Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., com., 2479; ref. to special com., 2653; com., 3823; 3r., 3938

Prorogation, 4701

Protection. *See* Budget; Tariff

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Bankruptcy, 2279, 2469-70, 2474
Budget, 3460. Taxes—economy in public expenditure, 3460; good roads, 3461
Canadian National Railway, coal, ques. 1211
Civil Service, specialists, 1184
Currie, Sir Arthur, proclamations by, ques. 607
Customs and Inland Revenue, salaries, 954
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 855
Fort William, railway lands, ques. 883
Franchise, 4622
Good roads, 3908
Hanna, townsite of, ques. 1535
Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602
Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791-2
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311, 2958, 4226, 4370, 4375
Exemption from income tax, 4234
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2453
Port Mann, ques. 979
Repatriation Committee, ques. 613, ques. 1340
Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2398, ques. 2566
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Speaker, Mr., living allowance, 2445

Provident Fund. *See* Intercolonial

Provincial Autonomy. *See* Housing; Highways; Technical Education

Public Accounts, 138
Committee, 113

Public Buildings, 2508, 4610. *See* Parliament; *also names of localities*

Public Debt. *See* Budget; War expenditure

Public Health, 2, 15, 21, 25, 94, 97, 135, 184, 214, 223, 456, 490, 504. *See also* Health Department Bill
Department of, 82, 174, 301, 431, 445, 4380
Appointments, 1182
Director General, 2572
Infant mortality, 336
Medical profession and, 1378

Public Health—*Con.*
Provincial rights and, 1369
Scientific research and, 1390. *See* Scientific
Tuberculosis, 498
Soldiers, returned, amongst, 183

Public Information Department, 40, 203, ques. 728, ques. 728, ques. 748, ques. 750, 4673
United States Representative, ques. 2145. *See also* Public Information

Public Ownership of Railways. *See* Canadian National
Shaughnessy, Lord, and, 1630, 1820, 1825

Provincial Subsidies, ques. 744

Public Welfare, Department of, proposed, 156

Public Works, 2780-97
Department
Cleaning, 2495
Clerk of Works, 2502
Concentration of works under, 1262-3
Contingencies, inspection service, 1278
Deputy Minister, 2330
Reform in, 2496
Report tabled, 40
Solicitor, 1270-8
Staff and salaries, 1262, 1266, 2330
Travelling expenses, 2331
Expenditure on, 44, 47
Ottawa
Hunter Building, 2507
New departmental building on Wellington St., proposed, 2507
Parliament Building, 2331-41
Public buildings, elevator service, lighting, heating, cleaning, repairs, furniture, etc., 2494-6, 2504
Rentals, 2505-7
Quarantine stations, 2503
Tender and contract, works not done under, 1263

Pugwash Spur, ques. 3067, ques. 4239

Purchasing Commission, appointments, 3470

Purchasing Commission Bill. Res., 3810, 4439; 1r., 1162; 2r., 3195-3211, 3215-27; amdt. (6-mos. hoist), 3220; neg., 3226; com., 3227
Commission, membership, powers, etc., 3227, 3232, 3236, 3810
Directors, 3228
Estimates, 3238
Records, 3236
Requisitions, 3237
Staff, 3228
Supplies to be purchased, 3238
Tender, 3239

Quarantine, 4682

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2449

Quebec Bridge, ques. 977

Quebec City
Canadian National Railway, improvements, ques. 978
Canadian Pacific Railway station, ques. 3587
Employment agent, ques. 1791
Federal buildings on Grand Allee, ques. 976
Kent House site, ques. 976
Military hospitals, ques. 844
Ross Rifle Factory, ques. 976
Terminal facilities, ques. 3469

Quebec Harbour and Port
Property and insurance, ques. 601
Spirituous liquors entered at, ques. 1533

Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605

Quebec Province
Northern, resources of, 542

Quebec Railway, Light and Power Co., 2504

Quorum. *See* House of Commons

Radiotelegraph, 2794, 2848

Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618

Rails, Canadian, sent overseas, 2239, 3863

Railway Act Amdts.
1. Coastwise and inland water rates. 1r., 71
2. Consolidation. 1r., 357; 2r., ref. to standing com., 936; com., 2617, 2929, 3073; 3r., 3157
Disagreement with Senate, 3293; message—consequential amdts., 3473; free conference: proposed, 3473; proposal accepted, 3679; managers appointed, 3738; meeting appointed, 3782; sitting of House not suspended, 3948; report, 4012; considered, 4064
Amdt. to clause 325 (the Board and tariffs), motion to insist, 4136-7, agreed to, 4139; amdt. to clause 374 (Power companies), motion to not insist, 4139, agreed to on div., 4165; amdt. to clause 376 (Telephones), motion to not insist, 4166, agreed to on div., 4169; Senate concurrence, 4456
3. Crossings. Res., 697; 1r., 701; 2r., com., 936; 3r., 1029
4. Location. 1r., 2342; 2r., com., 2510

Railway Belt Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Railway Commission
Daylight Saving, decision, 1422
Officers of, and Civil Service Commission, 2633
Report tabled, 71

Railway War Board
Daylight Saving, and, 907, 910
Railway time tables, 929

Railways. *See their several titles, including* Government *and* Canadian National
Cash subventions by provinces, ques. 604
Cattle on tracks—charge against engineers, 2617
Daylight Saving and. *See* Daylight
Railways extending into United States, 688
Level crossings. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Crossings)
Public ownership of. *See* Grand Trunk Pacific Receivership

Railways and Canals Department
Deputy Minister of, ques. 1215
Lumber purchases, Matane, ques. 1217
Salaries, 1588

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee, 112
Leave to sit while House is in session, 1864, 1886

Raw Materials within the Empire, 1053

***Read, Mr. Joseph** (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 214. Victory loan, 214; Department of Health—food control and European contracts—Union government, 215; general election, 216; Canada's immigrant citizens, 217; Hon. Mr. Calder—returned soldiers, non-productive employment, 218; shipbuilding—Liberalism, 219; tariff, 221
Civil Service, employment in, disadvantage of, 962
Daylight Saving, 901
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 947
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, motion for, 690
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 822

Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209

Reading Room. *See* House of Commons

Reciprocity, 309, 794. *See also* Tariff

Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 639, 708; 3r., 784

Reconstruction. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Highways; Housing; Immigration; Industrial unrest; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Soldiers' Land Settlement; Technical education; War, demobilization

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross

*Deceased April 6

Redman, Mr. Daniel Lee (East Calgary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (mover), 13. Canadian Expeditionary Force, 13; Governor General, appointment of His Excellency, Duke of Devonshire — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Peace—co-operation of British Empire and United States—Paris Conference—Canada's war record, 14; reconstruction—public health—housing, 15; vocational training — highways — franchise—immigration—industrial unrest, 16; returned soldiers—land settlement—pensions, 16
Allied soldiers, settlers, 3881
Divorce Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1584
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1922
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1922
Militia pensions, 2754
Soldiers, wounded, Civil Service positions for, 982

Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904

Registration. *See* National Service

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Department of Railways and Canals
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Canadian National Railway. *See also, under this head,* Canadian National Railway Company Bill
Construction and betterments, 3190, 4614
Death of employee, compassionate allowance, 3175
Expenditure, estimated, 4688
Intercolonial Railway, 2133
Labour trouble, reported, 1617
Operation, 4615-8
Patronage, 1642
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190, 4618
Private cars, 1590
Rates, 4171, 4615-8
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1395-1404, 1405-22, 1620-30, 1640-7, 1653-9, 1667-71, 1676-95, 1705, 1713-6, 1724-5, 1750-4, 1760, 1766-70, 1774, 1779, 2098, 2133-6
Com., suggested ref. to., 1623
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1713-6, 1724, 1769
Charters, schedule of, 1766
Directors, 1627, 1630, 1640, 1654
British Columbia, from, 1629
Executive Com., 1667
Management and operation, 1677-81, 1691

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Powers to construct under Order in Council, 1767
Provinces, representation of, 1570
Railways to be included, 1677-81
United States, in, 1693
Securities, 1769-70
Canals
Power development and export, 1599
Trent, 3188-9
Welland, deepening, work for returned soldiers, 1592-1610, 3175-87
Civil Service
Com. of inquiry, 1709
Salaries, 1591
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Correction of report of speech, 3188, 3221, 3378
Custom houses, as storage places for liquor, 956, 964
Daylight Saving, 919
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-3, 4583-7
Freight rates on raw sugar, 3471
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 701-8, 938-948
Government railways, reference to ministerial statement, 1589
Private cars, 1590
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 399
Highways Aid Bill, 730, 785, 3899-3926, 4391, 4423, 4426-8
Amdt. (agreement with Province), 4431
Lévis station, 2458
Location of railways, 2510-1
National Research Institute, 1709
Paradis, Mr. M., claim of, 3189
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 936, 2617-52, 3134
Senate disagreement, 4064-9
Board control of rates, 4136, 4139
Telephone companies, 4166
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3134
Railway crossings, 697-701, 936-8
Railways and Canals Department
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Railways and steamships, 4683-5
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1023
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2567, 2798
St. Lawrence River water powers, 1796
War Board, railways and Daylight Saving, 909, 929
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2939

Reid, Mr. John Flaws (Mackenzie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 585. Tariff, 585, 589; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — Government's land policy, 587; prohibition—returned soldiers, pensions—land settlement, 588; farmers, workers and manufacturers, 590
Agriculture, live stock, 2970
Briquetting lignite, 3472
Budget, 3593. Income tax—tariff, 3594; undue profits, 3596; agricultural implements—markets and prices, 3597; operation of grain elevators—agricultural implements, 3598; insurance of returned men, 3599
Daylight Saving, 926
Export of feed, Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048
Good roads, 3916-8
Immigration, illiterates, 1953
Shipbuilding, ques. 610, ques. 644
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Repatriation Com., ques. 1340

Representation Act (1914) Amdt. Bill (Fraser Valley). 1r., 4; 2r., com., 625; 3r., 727

Returned Soldiers. *See* War, soldiers

Revenue Bills
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3151; 1r., 3738; 2r., 3988, 4003; com., 4003; 3r., 4012
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Dependents, 3992
Garment factory operators, 3994
Military pensions, 3994
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1586-7; 1r., 1588

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker

Rhyl. *See* Kinmel

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne (Springfield)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 376. Young men and politics, 376; abolition of partyism — Union government — Liberalism, 377; tariff, 378, 391; party tyranny — Senate reform, 380; Liberalism defined, 381; leaders needed, 383; history of party, 384; vicious features of party, 385; public expenditures, 386; Printing Bureau and patronage—Civil Service — translators — Debates Com., 387;

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Canada's troops—war work of Canadian women, 388; Peace Conference and Canada's representation, 389; Mount Carmel, 390; national unity, 392
Board of Commerce, 4509
Budget, 3654. War and aftermath of war, 3654; parties and protection, 3655; Liberal party and the tariff, 3656; tariff commission — East and West, 3660; public ownership—Civil Service—regulation of profits, 3663; Union-War government, 3664
Budka, Bishop, 1917
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1755
Directors, 1635
Head office, 1648
Public ownership, 1630, 1757, 1760
Canadian Press news service, 4484-6
Conner, Mr., Immigration Agent, 2590-3
Cost of Living, 4323
Daylight Saving, 891, 923
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Government printing, Editorial Com., 1435
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1210
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1116, 1152
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1924
Immigration
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916
Deported conspirators, amdt., 1951
Treatment of immigrants, 1916
Judges' railway expenses, 2641
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Newsprint Control, 4541
Prohibition, 2673
Public ownership of railways, 1630, 1757, 1760
Railway Act, local freight rate agreements, 4139
Subsidies, mistaken policy of, 1297
Titles, 1451, 2731
Winnipeg strike, 2799

Rideau Hall, 2500-2

Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398

Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2566

Rimouski and overseas mail, 886, 929

River Beaudette-St. Zotique roadway, ques. 2144

Roads. *See* Highways

Robb, Mr. James Alexander (Chauteauguay-Huntingdon)
Agricultural implement duties and freight rates, 3697-8, 3706
Béland, Dr., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 4
Board of Commerce, 4528-30
Business of the House
Legislation to be brought down, 1616, 2398
Weekly statement of prospective legislation, 599
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3956-60
Canals, contracts, system of, 1598-1600
Canadian Trade Commission, ques. 644
Caughnawaga Reserve, 2902, 4057-8
Civil Service, enlisted men, 2925
Committee, Standing, 2
Cost of Living, 4316
Customs, rebate of duty, ques. 646
Dairy products and the war, 2966-8
Delayed returns, 886
Dominion water powers, 2513-7, 2523
Exhibitions, 2973
Toronto fair, 2997
Export trade, Trade Commission, etc., 2238
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Franchise Bill, probable date, 2906
Good roads, 3902, 4392
Grain trade—operation of elevators, 4087, 4099-4100
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 686
Greece, supply of wheat to, ques. 2907
Housing scheme, 2540, 2564
Income tax and judges' and others' pensions, 3711, 3719
Income, taxable, gross, ques. 2294
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 3
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2061-7
Militia
Accounts, audit of, ques. 2199
Permanent force, 2968, 2974
Amdt. to 3r. of Bill, 4002
National harbours and grain trade, 3751
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Pension cases, 3003
Rails from Canadian railways sent overseas, 2239
Railways
Public ownership of, 686
Provinces and branch lines, 695
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 708
Schools and religious teaching, 2413
Seed grain advances, 1040, 1042, 4047
Sharpe, Lieut.-Col., death of, 3
Siberia, economic commission, ques. 613
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Trade discrimination in Britain, 72

Robb, Mr. James Alexander—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vouchers for overseas payment, 1710
$350,000,000 vote, 2237
War Measures Act, 2148
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2942, 2950
Weights and measures, 2149
Wheat, free, 3707
Winnipeg strike, postal employees, 2508

Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216

Ross, Commander J. K. L., offer of destroyer, ques. 880, 1534

Ross, Mr. Duncan Campbell (West Middlesex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 500. Sir Arthur Currie, 500; demobilization — prospective deficit, 501; vocational training, pensions, land settlement, 502; franchise — War-time Elections Act, 503; public health—farmers and profiteering, 504; Daylight Saving — interior terminal elevators, 505; rural credits—tariff, 506; national unity, 507
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1669-70
Daylight Saving, 903
Fisheries, officers, 2893, 2895
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2065-6
Railway Act, Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3091
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 641

Ross, Mr. P. D. 2915-7
Buildings owned by, rental of, ques. 1438

Rosslyn, 3191

Ross Rifle, ques. 976, 1614

Roumania. *See* Foreign trade

Rowell, Hon. Newton W. (President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 358. War's effect on Canada's national status—Canada and Germany contrasted, 358; Imperial War Conference, 359; Dominions and foreign affairs — Imperial War Cabinet or Council, 360; the Dominion and the Crown — Imperial War Cabinet and Parliament of Canada, 362; Dominions and Prime Minister of Great Britain, direct communication, 365; consulting Parliament, 366; Peace Conference, Canada's representation — League of Nations, 367; Russia, Bolshevism, 368; Canada's war troops, Gen. Sir Arthur Currie, 370

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*

Air Service, mail by, 2036
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821-2
Budget, 3401. Victory bonds, 3402; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices—iron, steel and coal industries, 3405; national debt, 3406; tariff revision, 3407; cost of living and industrial unrest, 3409; Bolshevism, 3412; unity and strength, 3413
Cabinet secrets, alleged revelation of, 3628, 3631
Canadian National Railway, 1747
Public ownership, 1749
Canadian representation at Washington, 2202
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016
Civil Service
Overmanning of, 4671
Postal workers' correspondence, 2342
War bonus, 2314, 2924-8
Consular officers, payments to, 1900
Dominion Police, pay of, 2925-6
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4576-80
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 2074
Good roads, 4392-5
Government by Order in Council, number of orders passed, 4487
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435
Health, 1366-80
Social and industrial conditions, 1366
Health Department Bill, 843, 1164, 1182-3, 1186-1206
Housing scheme, ministerial explanation, 2532, 2539, 2551-64
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Ministerial statement, 1044
Naturalization, East Indian immigration, cables and passports, resources of the Empire, Canada's status, War Graves Commission, etc., 1047-70, 4125-6
India, famine in, 2616
International Joint Commission, 1901-4
Lake of the Woods, technical and control boards, 2067
Mounted Police Bill, Senate amdt., 3809
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2026, 4482
Newsprint control, 4663
Ocean rates, 1051, 2069
Paris agency, 1901
Peace Treaty, 2146
Eight-hour day and, 1996, 2044

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*

Pensions
Commission, expenses, 2448
Com., 139
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4172-96, 4199-4208, 4274-99
Resolution and explanation, 4023
Taylor, Mr. John, 3002
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4279
Vote, $28,000,000, 3000-4
Postal Service
Canadian National Railway and mails, 2094
Finance and expenditure, 2032, 2040, 2092
Mail contracts, 2079-81
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Postage rate, suggested reduction, 2041
Postmasters, substation and rural, 2030
Post Office officials serving overseas, 2040
Rural mail, 2081
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 1794. *See also, under this title,* Winnipeg
Prohibition, 2675-82
Purchasing Commission Bill, 1162, 3195-6, 3223-7, 4441-52
Salaries of Commissioners, res., 3810-6
Railway Act Consolidation, disagreement with Senate, 4160
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply; Ministerial explanation; history of force, war record, etc., 2313-30
Royal Northwest Mounted Police Bill, 2510, 2695-6
St. Lawrence water powers, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396
Shale Oil Company, 1056
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2761-78
Officials, 4674-6
Titles, 2739
Transatlantic mails, Rimouski and Halifax, 929, 1794
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1016
War appropriation; demobilization appropriation, 2564
War Measures Act, Orders in Council under, 4135
War tax on cheques—postage stamps for, 2031-2
War Trade Board, 2072
Washington, Canadian representation; War Mission, 2070, 2076, 2202
Winnipeg strike, 3843-5
Post office employees and, 2508, 3809, 4345

Royal Air Force. *See* War

Royal Assent, 1111, 3213, 4701

Royal Military College building, Clerk of ques. 4377

Royal Naval College, 2850

Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 173, 4672
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply: Increase of the force; history, war record, etc., 2313

Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2509; 1r., 2532; 2r., com., 2695; 3r., 2752; Senate amdt., 3809, 3823

Royal Society of Canada, report tabled, 138

Rural Credits, 506

Ruthenians, 1938, 3472. *See also* Poles

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212

Ste. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464

St. Catharines Bay and Tadoussac service, 411

St. Charles River
Belanger vs. The King, 1021
Contract for damming, ques. 677
Works, 1279, 2788

Ste. Famille wharf, 2786

St. Gedeon, postmaster, 410, ques. 972

St. John Harbour, 2359

St. John Harbour Commission Bill. Res., 4299; 1r., 2r., com., 4306; 3r., 4339

St. John and Quebec Railway Bills
1. Gagetown and Westfield. 1r., 41; 2r., com., 696; 3r., 784
2. Centreville and Andover. Res., 2567; 1r., 2568; 2r., com., 2799; 3r., 2800

St. Laurent wharf, 2785

St. Lawrence
Coal trade, shipping for, 4335
Dams, 886
North shore, communication, 411
Ship channel, 2608
Water power. *See that title*

St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396

St. Louis Road property, ques. 604. *See* Gustave

St. Malo Workshops, ques. 1212

Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958

St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092

St. Stanislaus Novitiate. *See* Military Service, Guelph

St. Zotique-River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144

Saguenay and Labrador winter communication, ques. 2565

Salmon Fishing Licenses. *See* Fisheries Act

Salvarsan, sale of, ques. 2144

Sanders, Lieut. J., ques. 3067

Saskatoon public building, 739

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 406. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —French Canadians, 407; enlistment in Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408; draft evaders—cost of living—woman suffrage, 409; patronage, local postmasters, 410, 412; returned soldiers, 410; North shore communication, 411
Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439
Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566
L'Hereux, Maj. Napoleon, ques. 978
Military Service Registrar, Montreal, ques. 973
Pariseault, Lt., ques. 884
St. Gedeon, postmaster, ques. 972
Saguenay-Labrador, ques. 2565
Tadoussac-Labrador, ques. 3327

Saw Pit Wharf, 2782

School and Dominion Lands in Taber irrigation district, 4210

Schools, Dominion, non-sectarian, 2403. *See* Education

Schools of Navigation, 2601

Scientific Research. *See* Industrial

Scotch Cove, 2782

Scott, Mr. Frank Stewart (South Waterloo)
Budget, 3302. Siberian expedition—tariff—shoe manufacture, 3302; business profits tax—income tax, 3307; Canada's record, 3309
Canadian National Railway, 2111
Public ownership of railways, 2111

Seaweed, 2787

Secretary of State
Powers of in naturalization. *See* British Nationality
Report tabled, 138

Sedition and Seditious Propaganda Com,, 1956, 3285. *See also* Criminal Code; Immigration; Naturalization

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code

Seed Grain, ques. 979, 2446, 4047, 4054-5

Seed Grain Advances Bill. Res., 625; 1r., 629; 2r., com., 1029; 3r., 1111

Seguin, Mr. Paul Arthur (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
National Service Registration, ques. 1907, ques. 2296

Selkirk, postmaster, ques. 1308

Semolina, 3681

Senate
Cabinet Ministers in, 406, 1002-11
Speaker of, living allowance, 2444

Sergeant-at-Arms, Deputy appointed, 4

Sexsmith, Mr. John Albert (East Peterborough)
Bran and shorts, 4007
Cow testing, 2982
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2465-7
Good roads, 794, 3901
Income tax, farmers and, 3733
Military Service Act, 1323
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pensions, 4184
Railway Act Consolidation — telephone clause, 2644-8, 4168

Seymour Narrows Battery, ques. 975

Shale Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Sharpe, Lieut.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., M.P., death of, 3, 549

Shaughnessy, Lord, 648, 1630, 1820, 1825

Shaw, Mr. Hugh Murray (Macleod)
Budget, 3583

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 78. After-war problems—pensions, 79; franchise, 80; aliens—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81; Health Department, 82; public revenues and taxation, 84; Civil Service Commission, 85; Civil Service salaries, 86
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2295
Civil Service
Appointments by Commission, 2633
Reclassification, 2292
Divorce Court Bill, 3785
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4580-3
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 3464
Pensions and disability, ques. 882
Proprietary medicines, 2482
Soothing syrups, 2491
Public Health Bill, 1175, 1182-5, 1205
Public health and social conditions, 1366

Sheard, Mr. Charles—*Con.*
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Titles, 2705
Transmission lines on highways; powers of municipalities, 3100, 3117

Shell Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Shipbuilding, 43, 53, 123, 219, 1688, 4682
Canada's achievements for war, 19
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
George, Right Hon. David Lloyd, opinion of, 2253
Government programme, ques. 613, ques. 644
Vote of $30,000,000, ministerial statement, 2202, 2251
Tariff and, 2217, 2223
Vessels built by Government since 1917, ques. 610

Shipping. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Inter-imperial, 1051
Registration, 2602
Shortage of Canadian tonnage, 2207

Ships. *See* Vessels

Siberian Economic Commission, ques. 613, ques. 747, ques. 1535

Siberian Expedition, 143, 227, 334, 3297, 3741
Alleged imprisonment of Canadian soldiers, 4000
Draftees in, 321
Liquor for, ques. 845
Return of, 971, ques. 1216
Statements by Ministers, 319, 1062

Sick Mariners' Fund, 40, 2615

Sifton, Hon. Arthur Lewis (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Budget, 3260. Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3260; taxation methods—tariff changes — people seeking special favours — tariff commission, 3261; after-war problems, 3262

Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1908

Signal Service, 2610

Simpson, Mr. Thomas Edward (West Algoma)
Budget, 3565. Canada's debt incurred at home—pensions, 3565; cost of living, 3566; iron and steel industries and the tariff, 3567

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen (Queen's P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 457. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—highways—public health, 458; production and marketing, 459; P.E.I.

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
railway, broadening the gauge, 460; fisheries and returning naval men—Orders in Council — deserters — franchise, 461; aliens—national unity, 462
Agricultural Gazette, 2990-1
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, ques. 4464
Cold storage, 2983
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2287-9
Good roads, 4434
Greater production grant, ques. 600, ques. 2566
Judges' salaries, 4223
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Oyster culture, 2892, 2898
"Prince Edward," car ferry, 4618
Prince Edward Island Railway, 460, ques. 4377
Soldiers at Halifax, 1663

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 51. Mr. McKenzie, leader of the Opposition — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 51; victory and peace, 52; highways and housing, provincial rights—shipbuilding, 53; Military Service Act, 54; Union government—party, 55; patronage and graft—public loans, 56; food and Food Board—prices—industrial unrest, 57; Civil Service—trade with the United States, 58; efficiency, 60; Government commissions, 61; labour and reconstruction, 62
Air Board Bill, 2051, 2057
Alien enemies, property of, ques. 1535
Amherst
Doctors, payments to, ques. 3377
Internment camp, 2565, 3848
Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Anti-loafing, ques. 883
Arisaig Wharf, 2780
Ballantyne's Cove, 1302
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004
Bear River, ques. 3242
Bliss, Dr. C., ques. 3397
Board of Commerce, 4556-8, 4566
British Columbia fishing licenses, 934
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Business Profits Tax, ques. 1791
Canada Food Board, ques. 602
Canada Shipping Act, 3756-7, 3931-7
Canadian Expeditionary Force, ques. 1440, ques. 2798
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905
Canadian National Railway
Abandoned lines, 1709
Annual meeting, 1810
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1721
Directors, 1671, 1810
Finance, parliamentary control, 1417, 2124
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1676
Steamships, 1681-4
Canadian Northern Railway, net earnings, ques. 2462
Canadian vessels requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," steamer, ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3177
Welland, deepening of, 3181-4
Canso
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour master, 3158
Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
Censorship, Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Civil Service
Appointments, 963
Commissioners, 2909, 2916
Efficiency, 1559
Overmanning of, 4672
Combines, 4570, 4592-7
Copyright, 4022
Dominion Elections Act, 4621, 4629, 4648-51
Dominion Parks, sites in Western Nova Scotia, 2304
Dominion water powers, 2513, 2515
Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791
Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 1535
Economy, 4051, 4673
Experimental Farms, 2977
Fair wage officer, Nova Scotia, ques. 1907
Farm tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9, 2464-6
Fish and Fisheries
Compulsory inspection, 951
Lobsters, 714-726, 2894, 2899, 2900
Oysters, 2894
Protection service, 2848
Salmon (Fisheries Act Amdt.), 3758-61
Twine and cordage, 3708
Waste, utilization of, 3341
Foreign credits, Italy, 3831-3
Fort Lawrence, dredging, ques. 3680

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Freight rates
Farmers and, 3698
Raw sugar, on, 3471
Gold, prohibition of export, 1103
Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 4070, ques. 4465
Gordon, Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 702-7, 938-9
Government-owned vessels, 974-5, ques. 1306
Grand Etang, 2609
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1185
Guysborough public building, ques. 846
Halifax
Harbour master, 2802
Pilotage rate, 2694
Terminals, ques. 2398
Heatherton-Canso mail route, 2090
"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998
Homestead entries, ques. 751
House of Commons—questions and returns, 648
Housing scheme, 2562
Immigration Act Amdt.
Discharged seamen, 1979
Illiterates, 1966
Penalty on transportation complaints, 1978
Immigration and Colonization Department, 2572
Income war tax, 3717-8, 3725
Losses, 3991
Unmarried women, 3993
Intoxicating liquors, illegal handling of, ques. 883, 960
Judges
County Court, 1769, ques. 2565
Salaries, 4375
Land values tax, 3839
Lands for school purposes, ques. 848
Live stock shipments, 2603
Livingstone's Cove, 2780-1
Loans, public, 4242
$100,000,000, cost of, ques. 1907
Lobster, canned, 714-726
"McKee," steamer, ques. 1212, ques. 2397
Marine hospitals, 1201
Marine rates, ques. 4241
Matches, stamps on, 969
Military Service
Deserters and absentees, ques. 879
Expenditure, ques. 973
Guelph Novitiate, 1248
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 2986
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mulgrave services, 1302, 1304
National harbours, 3743-4

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
National Parks, 4051-2
Naturalization, 4270-2
Naval recruiting in Prince Edward Island, ques. 646
Naval Service, 2836
Bronze Star, ques. 602
Discharge of men, fisheries needing help, 1959
New Harbour breakwater, 2783
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1564, 2021-3
Old-age pensions, 1268
Parliament Buildings, 2334
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Pensions, 4188, 4199
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Pictou Island, 2793
Pilotage, 2612, 2803, 2804, 2807, 3159
Port Felix custom house, 956
Postage rate
Letters, suggested reduction, 2041
Newspapers, ques. 727
Post Office supplies, 2091
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
Provident Fund Act, ques. 2045
Provincial subsidies, ques. 744
Public Health Department, 1191
Appointments, 1182
Public Works, Nova Scotia, 2781
Purchasing Commission, 3230, 3238-9, 4454
Railway Act Consolidation — telephones, 4167
Railway crossings, 936
Railways, subventions to, ques. 604
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 709-713
Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398
Royal Naval College, 2850
Rural postmasters, ques. 1536
St. John Harbour Commission, 4302-3, 4337-8
Seed grain, 627, 1035-40
Shipbuilding, 1688, 2211, 2259-61, 4683-4
England, in, cost of, 2213
Permanency in Canada, 2260
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1770-2
Soldiers' Settlement Board, 1075
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Nova Scotia loans, ques. 847
Solicitors, ques. 883
Statistics Act Amdt., 596
Steamship services, 1283, 1284
Steam shovels for Militia Dept., ques. 1907
Taxation, statistics of, 3839
Technical education, 3167-73, 3793, 3896
Telephone companies, 2646
Trawlers
Built in Canada, 2213
Sale of, ques. 751

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
"T. J. Drummond," steamer, purchase of, ques. 2397
War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216
War Trade Board, 2073
Weights and measures, 2149
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 616
Wine Harbour, 2783
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-5

Slate River, 3191

Slides and Booms, 4607

Smart, Brig.-Gen., charges by, 1099, 1483

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Daylight Saving, 893

Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068

Social Welfare. *See* Public Health

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81, 1896, 4673
Department of
Allowances; vocational training, 2776
Buildings, etc., vocational training, 2764
Deputy Minister, 3586
Director of Medical Services, resignation of, Col. F. McKelvey Bell, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674
Hospitals, 2774
Maintenance of patients, 2770
Officials without overseas record, 4240
Parliamentary Secretary, resignation of, Mr. F. B. McCurdy, 185, 974, 4676
Report tabled, 270
Representation in House of Commons, 974
Staff and salaries, 2761, 2772, ques. 4240, 4479

Soldiers' Land Settlement, 88, 96, 153, 185, 300, 323, 343, 395, 413, 446, 588
Board, ques. 1075
Salaries, 2452
Solicitors, ques. 883
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Offers of land, ques. 610
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1437
Santa Lucia, troops at, ques. 615
See also Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill; Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest; Reclamation

Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill, 1616. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 3848, 4012; 3r., 4073
Board of Commissioners, 3873
Compulsory purchase, 2875
Default, resale, 3882-4
Exemption from seizure under ordinary laws, 3885
Free soldier grants, 3879, 4014
Garden villages, 4012. *See that title*

Soldiers' Land Settlement—*Con.*
Indian reserves, land from, 3875, 4015
Lands sold to Board free of commission, 3891
Liens, statement of, 3888
Loans on stock, fruit trees, etc., 3890, 4014
Regulations, 4014
School lands, 3879
Security, 3887
Surveys, 3890
Taxation, 3888
Title to land, 3874

Soothing Syrups. *See* Proprietary

Sowden, Mr. Felix M., ques. 729

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Living allowance, 2445
Rulings and statements of
Adjournment—matter of urgent public interest—leave to discuss (Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt's charges), 1099, 1101
Appeal from decision to House—Daylight Saving, 1432
Bills
Introduction, unprinted, not in order, 3754
Motion to commit, limits of debate on, 2617
Second reading, limits of discussion, 3200, 3818, 4506-9
Chair to be addressed, 3639
Committees
Appointment of members opposed to principle, 1482
Reference in House to proceedings of, 3590, 3603
Report of—to be accepted as regular, 4313, 4320
Amendment of, procedure in, 2722
Clerical errors, correction of, 2616
Daylight Saving
Motion, form of, 928
Time of meeting of House under, 1432
Debate, special latitude of, 4141
Debating same subject twice—Mr. McMaster's amdt. to the Budget allowed, 3260, 3677
Divisions—not needed if no contrary voice, 4527
Galleries of House, 1910
Internal Economy, Board of, report under Rule 9, 605
Language: "defraud the electors," 1325; "culprit," 1326; "miserable, cowardly slander," 1334
Lapsed order
Member speaking at time of lapse continues only by consent, 399
Reinstatement, motion for, not debatable, 398

Speaker (Hon. Edward N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements—*Con.*
Member speaking may not interrogate another, 3638
Motions, form of, 2722
Withdrawal of, 1259
Newspapers referring to proceedings of the House, 3660
Orders of the Day: appropriateness of discussion on calling, 271, 318, 357, 2201, 2202, 2294, 2399, 3472, 3473, 4239, 4335
Attack on Government not in order, 3194
Questions only, no debate, 1435, 1483
Reading of document, 1711
Privilege
Address instead of message from Senate, 642
Limitation of speech, on rising to, 1998
Procedure under general resolution takes precedence over procedure subsequently set, 398
Question in interruption of speaker, 275-6
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 648
Copies, supplying of, 612, 647
Reading of documents from outside criticising members of House, 1488
Reconsideration, 4140
Relevancy, 643, 878, 1330, 1335, 1337, 1382, 4146, 4150, 4167, 4506
Senate
Amdts., advisability of form of, 4153, 4157
Non-concurrence in, form of motion, 3810
Conference with, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Message to, motion not debatable, 4170
Reflection upon proceedings of, 4148, 4154
Six months' hoist, 903
Unanimous consent, 936, 1479, 2653, 3175, 4140
Bill, amdt. on. 3r., 696
Necessary, resuming speech on lapsed order, 399
Written speeches, 117

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard (*Fraser Valley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 412. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—party government, 412; Soldiers' Land Settlement, 413; Indian reserves—rural mail carriers and postmasters, 414—amdts. to B.N.A. Act—national unity, 415

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard—*Con.*
Budget, 3390. Farmers and the tariff, 3390; after-war troubles, 3391; industrial unrest, 3392; reasons for vote, 3394
Representation Act Amdt., 4, 727
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Compulsory purchase—Indian reserves—amdt., 3875-9, 4016
Payments, 3882

Stamp Taxes, alleged abuses under, 334

Standardization, Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842

Standing Orders, Com. appointed, 112

Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616

Statistics
Imperial, 1057
Industrial, 1917, tabled, 550

Statistics Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 595; 3r., 625

Stead, Mr. R. J. E., appointment, 280

Steamship Services
Australia and New Zealand, 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1296
France, service advocated, 1291
Freight services, 1285
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Grand Manan, 1301
Great Britain, ques. 1107, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, ques. 3827
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Liverpool, 1294
Magdalen Islands-Pictou, 623
Need of, 1290-6
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou and Montague, 1304
Pictou, New Glasgow and Mulgrave, 1304
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
Railway subsidies vs. steamship, 1296
South Africa, 1289, 1291
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283

Steam shovels for Militia Department, ques. 1907

Steel Plate Plant, Dominion Steel Company, 2209, 2251-60

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 96. Returned soldiers—land settlement, 96; Liberal party—Union government—public health, 97; immigration, 99

*Name changed: formerly Westminster District. *See* pp. 4, 625, 727

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Canada Food Board, ques. 2750
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 2015
Civil Service, Committee to inquire into efficiency of, 1554
Daylight Saving, 911
Divorce, 3781, 3790
Famine in India, 2616
Fish, Canadian, marketing overseas, ques. 2750
Immigration
Medical examination of passengers, 1974
Prohibiting certain classes, 1924
Mail contractors, 2088
Mennonites in Ontario, 1925
Orders in Council, number passed, ques. 2145
Parliament Buildings, 2337
Portland cement, duty on, ques. 1612
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81, 2485, 3826, 3938
Opium and derivatives, 2489-92
Public Health Bill, 1189
Child welfare, 1375
Rural postmasters, 2089

Stefansson Expedition, 2849

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert (Vancouver Centre)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Board of Commerce, 4470
Budget, 3315. Foreign credits—tariff, 3316; war and protection, 3318; high cost of living, 3319; coal duties and freight rates, 3329
Canada Grain Act Amdt.—grain trade, operation of elevators, 3947-9, 4077-84, 4090
Chinese immigration, ques. 751
Civil Service, appointment of returned soldiers, 281
Combines, 4569
Copper refineries, 1106
Daylight Saving, 911
Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Foreign trade—credits and ships, 2167, 3835
Grain on Great Lakes, ques. 599
Immigration, restrictions, 769-773
Judges, County Court, 2954
Judges' salaries, British Columbia, 2305, 2310
Mounted Police, service in Northwest Rebellion, 2322
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Railway Act Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3083

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert—*Con.*
Telephone companies, 2646
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2564
Vancouver harbour, 4021
Vancouver pension office, ques. 3377
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1011, 1020

Stewart, Mr. John A. (Lanark)
Insurance Act Amdt.—"actuary," 3987
Judges and income tax, 4230
Prohibition, 2351, 2356
Proprietary medicines, 2480-2, 2486
Coal tar derivatives and opium, 2490
Purchasing Commission, 4450

Stewart, Mr. Thomas Joseph (West Hamilton)
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4345
Railway Act Consolidation
Commission's control of rates, 4142
Reconsideration of clause 325 objected to, 2929, 4140
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2943
Telephone companies, 2650

Stewart, Maj.-Gen. J. W., 2868

Stock Feed, purchase of, 2447

Stock Yards. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill

Strikes. *See* Industrial Unrest

Submarine, gift to Canada, 229, ques. 2868

Sugar, raw, freight rates on, 3471, 4683

Supply, Com. of, ordered, 592

Supply, 842, 954, 1044, 1105, 1262, 1282, 1483, 1588, 1886, 2016, 2067, 2202, 2251, 2291, 2313, 2359, 2440, 2493, 2761, 2780, 2808, 2887, 2952, 2959, 3175, 3827, 4033, 4475, 4601, 4664

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supreme Court
Chief Justice, allowances to. *See* Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Final appeal, 1059

Surveys, 4049-51, 4055
Geodetic, 4045
Military, 1899

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Air Board Bill, 2060
Board of Commerce, 4512
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1561
Transfers, 1269
War bonus, 2929
Daylight Saving, 896
Good roads, 3904

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Grain trade—elevators and mills, 4091
Immigration, 1884, 1910, 2595
Industrial unrest, causes of, 2929
Labourers needed, 3905
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—price of butter, 2064-5
Mail contractors and city postmen, 2081
Noxious weeds, 4091
Pensions Board; appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Public Health Bill, appointments, 1184
Railway Act
Senate amdts., telephones, 2645-50, 4154
Rural mail delivery and closing of offices, 2086-7, 2928
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-9
Terminal elevators, ques. 880
Titles, 1478
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 995

Sweeney, Cpl. George, ques. 3067

Sydney Wharf, 4613

Taber Irrigation District Bill. 1r., 3997; 2r., com., 4210; 3r., 4211

Tadoussac-Labrador winter communication, ques. 3327

Tariff. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Commission, 311, 484
Implements and raw materials, 142, 514
Luxuries, on, ques. 749
Proposed amdt. of Mr. McMaster, 794

Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066

Taxation. *See also* Address; Budget; Tariff
Commissioner of, 2798
Staff of, 3712
Methods, 830
Provincial taxation of Dominion lands, 709

Taylor, John, pension case of, 3001

Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

Technical Education Bill. Res., 3164; 1r., 3175; 2r., com., 3791, 3891; 3r., 4136
Question as to time of presenting, 1616

Telegraphs and Telephones
Government, 4608
Nova Scotia, 2793

Thanksgiving Day Bill. 1r., 1305-6

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 298. Union government, 298; Orders in Council, 299; women's franchise—Opposition leader—land for soldiers—immigration, 300; Health Department—foreign trade, 301; highways—aerial navigation and Canada's great hinterland, 302; world commerce via Canada by airship, 305; Canada's lead in great enterprises, 306
Immigration, medical examination, 1975
Mining machinery, 3692
Naturalization, 4273
Red Cross Society, 3168
Scientific Research, 4462
Shale oils, 3692-3
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763-4, 2766, 2771
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Yukon Act Amdt., 503-5
Yukon Placer Mining Amdt., 629-632
Yukon, wheat growing, 2973

Thompson, Lt.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Thompson, Mr. Thomas Henry (Hastings East).
Daylight Saving, 906
Income tax, 3714-5

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Board of Commerce, 4568
Budget, 3579. Representative government, 3579; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3580; free trade or protection, 3581; income tax, 3582
Judges and income tax, 4234
Naturalization, 4263
Prohibition, 2682-4
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 823
Titles, 2739

Timber purchases in Canada, 1361

Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Titles
Address to His Majesty the King, motion for (Mr. Nickle), 1441
Amdt., appointment of Special Com. (Mr. J. D. Reid), 1464
Amdt., to change phraseology (Sir Thomas White), 1479; agreed to on div., 1481
Committee report, 2359
Correction, 2615
Day fixed for discussion, 2617
Motion to adopt (Mr. Nickle), 2696; agreed to on div., 2749
Amdt. (Mr. Nicholson, Algoma), 2722; neg. on div., 2749
Address to the King acknowledged by H.E. the Governor General, 3377

Tobin, Mr. Edmund William (Richmond and Wolfe)
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Canada Registration
Persons registered and cost, ques. 728
Use made of information, ques. 728
Canadian National Railway, ties, 3900
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Grand Trunk Provident Fund, ques. 1213
Kingsmill, Admiral, visit to Victoria, ques. 1340
Kohn, Mr. Louis, Secretary, Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 747
Land grants to railways, ques. 975
Members of Parliament, sessional indemnity, ques. 749
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
Military Service Act
Defaulters, ques. 883
Exemptions, ques. 1108
Expenditure, ques. 645
Men of 19 years, registration of, ques. 615
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973
Regulations in force, ques. 646
Militia, permanent force, 3984
Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Naval Service, Canadian ratings in Grand Fleet, ques. 608
Ottawa
Central Station, ques. 1213
Federal Hotel, lease of, ques. 2045
Proprietary medicines war tax, ques. 1107
Seed grain, ques. 979, 1030
Soldiers' Land Settlement, ques. 610
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747

Tolmie, Mr. Simon Fraser (Victoria City)
Air Service
Air Board Bill, 2060
Aviation in Canada, ques. 1340
Mails by, 2036
Budget, 3569. Tariff and Japanese competition—development of natural resources, 3570; labour unrest, 3571; dairy products, beef and pork, 3572; British embargo on Canadian cattle, 3573
Cold storage, 2986
Good roads, 4429
Judges' salaries, 2958
Live stock, pure-bred sires, 2995
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988
Wrecking plants, 2605

Toronto
Deputy Postmaster, 161, 276
Euclid Hall as hospital, ques. 749
Harbour improvements, 2363
Letter carriers, 1341

Toronto and Niagara Power Company. *See* Railway Act Consolidation; Electric and Power Companies

Toronto Suburban Railway, ques. 1678

Tourist Traffic, 4046-53

Town Planning and garden villages, 761. *See also* Housing

Tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048

Trade
Commission and Commissioners, ques. 664, ques. 1905, 3831, 4493
Development of, $150,000 vote, 3840
Discrimination in Britain, alleged, 72, 115, 140, 229
Embargo, 567
Export, reference in Speech from the Throne, 2
Exports and Imports, report tabled, 550
Foreign, and credit, 3831-7
France, 1099
Italy, 3808
Japan, 4019
Roumania, 1110, 1615-8, ques. 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton and, 1908
United States, 58
Great Britain, trade with and credits to, 1353-61

Trade and Commerce Dept., 335, 4605

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 293. Peace Conference, Canada's representation — Civil Service Commission, 293; reconstruction — resignation of Parliamentary Under Secretary—returned soldiers, 294; pensions—censorship, 295; industrial unrest—women's franchise and election—Government labour and social programme, 296; tariff, 297; national unity, 298
Budget, 3394. Finance and currency, 3394; remedies for existing difficulties, 3397; tariff, 3398; income tax, 3399; real wealth, 3401
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Public Health, 1186, 1376
Social welfare, child welfare, 1200-5
Technical education, 3792

Transatlantic Flight, ques. 2143, 2564

Trnsatlantic mail service, 1711, 1794

Transcontinental Highway, 1401

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Transmission Lines on highways. *See* Railway Act

Trawlers
Building and use of, ques. 746
Sale of, ques. 751
T-30, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472

Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880

Trudel, Mr. Alfred, ques. 2921

Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Tuck, Mr. Donald, 279

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 307. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Opposition leadership, 307; Canada's soldiers — League of Nations — tariff, 308; reciprocity, 309; manufacturers—expenditures on Government railways, 310; taxation — tariff commission—War-time Elections Act, 311; highways—printers in Militia Department plant, 312
Budget, 3262. Procrastination charged, 3262; finance, 3263; cost of living, 3264; customs and other taxes, 3265; naval policy, 3266; Canada and free trade, 3268
Canadian National Railway
Lines to be included, 1682
Term of office of directors—vacancy—annual meeting, 1814
Gloucester, fisheries officer, 2893
Guelph Novitiate, 1253
Lobsters and hatcheries, 723, 2901-2
Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790
Petit Rocher as site for experimental farm, 2965
Technical education, 3170

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March (West Calgary)
"Belgian-Canada," 2587
Canadian National Railway, 1832
Daylight Saving, 926
Divorce Court Bill, 3780
Dominion Parks, 4053
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Frozen beef, 1287
Highways, 790
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Hutterites, 1876, 1941
Illiterates, 1963
Offices in the West, 2588
Prohibiting certain classes, 1940

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March—*Con.*
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2312
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Post office officials enlisted, 2040
Public Health, social welfare, 1192
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3120
Railway branch lines, 792
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2324
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2947

Ukrainians, 1933, 1937, 2343, 3472. *See also* Poles, Ruthenians

Unforeseen Expenses, report tabled, 138

Uniats, 1384

United States
Canada's relations with, 153
Canadians entering and returning, 1110
Immigration legislation in, 2281
Prohibition in, 2659
Trade with. *See* Foreign trade
War and, 14, 117

Units of Electrical Measure Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 713; 3r., 784

Universal Military Training 1891

Unprovided Items, 2461

Vancouver District Pension Office, ques. 3377

Vancouver Harbour Bill. Res., 3742; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 4017; 3r., 4021

Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070

Vaudreuil-Soulanges mail, ques. 2566

Venereal Disease, 1373. *See also* Public health

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Canadian National Railway, labour representation, 2138
Dominion Police—Henri Bourdon, ques. 1440
Military Service Act, M.D. No. 4, ques. 1438
Public health, 1377

Vessels
Canadian, requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
Cold storage on steamers, ques. 882
Government-owned, ques. 1306
Employees on, ques. 609
How engaged, ques. 974
Names
"A. J. McKee," ques. 1212, ques. 2397
"Alert," The, 966
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608

Vessels—*Con.*
Names—*Con.*
"Brant," steamer, 2607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 608, 746
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
"Champlain," steamer, ques. 616, 2006
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
"Helena," ques. 3998
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 606, ques. 609
"Lady Evelyn," steamer, ques. 3680
"Lottie Russell,' steamer, ques. 746
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 1978, 2607
"Montmagny," C.G.S., ques. 1613
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615, ques. 3680
Steamer to replace, 2797
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747, ques. 880
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793-4
"Tuna," steamer, ques. 746, ques. 1905
"T. J. Drummond," ques. 2397
"T-30," trawler, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 617

Vickers, Limited, trawlers built by, 2214

Victoria, Astrophysical observatory, 4045

Victory Loan. *See also* Budget
Cost of (1918), ques. 2798
Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
$50 bonds, ques. 2047

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lobtinière)
Board of Commerce, 4507, 4531-2, 4561-4
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1776, 1853
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1765-9
Directors, 1783
Securities of other companies, 1781
Circulation and reserve, ques. 614
Cost of Living Com., 4309
Dominion Parks, expropriations for, 2302
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Federal district, 4385
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Force contracts, Government policy in, 1603-9
Gold shipments, ques. 614
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 693, 1112, 1261
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311
Lévis station, 2458

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Loans, taxed and tax-free, 2246-8
Mineral claims on Dominion lands, 2298-9, 2300-01
Railway crossings, 937-8
St. Charles River works, 1023
Schools and religious teaching, 2404
Shipbuilding, ques. 613
Soldiers' dependents, payments to, ques. 644
Telegraphs and telephones, 4609
War expenditure ($350,000,000), transportation, 2243

Vimy Ridge, 1058

Vocational Training. *See also* Technical Education
Governor General's Speech, 2
Soldiers, of. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Under-age soldiers, for, 1011

Votes and Proceedings. *See* House

Voters' Lists, provincial, 2446

Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties, 3707

Wallace, Mr. Thomas George (West York)
Railway Act Consolidation, 2620, 2642
Telephone companies, 2642, 2650

War
Aerial craft and forces, 1263, 2866
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Royal Air Force, ques. 646, ques. 1611
Argyll House. *See, under this title,* Overseas administration, Headquarters Staff in London
Armistice, 1
Prolonged, 111, 550
Battles
St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205, 337, 464-7
Ypres, second battle, 545
Belgium, restoration of, cablegram, 1955
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Canada's record, 201, 420, 499. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Canadian Army Dental Corps, 2871
Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2869-71
Canadian Cavlary Brigade, 2866
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 388, ques. 1307
Enlistments in, ques. 2904
Files, mislaid, ques. 1108
Religion and nationality, ques. 3998
Resolution of gratitude, 4696
Rifles and ammunition, 338, 1614
Routine orders tabled, 40

War—*Con.*
Canadian Field Comforts Association, 2874
Canadian Military Y.M.C.A., 2874
Canadian Officers' Club, 2874
Canadian Railway Troops, 2868
Canadian Red Cross Society. *See that title*
Canadian War Contingents Association, 2874
Casualties. *See also under this head*, Overseas Administration
Canadians as prisoners of war, ques. 1077
French Canadians, ques. 644
Chaplains, 2871
Correspondence, production not in public interest, 753
Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur. *See that title*
Decorations for Canadians, 327, 339, 2861
Demobilization, 118, 207, 322, 501, 1058, 4535
"Aquitania," SS., port of landing, 2292
Farmers' sons, 1958
Men in garrison, 2236
Ministerial statements, 1793, 2861, 2874
Plans. *See below*, Overseas Administration
Port of landing, 2402
Progress of, 971
Strikes delaying, 3741
Troops awaiting embarkation, entertainment and occupation for, 648
Deserters, ques. 879. *See below*, Military Service
Director of Military Estates, 2871
Enlistment
Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408
Quebec, 443
Expenditures, ques. 2798. *See also* Budget; War Expenditures Bill
Summary by Departments, 1345
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1710, 1789, 1865
Forestry Corps, 2869
German fleet, 266, 1289
Germany's surrender, 1
Hospitals
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296
Doullens, bombing of, 2870
Etaples, bombing of, 2870
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1212
St. Dunstan's Hostel, 2874
Troyes, 2871
Imperial Munitions Board. *See that title*
Indemnity
Cable from Prime Minister, 928
Canada's claim, 450, 773, 929
I.O.D.E. Clubs, 2874
Khaki University, 2873
"Llandovery Castle," sinking of, 2870

War—*Con.*
Maple Leaf Clubs, 2874
Medical Service, financial administration, 2885
Memorials
Building, ques. 1216
Scholarships, 340
Ypres memorial, 4465
Military Service. *See also* Military Service Act
Conscientious objectors, 372
Conscripted men in active service, ques. 610
Defaulters and slackers, 263, 418
Cost and control of registration, ques. 610
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Totals May-December, 1917, ques. 609
Registration and men of 19 years, ques. 615
Naval Service
Boys in, ques. 607
British Admiralty and, ques. 603
Bronze Star for, ques. 602
Canadians in British Grand Fleet, ques. 606, ques. 608
Coast protection, ques. 745, 1263
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Increase of pay, ques. 607
Newfoundland ratings in, ques. 606
Prize money, ques. 607
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Nursing Sisters, 2870
Overseas Administration
Canada's forces at the front, organization of, 204
Brigades and divisions, 2865
Canadian troops, control and administration, 2858
Outside Canadian corps in France, numbers, 2858
Canadian war records, 2043, 2872
Decorations won by Canadians, 2861
Canadians for Mesopotamia, Palestine, North Russia, 2860
Charges by Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 513, 522, 575, 1483
Base Commandant at Dunkirk, records of, ques. 1216
Cinematograph films, 2872
Demobilization, 2857, 2874
Documents, 2878
England, discharges in, 2861
Steamship accommodation, 2877
French Canadian Brigade, 150, 331
Headquarters Staff in London, 2879
Names, 2880

War—*Con.*
Overseas Administration—*Con.*
History of operations, forthcoming, 2857
Mails for soldiers, 2864
Ministerial statement — Sir Edward Kemp, 2856-87
New organizations in active service, 2859
Overseas Military Council, 2860
Overseas Purchasing Comm., 2871
Stores, horses, etc., disposition of, 2862
Trophies, 2043, 2864
Paintings, 2872
Paris Conference. *See* Peace; Reconstruction
Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic
Pay Corps, 2871
Provinces, respective war records, 265
Records and documents, preservation of, 330. *See also under this head,* Overseas Administration
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Rifles, Canadian and Lee-Enfield, 1614
Roumanian border, proposed guard by Canadians, 1618
Royal Automobile Club, 2874
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Cavalry squadron to Siberia, 2316
Siberian Expedition. *See that title*
Soldiers. *See also that title*
Canadian, and British public opinion, 468
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905
Canadian, in Ireland, ques. 849
Canadian, in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian, in Russia, ques. 1216
Casualties, 2873
Censorship of letters, 1663
Complaints, alleged suppression of, 1618
Crucifixion of Canadian by, Germans 2872
Dependents, ques. 644
Widowed mother, ques. 1908
Equipment allowances for officers, ques. 1663
Furloughs in France, 271
German-Canadians, 376
Gratuity, war service, 343, ques. 1791, ques. 4241
Irregularities
Camp disturbances, 2876, 2886
Kinmel (*see that title*) 357, 424, 437
Trials and sentences overseas, 1029, 1163, 1434, 1435, 1959, 3469, 3470
Parade in London, 2874
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions. *See that title*
Prisoners in Germany, 2873
Regulars vs. Irregulars, 200

War—*Con.*
Soldiers—*Con.*
Returned, 95, 105, 135, 159, 177, 183, 187, 222, 294, 328, 353, 410, 418, 445, 548
Civil Service and, 280, 291, 962
Positions for wounded: motion (Mr. McCurdy), 981; withdrawn, 1002; amdt. (Mr. Morphy), 998; withdrawn, 1002
Community life and, 768
Disability, industrial, Government insurance against, 994
Employment of, 218, 1607
Garden villages for, 761
Halifax, at, discharge or leave for, 1663, 1711
Land settlement, 502
"Northland" inquiry, report tabled, 111
Occupation for, 764
Officers, rank in militia after peace, 1890
Paralytic patients, ques. 749
Parliament, in, 473
Portland, reported debarkation at, ques. 647
Repatriation, cost of Committee, ques. 613
Technical education, 756
Treatment of, Government policy respecting, 753
Usurious practices against, ques. 977
Vocational training, 502
Quebec, province, in, ques. 971
Under-age soldiers and, 1011
Service medal, ques. 883
Sickness and disability
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Patients in England, ques. 615
Total disability, ques. 1213
The honoured dead
Bodies, ques. 1107
Graves, 332, 2861
Votes, 3135
War record of Canadian soldiers, 308. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Trophies, 1349, 2864
Universities, work of, 2870
United States, part in, 14, 117
Units
Princess Patricia's C. L. Infantry, 550, ques. 616
22nd Battalion, demobilization of, 1616
War Service button, 343
Women's work, 388, 470

War Credits in Europe, 1352. *See also* Trade

War Expenditures Bill ($350,000,000). Res., 1343; 1r., 1366; 2r., com., 2166; 3r., 2343

War Graves Commission, 1057, 1061

War Measures Act, 1163
Orders in Council passed under, 4135
Powers under, 652

War Measures Act Extension Bill. 1r., 1433; 2r., 1566, 2097, 2148

War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216, 3198, 3202, 4307
Letter from Canadian firm criticizing, 3236

War Revenue Act, violation of, ques. 1791

War Service Gratuities, 4241

War-time Elections Act. *See* Address; Ukrainians; Franchise

Washington, representation of Canada at, 1074, 2070-9, 2201

Water-borne Traffic, control of rates, 2929. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Waterhen Lake, reclamation, 709

Water-power, development and export, 1599-1600
French River, 1077
Lake Nipissing, 1341
St. Lawrence River, 886, 1796, 1901-4, 1956
Documents to be printed, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Co., 2396

Water Supply. *See* Public health

Ways and Means, Com. of, 592, 3081, 2952, 4689

Weights and Measures, salaries of inspectors, ques. 2296

Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 952; 1r., 954; 2r., com., 2149; amdt. (Mr. Jacobs), 2151; agreed to, 2158; 3r., 2290-1; Senate amdts., 4021

Welland Canal, 1592-1610
Contracts to be laid on the table, 1609

West Indies, ques. 1533
Cable, 3840

Westman, Mr. Eldon, Toronto, 277

Westminster. *See* Representation Act

Wharves, piers, breakwaters, 40

Wheat
Crop and prices, 1919, 3471, 4466
Export, ques. 1790
Financing crop, 977
Flour duties, 2681
Free, 3706
Greece, contract for, ques. 2907
Market for, 1711
Ships to carry, 2259, 2261
United States' crop, 2259

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, wheat specialist, 2970-2

Whidden, Mr. Howard Primrose (Brandon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 221. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 221; aliens—Liberal party—returned soldiers, 222; housing — prohibition, 223; public health—vocational education, 224
Budget, 3422. Mr. Cannon, 3422; industrial unrest, 3423; tariff reductions, 3425; reasons for vote, 3426
Canadianizing immigrants, 1924
Immigrants, undesirable, 1923
Peace Treaty, 1382
Prohibition, 2669
Technical education, 3800

White, Hon. Sir Thomas, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Finance). *See also* Leader of the House
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 27. Leader of Opposition—mover and seconder, 27; war and victory—Peace Conference, 28; Germany must pay—demobilization and reconstruction, 29; unemployment — construction of railways—housing, 30; export trade—highways—franchise—House of Commons, 31; League of Nations—party government, 32
Agricultural implements—duties on, 3694-9, 3705
Drawback on duty, 3699
Freight rates on, 3697-8, 3703
Auditor General, death of, 116
Auditor General's report, 514, 744
Baker, the late Lt.-Col. George Harold, M.P., 2224
Bank and Dominion notes, 634
Bank mergers, 1089
Bankruptcy, 2275-7
Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 3
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Budget Speech, 1712, 3135. Cost of the war to Canada, 3136; national debt, 3136-7; loans and maturities, 3137; national assets and resources, 3139; industrial production — foreign trade, 3141; revenue and expenditure, 3143; tariff and taxation proposals, 3144; railway rates and coal duties, 3145; income and business taxes, 3147; tariff revision, 3150; resolutions, 3151
In reply, 3605. Conscription of wealth, business profits war tax, 3606; tractors —war and finance, 3607; currency and exchange, 3609; victory loans, press advertising and support, brokerage, interest rate, 3611-13; calling in of

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
In reply—*Con.*
loans—prices, 3615; income tax, 3616; land tax—credits for foreign trade, 3617; cost of living, 3619; prospects, 3620; fiscal policy, 3621; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3622; increased public expenditure — national unity, 3624
Business profits war tax, 3709-10
Cabinet Ministers, House of Commons and Senate and, 1005
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1734
Directors, appointment of, 1634
Term of office of, 1646
Expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 1704, 2103
Head office, 1651-2
Labour representation in directorate, 1643
Orders in Council, 1692-3
President's salary, 1657
Public ownership, 1734
Canadian Press news service, 4482, 4486
Censorship, 1110
Chartered Banks' excess circulation, 633-7, 1103
Currency Act—bronze coins, 637
Customs war tax, 3708
Daylight Saving, 647, 886, 923, 970, 1208, 1434
Ottawa time and Parliamentary time, 1342
Railway time, 1434
Dominion Iron & Steel and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Economy in expenditure, 4246
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 141
Finance Dept., salaries, 4475-7
Fishing—twine and cordage used in, 3708
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 856, 971
Flint, Dr. Thomas B., death of, 1341
Foreign exchange, 2239
Foreign trade, credits, etc., 1351, 1360, 2190
Belgium, 1360
Roumania, 1615, 1618, 3241
Fraternal Societies—Insurance Act Amdt., 1567
Galvanized iron, 3681, 3689-90
Gold
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Reserves, 636

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Good roads, 4412
Government measures, time of presentation, 1616
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 316, 1127-37, 1159
Exchequer Court and, 664
Government's position under, 694
Resolution for, 649, 653
Grand Trunk Railway
Finance, 4245
Proposed taking over of, 657
Government offer, company's counter offer, 659, 694
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1184-85, 1210
Greece, supply of wheat, 2907
High Commissioner, reported resignation, 647
Horse racing, 1710
House of Commons
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 185
Committees, standing, 2
Easter adjournment, 886
Legislation to be brought down, 2399
Privilege—address from Senate instead of request by Message, 642
Questions and returns, 648, 886
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Wednesday sittings, 929, 1109
Income war tax, 3710-38
Assessment, date of, 3737
Children, allowance for, 3725
Depreciation, renewals, etc., 3720-1
Timber limits, etc., 3721-2
Judges, 3715, 3719
Life insurance, 3718
Living expenses, no allowance for, 3725
Losses, 3991-2
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3992
Number of taxpayers, 3726
Personal and living expenses, 2980, 3990
Publicity of assessment, 3717-9
Returns—penalties, 3736-7
Shareholders of tax-paying corporations, 3725
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727-9
Undistributed profits, 3727
Industrial Relations Commission, 1432
International Waterways Commission, 462
Kinmel Camp riots, 357, 424
Statement and cables, 512
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 2, 4, 5
Loans
Authorized and to be made, 2245-50
Borrowing powers and loans made, 2343-4

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Loans—*Con.*
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Taxed or tax-free, 2246-7
$75,000,000, New York, 4198
$100,000,000, domestic, 2245-6, 4242-6
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, et al, 513, 647, 1101, 1502
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1257
Ministerial changes, 139
National Transcontinental Railway, summary, 665
Newsprint control, 2240, 4536, 4540-8, 4662-3
Nickel, 3685-9
Oleomargarine, 3708
Ottawa, the Dominion Capital, planning of, 4249-50
Ottawa Improvement Comm., 4246-51, 4385-6
Packing companies, taxation of, 4478
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Peace Conference, 1382, 2200
Cable from Prime Minister, 929
Ploughs, duties on, 3691-3705. *See under this head,* Agricultural
Printing Bureau strike, 424
Prohibition, 2654
Res., 2346-58
Public ownership of railways, 1734
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reciprocity, in effect a binding agreement, 3670
Returning soldiers, entertainment and occupation for, 648
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
Sharpe, Lt.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., death of, 3
Soldiers' complaints, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers sentenced to penal servitude in England, 1163
Supply, interim vote 1919-20, 842
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; Address
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Hon. Senator George, death of, 885
Titles, 1458, 1479, 2729
Amdt. to motion for abolition of—appointment of Com. to consider, 1464, 1479
Trade discrimination against Canada, 72, 115, 140, 230, 314
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2565
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707
War correspondence not produced, 753

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2190, 2239-50, 2343-4
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2241-5
Ministerial explanation, 1343
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1711, 1789, 1865
War indemnity, 775, 929
Wheat, market for, 1712
Winnipeg strike, 2616, 2753
Witley Camp,, 462-3

White, Mr. William Henry (Victoria, Alta.)
Budget, 3573. Hon. Mr. Sifton and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3574; aliens, 3575; tariff, 3576; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3577
Franchise, 4626
Naturalization, 4129, 4264-6, 4272
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2318, 2330
Seed grain, 1041
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 816

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Private Bills

Wigmore, Mr. Rupert Wilson (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Coal ships, Sydney-St. Lawrence, ques. 3471
Grand Manan steamship service, 1301
Public Health, 1194, 1196
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 998
St. John Harbour, 4301
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769

Wilson, Mr. Gordon Crooks (Wentworth)
Railway Act Consolidation, Senate amdts., telephones, 4156

Wilson, Mr. James Robert (Saskatoon)
Budget, 3537. Land settlers needed, 3538; oil—tariff, 3539; land tax, 3541; wheat prices, 3542
Canadian National Railway, 1418
Highways, 739
Housing scheme, 2538, 2552
Pensions, 4297
Saskatoon letter carriers' strike, 2084
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat crop, shipping of, 2261
Wheat, experiments of Mr. Seager Wheeler, 2970
Wilson, President, banquet to by His Majesty, 103, 148

Wine Harbour, 2783

Wireless, 2794, 2848

Witley Camp, 462, 3472

Woman masquerading as man, 2440

Woman Suffrage, 226, 296, 300, 405. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Women in the public service, 341

Wool. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.

Woollen Trade
British orders in Canada, 1363
Exports, ques. 845

Worsdale, Cpl. R. W., ques. 3067

Wrecking Plants, subsidies to, 2603-6

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Budget, 2587. Record of the Government, 3587; farmers and wheat prices, 3588; tariff and free trade, 3589

Yapp, Mr., agent for woollen sales, 1363

Yarmouth Bar, 2783

Year Book, 3839

Young men and politics, 376, 383

Yukon, Government of, 4045

Yukon Act Amdt. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 629; 3r., 649